

Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 - 2038

Submission Library

January 2020
Consultation Responses Schedule



Bassetlaw
DISTRICT COUNCIL
— North Nottinghamshire —

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
1190067	Resident	Principles are well meant but limiting. New housing will go in places accessible by sustainable and public transport with a promise to protect important green spaces. This is at odds with ST21 site H57 proposal to relocate Leaffield and Denman allotments	The Council is now proposing to remove Site HS7 Leaffield Allotments from the site allocations. It will remain as an allotment site.
REF010	Resident	The problem (puzzle might be a better word) is that predicting population and economic growth is incredibly difficult. My worry is that Bassetlaw is over optimistic and that has led to projections for way too much housing development and, crucially, allowing housing to be developed without first putting in place adequate infrastructure to support it. Now really important for housing development to begin in places with no or little impact on other residents. In Retford, many people have been affected by unsympathetic building sites. More sympathetic North Road site in Retford is very important. That site should be developed before any further demands are placed on the town or villages. All Retford needs is the excellent Garden Villages, which could be wonderful, and the North Road development. Have an interest in villages and some will want to expand considerably. See my comments about the small village of Lound, where your consultation reads like a set of demands at a time when local people have very recently undertaken 4 years of work to write a Neighbourhood Plan. The real danger is that imposed, rigid targets for housing development without prior visible changes in transport, shops or appreciation of local residents' work to help planning through existing Village Neighborhood Plans will lead residents to become very cynical about local government.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. Policy ST1 has been updated to reflect comments received from the previous consultation in January. This has led to a change to the proposed percentage requirement and to the list of eligible Small Rural Settlements. The updated Rural Settlement Paper provides a narrative to the evolution of the strategy for rural Bassetlaw since 2016 and how the percentage requirements were derived and changed overtime.
REF023	Water Management Consortium	The Board is primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses; supports the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. Bassetlaw is served by two Internal Drainage Boards. Below is information regarding Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board's operations and responsibilities which may be useful to include as an overview of the Boards' activities.	The Council will ensure that the evidence is updated accordingly.
REF029	Torworth Parish Council	Within the Spatial Strategy Document (Jan 2020) Torworth has been incorrectly identified as having a Village Hall – which therefore determines it as being classed as a small rural settlement. Don't have one, or any of the other facilities that would class it as being a small rural settlement. How can this be corrected ?	The Spatail Strategy Background Paper will be updated accordingly.
REF089	NEDDC	Offer support, in principle, for Bassetlaw's strategy to deliver sustainable development and accommodate all its development needs within its own boundaries. Require further clarification in relation to the Draft Plan's housing and employment land targets, before could recommend that this Council signs up to any cross-boundary agreement on these matters.	The Council has followed national Planning Practice Guidance: Housing and economic development needs assessment in determining the requirement for Bassetlaw. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two.
REF132	CODA Planning	Planning permission for development have been subsequently built out or are under construction; • emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan residential, employment and mixed-use allocations which are considered physically related to the settlement; and • areas of land which are physically related to the settlement, are defined by a strong physical boundary, and are capable of being developed without compromising: i. residential amenity of neighbouring properties; ii. the setting of a Listed Building or Conservation Area; iii. the natural beauty of an AONB; iv. an internationally designated wildlife site; v. flood risk (i.e. is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3); or vi. protected Public Open Space.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF136	A and D Architecture	2) Policy ST1 should be modified by adding new sub-paragraph (f) to paragraph C as follows: f) No less than 60 pitches will be allocated for static caravan development.	Local Plan policies must be evidence led. The Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2019 provides no evidence to support this approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy ST01Bassetlaw's			
1195216	Resident	Is there any evidenced need for new houses to be built Any new garden village if needed should be built on brownfield sites such as Bevercotes and not on greenfield.	National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed. Bevercotes is protected as a Local Wildlife Site so is unsuitable for residential development.
1195356	Resident	Easy access to A1 and A57 !!!!!!!!! Seriously..... the A57 from Gateford is a mass car park, what used to be a 35 - 40 minute commute to Sheffield is now approx. 90 minutes or more. Access to A1 through Worksop via Five Lane Ends is horrendous and getting worse with the building of DHL so more lorries. It can take me 15 minutes just to get through Worksop alone. And travelling to the A1 via Blyth is slightly quicker however that road also contends with HGV from Peppers Warehouse and Blyth is struggling to cope with this and normal cars and you want to add a futher potential 3000 cars onto that route by building houses on ST15 HS1 Peaks Hill Farm. The infrastructure cannot handle it and you refuse to change as you will only build 40 houses at a time to slip the through the loop hole that the Highways Agency limit state is 40 + houses then requires a change of roads. As currently been seen on Thievesdale Lane This cannot be allowed to happen the roads cannot cope and are accidents waiting to happen	The Local Plan is informed by the Bassetlaw Transport Study Parts 1, 2 and 3 which identifies the impact of the allocations on the highways network and recommends highway improvements to aid traffic flow around the town including to the A57 and a new road between Blyth Road and Carlton Road. The Council continues to work with Nottinghamshire County Council Highways and Highways England on the Local Plan. This ensures proposed allocations are suitable and deliverable in highways terms.
1195356	Resident	<i>Worksop will deliver...</i> Re read your quote above so why do we need another 1500 houses been built Peaks Hill Farm ST15 HS1 on top of the 174 houses been built by Rippon Homes The Lodge on land off Blyth Road/Thievesdale Lane This cannot be allowed to happen.... you are destroying green land , eco friendly land, animal welfare , established rural landscape for no reasonable or sustainable use. Promoting the efficient and effective use... This again is a complete contradiction to Peaks Hill Farm ST15 HS1 where you are actually destroying versatile agricultural landif the farmers want to sell at least use if for energy like solar farm or wind farm not 1500 houses that are not required as previously stated	National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. This needs to be part of a Local Plan which is a statutory requirement. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield and agricultural land is needed.
REF171	Bawtry Town Council	Paragraph 5.1.25 states that, at 30/11/2019, 185 new homes had been delivered in Harworth & Bircotes and that a further 1,853 are "in the pipeline". Presumably the latter figure includes the development of 650 new homes on land south of the A631 Bawtry Rd, Harworth, for which approval was given last year. The population of Harworth & Bircotes is approximately 7,500 at present. This expansion will take it to over 12,000. The sites of some of the new and planned developments in Harworth are less than 2 miles from Bawtry's High Street; in terms of travelling time Bawtry is as close as the centre of Harworth. Concern that such a substantial expansion of Harworth & Bircotes will place an unsustainable load upon Bawtry's facilities, services and infrastructure. The Localism Act 2011 established a Duty to Cooperate between neighbouring planning authorities in relation to cross-boundary issues, including transport and infrastructure. This was acknowledged in the Initial Draft Plan to: "Support opportunities for the retention, or creation, of new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services, and ensure that impacts on them are appropriately mitigated, including where new development impacts on areas outside of Bassetlaw's boundary." In our response to the Initial Draft we suggested there should be clarification of how this commitment would be delivered, in the context of our concern about adverse impact upon Bawtry. Appendix 2 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan January 2019 concerns about impact upon Bawtry of the expansion of Harworth & Bircotes appeared to have been acknowledged, and there was a statement that BDC and Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council were to "continue to meet as and when required to address cross boundary issues, with the next step being agreeing a Statement of Common Ground." Requested involvement in that process, and BDC responded by stating that the Statement of Common Ground referred to was between the two planning authorities, but they would "explore the potential of a Statement of Common Ground with Bawtry Town Council at the relevant time."	A Statement of Common Ground has been signed between the Council and Doncaster Council which includes an ongoing commitment to work together to manage traffic impacts across boundaries. The Local Plan proposes no allocations in Harworth & Bircotes. The development referred to has planning permission and transport infrastructure improvements have been agreed through the planning application process for each site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
1195879	Hamlin Estates TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services	It is clear that the Local Plan seeks to identify a realistic level of housing and there is general concern that the proposed level of 468 dpa does not take account of historic underprovision across the District. The proposed spread of housing is unlikely to be achieved as there is ample evidence to show that sites such as a 'garden village' have a long gestation before and during delivery. It is thus unrealistic to expect this to deliver the full 750 units in the Local Plan - 500 would be more realistic.	The calculation of housing need (using national guidance Standard Method) takes into consideration under delivery. As such there is no requirement to add it on. The Bassetlaw Local Housing Need and Economic Need Assessment 2020 provides the evidence for the housing requirement and housing delivery.
REF198	Consultant	Para 5.1.49 page 30 This refers to ST1 which again confirms that the house numbers can be delivered but also states that this, so called, "step change" is to be included. Why? If the figures can be achieved, what evidence is there that we need a step change?	National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. This is also a requirement of national policy. The step change refers to the need to deliver better paid higher skilled jobs to the benefit of residents.
REF199	Cushwake	It is noted that following an updated assessment the Council has reviewed the housing requirement in light of the opportunities for an increase in economic growth across the District over the Plan period. There is a requirement to deliver a minimum of 478 dwellings per annum or a minimum of 9087 dwellings over the plan period and this increase is welcome and the inclusion of 'minimum' within the policy text of Policy ST1C (1) is in line with our previous representation and suggested amendment to the policy wording.	Support noted and welcome.
REF199	Cushwake	Policy ST1 as drafted is unjustified and unsound. Development in large and small rural settlements is capped at 20%, however the Council have not provided any clear justification for this cap in the evidence base. Each application should be determined on its own merits based on the principles of sustainable development and the future sustainable growth of rural settlements should not be restricted because an arbitrary cap of 20% has been reached. Consider that the restriction on development for larger settlements to site areas of 1ha or less for housing sites that are not allocated either through the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan is not justified. Similarly, for small rural settlements, development proposals are restricted to 10 dwellings – again this is not evidenced and therefore not justified.	Policy ST1 has been updated to reflect comments received from the previous consultation in January. This has led to a change to the proposed percentage requirement and to the list of eligible Small Rural Settlements. The updated Rural Settlement Paper provides a narrative to the evolution of the strategy for rural Bassetlaw since 2016 and how the percentage requirements were derived and changed overtime. The NPPF encourages local and neighbourhood plans to identify, " land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare" and therefore the Local Plan is encouraging this through rural development and through the allocation of sites within neighbourhood plans. The limit to 10 dwellings per site for Small Rural Settlements has been dropped.
REF205	Resident	The Policy proposes delivering sustainable development and growth appropriate to the size of each settlement. This Policy is supported.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF214	Oxalis Planning	<p>Broadly support Policy ST1. Agree that the most logical approach to delivering the District's housing needs over the Plan period is to direct the majority of housing towards the main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. It is a sensible and logical approach to divide the majority of the rest of development across the Large Rural Settlements, as these locations already have the infrastructure in place to enable them to accommodate sustainable growth, which will, in turn, help to sustain the vitality of these locations. Support Misterton's identification as a 'Large Rural Settlement'. To accord with the Council's vision and objectives, new development should ensure that it seeks to mitigate its potential impact through the provision of physical, social and green infrastructure, to ensure that growth within the Large Rural Settlements is sustainable for the long-term. However, we do not agree with the proposed distribution of housing within the Large Rural Settlements, which is limited to those sites identified within Neighbourhood Plans. The inherent nature of Neighbourhood Plans means that they have a strong focus on the local area and consequently parochial ambitions, but they do not necessarily deliver the strategic scale thinking which is required to ensure that the strategic needs of the District are accounted for. If the Large Rural Settlements are to deliver both strategic and local needs, as required through paragraph 4.1.8 of the Local Plan, then the Council should review the Neighbourhood Plan allocations and consider: 1) Whether additional sites should be allocated; and 2) whether Policy ST1 should contain in built flexibility to enable additional sites to come forward in the Large Rural Settlements to meet the strategic needs of the District, if the allocations from the Neighbourhood Plans do not come forward as expected, or do not deliver on the District's strategic needs. Previously promoted land at Grovewood Road, Misterton, through the Council's 'call for sites' and through the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan process. The Neighbourhood Plan has not allocated land at Grovewood Road for development, despite the fact that it is available now, for immediate delivery; it has the capacity to deliver up to 150 dwellings; it is in one of the most sustainable locations in the village, located in Flood Zone 1 and directly adjacent to the Primary School; the proposals for the site include a substantial level of green infrastructure, including the retention of the majority of the hedgerows within the site, which would be supplemented through additional planting; and the site could deliver community infrastructure and facilities in the form of playing pitches and a pavilion. The fact that the site has been overlooked for allocation by the Neighbourhood Plan and the restrictive nature of Policy ST1 means that the District could lose out on the opportunity to provide a long-term sustainable housing delivering solution for Misterton. This could also be the case in other Neighbourhood Plan areas across the District. The Grovewood Road site could help the Council deliver on its housing needs, in a sustainable location, if the Neighbourhood Plan allocations do not progress as anticipated. Policy ST1 should be amended to include the necessary flexibility to ensure that the Local Plan remains relevant and sustainable throughout the Plan period (amendments shown in dark red): "A minimum of 1764 dwellings on sites allocated or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans, or on sites brought forward where it is demonstrated that there is a clear need for development and that it can be delivered quickly and sustainably to provide necessary housing for the Large Rural Settlements".</p>	<p>Consistent with national planning policy, the Council promotes Neighbourhood Planning as an appropriate tool for the local community to influence the way their local area grows. This is reflected in the Local Plan and the approach taken to Large Rural Settlements. These settlements are not as sustainable as the Main Towns therefore 20% growth is considered appropriate, unless the local community choose to exceed that figure through a neighbourhood plan. This approach ensures the local community retain influence over the sustainable growth of their area. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be reviewed and updated in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. This provides Neighbourhood Plan Groups to review the delivery of development and allocate new sites where necessary.</p>
REF214	Oxalis Planning	<p>Support the overarching plan for the District, as described through the Bassetlaw 'vision' which states at paragraph 4.1.6 that, by 2037, new development "will have been delivered in the most sustainable locations". Paragraph 4.1.8 explains, in broad terms, how this will be achieved, stating that the large rural settlements (including Misterton) will deliver residential development "to meet strategic and local needs. Necessary physical, social, green and digital infrastructure and community facilities need to support this growth will have been delivered on time". Agree that it is a sensible and logical approach to distribute development to the most sustainable locations within the District, which includes those settlements defined as the Large Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy			
ST01Bassetlaw's			
REF215	Trustees of H S Wallis	<p>Para. 5.1.2 draws special attention to what is seen as a step change in the District's economy in seeking to reflect new priorities. Draws attention to one of these priorities - the growth zone associated with the AI strategic corridor - (this approach derives from the 2019 Spatial Strategy Background Paper in which the value of the AI corridor associated with Harworth is recognised as a "logistics corridor"). The following paragraph then summarises Draft Policy ST1 -to encourage the effective use of greenfield land " where this will bring social, economic and environmental benefits.... ". This in turn derives from the Background Paper para. 1.3 in setting the scene for the Local plan to look for "....sustainable housing growth particularly in the rural parts of the District. " There are few sites better placed to achieve these objectives than the site fitting so well as it does into the local landscape and the built forms of "North Blyth", proximity to the AI and close relationship with substantial areas having permission for employment uses. Subsequent paragraphs set out the process by which the Spatial Strategy has emerged. They refer to the wish to retain the Main Town, Large and Small Rural Settlements hierarchy. No where in the document is there any indication that the distinctiveness of "North Blyth" is recognised or where it does or might fit into this categorisation. Whilst being within the parish of Blyth the area could not be more distinct and separate (not least by the AI) from the core of the more historic core of Blyth. There is an argument for suggesting it is a settlement in its own right but equally it could be argued that it is better for all planning purposes to see it as being "clustered" with the main town of Harworth/Bircotes just to the north. Paras 5.1.24 - 5.1.26 briefly describe Harworth/Bircotes in part in the following terms "Harworth & Bircotes is' a strategically advantageous economic location and is expected to deliver significant employment growth (see Policy ST6)....reflecting its easy access to the AI (M)" Paras. 5.1.27 - 5.1.31 then set out the approach to be taken with Large Rural Settlements (LRS) of which Blyth is one of five. Having noted that the rural settlements of Bassetlaw vary considerably Para. 5.1.28 goes on to state about the LRS's that they:- "...are the most sustainable due to them having the largest populations having higher numbers of journeys made to employment, shops and services and having the most frequent and commercially viable public transport services to nearby larger towns and cities. All serve both the settlements themselves and the surrounding rural area. Focusing rural development there will help support existing facilities and provide a focal point for use by residents of the surrounding smaller villages and hamlets. " In earlier para. 5.1.9 the Draft Plan in referring to future housing states that the largest towns would see the largest growth (a not uncommon approach) but it then goes on to state "...but rural settlements would be able to increase their populations by up to 20%..." Nothing in the text indicates that this the approach is to be applied to LRS's. When the Draft plan later sets out its approach to Small Rural Settlements (SRS) it again refers to a 20% maximum per parish justified briefly on the basis of the need to sustain those villages which often have greater environmental constraints. It is only Draft Policy ST1 that clearly identifies that the 20% limit will only apply to SRS's. LRS's are to be planned in the same way as the Main Towns. policy ST1- B2a refers to land allocations and appropriate forms of development within their settlement boundaries. "North Blyth" does not have any development boundary. Given the very special and strategic advantages attaching to this part of the District and the planning permissions that have already been granted that is something of an anomaly.</p>	Blyth is included within the Large Rural Settlements due to its size and function as a local service centre. North Blyth is not identified as an eligible settlement because the location is not considered to be sustainable in that location.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF215	Trustees of H S Wallis	<p>The Draft Local Plan appears to be diverging not only from what is set out above but also the "Vision for Bassetlaw 2037" set out in the Background Paper where at para. 4.12 it states "4.12 The district will a diverse and thriving economy with Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes and the Large Rural Settlements acting as employment and service centres for the surrounding rural areas..." In Draft Policy ST1:- CI it indicates that a minimum of 1764 dwellings are to be permitted in the LRS' s on "... sites allocated or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans..." So a clear statement that allocations in the Local Plan will be made thus following through on the importance the Draft Plan is attaching to LRS's. However, in "Housing Distribution" at para. 7.1.6 it states:- " In the early plan period more development will be delivered by commitments in Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes; in sustainable locations in accordance with Policy STJ. Similarly housing development will take place in the Large Rural settlements either through Neighbourhood Plan allocations or via commitments " So now there to be NO Local Plan allocations for sites in LRS's? Then the Draft Plan sets out its Policy ST2 under the heading "Rural Bassetlaw ". Under ST2- B the policy approach seems to be 'let's leave it entirely to the Neighbourhood Plans' to which a 20% cap will be applied. Without further explanation LRS's now seem to have acquired a much reduced status in the hierarchy and are to be treated just like the SRS's' . The Draft policy at sub-paragraph B then in tabulating how the 1764 dwellings (the total in the table in the Plan is actually 1747 - the difference being half of the number of dwellings the subject site in "North Blyth" could provide) are to be distributed between the LRS's the text contains the following sentence:- "Most of this growth will be delivered through existing planning permissions or through allocated sites made in Neighbourhood Plans or this Local Plan as identified on the Policies Map" There is a clear conflict between not only Draft Strategic Policies 1 and 2 but between what the Draft Plan states to be its broader ambitions. As far as "North Blyth" is concerned not only does it appear that the Local Plan will remain ambivalent, but in abdicating its role in favour of the Blyth Neighbourhood Plan, which is (in the context of Draft Policy ST1) seeking wrongly to apply a 20% cap, the strategic advantages of the area are to be wholly ignored. This seems to be a serious error and entirely contrary to the sentiments expressed in the earlier paragraphs 5.1.27 - 5.1.28 under the heading "Large Rural Settlements". THERE SEEMS JO BE LITTLE POINT IN EXPLAINING AND THEN ADOPTING A SETTLEMENT IDERARCHY HAVING THREE DISTINCT ELEMENTS AND THEN FOR THE HUGELY IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF PLANNING FOR HOUSING 'LUMPING' TWO OF THEM TOGETHER. It is noted the degree of reliance placed on developing a new settlement on the Cottam Power Station site. Given the challenges such a site presents not least in terms of clearance, contamination and flood risk and the inevitable timeframe, over which the Planning Authority has no control whatsoever, the site should surely not feature as a formal allocation but be regarded as a laudable ambition but in planning policy terms somewhat more as a windfall site. There is even a greater argument for it to be seen as an employment site rather than housing.</p>	Blyth is included within the Large Rural Settlements due to its size and function as a local service centre. North Blyth is not identified as an eligible settlement because the location is not considered to be sustainable in that location.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>NCC has considered the housing need as identified for each settlement as per the spatial strategy hierarchy outlined in Policy ST1 and so the following response is, wherever possible, in line with the Bassetlaw spatial strategy for growth which is the following: • Main Towns • Large Rural Settlement • Small rural settlements • Garden Villages</p> <p>Worksop Primary across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that there will be sufficient places to meet demand set out in the Local Plan. Projected to be a shortage of school places in Gateford, which is due to be addressed by the delivery and possible expansion of a new Gateford Park Primary and Nursery School, to which HS1 / Policy 15 (Peak Hills Farm) refers. Secondary CIL is in operation in this area but NCC would instead intend to seek the s106 contributions that are required to mitigate the effects on education of further developments. NCC is already planning to expand Outwood Portland Academy to address existing pressures but the additional housing in the Local Plan would exacerbate the already significant shortfall of secondary places in this area. NCC would seek developer contributions towards the cost of adding a further 5-6 classrooms (c180 secondary places) arising solely from housing in the local plan, on top of existing plans, subject to feasibility; Outwood Portland may not be able to cope with yet more expansion, so the need for a new secondary school site and contributions cannot be discounted. NCC will seek to clarify this matter prior to the finalisation of the Plan. Retford Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that demand set out in the Local Plan would require mitigation from developers. This would largely be used to fund the expansion of existing schools, although many are on small sites that offer little scope for this. Given the 3,250 dwellings proposed to be added to the Garden Village after 2037, a new 630-place (3 forms of entry) primary school would be required around the Ranby area. Secondary NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated at existing schools. However, the proposed Garden Village would necessitate the addition of a further c500 secondary places, for which contributions would be required. Potential expansions of existing secondary schools would be subject to feasibility. If circumstances at the time of a formal application had changed – i.e. changing population, school rolls and school capacities – and a new secondary school was required in this area, NCC would also need developers to contribute land. Tuxford Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that demand set out in the Local Plan would require mitigation from developers. This would be best used to fund the expansion of an existing school by approximately 3 classrooms. Expansion of any of the 3 local primary schools may be problematic, so further discussions and feasibility would be required. Secondary Tuxford Academy falls within the Retford secondary planning area. Harworth, incorporating Styrrup Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that approximately 3 new classrooms would be required if the Local Plan came to fruition. New housing in Styrrup would require the expansion of Serlby Park's primary provision. Secondary NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated in Serlby Park Academy's secondary provision. Langold, incorporating Blyth Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that c300 additional primary school places would be required if the Local Plan came to fruition. (New housing in Blyth is anticipated to arise from the neighbourhood plan, rather than the draft Local Plan.)</p>	The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure necessary education infrastructure associated with development is delivered. This information will inform policy development and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Three of the four schools in this planning area are likely to have space to expand, subject to feasibility, so housing developer contributions would be calculated on that basis. Walkeringham and Misterton, incorporating West Stockwith Primary The Misterton and Walkeringham neighbourhood plans, upon which NCC Pupil Place Planning have not previously commented, would necessitate 2-3 additional classrooms. Misterton Primary has space to expand, subject to feasibility. Tuxford Primary This planning area encompasses Askham, Dunham-on-Trent, East Drayton, East Markham, Laneham, Headon-cum-Upton and Tuxford. Housing in the Local Plan would necessitate the addition of 1-2 classrooms in Tuxford. Housing in the respective Neighborhood Plans would require 1 further classroom. However, expansion of any of the 3 local primary schools would be problematic or impossible, so further discussions and feasibility would be required. Secondary Tuxford Academy (secondary) falls within the Retford secondary planning area; and so please see comments above under Retford, Secondary. Small Rural Settlements Claborough, incorporating Welham, Clayworth and Hayton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Claborough Primary Cuckney, incorporating Holbeck and Nether Langwith NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Cuckney C of E Primary. Elkesley, incorporating Bothamsall NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighborhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Elkesley Primary and Nursery Everton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Everton Primary Gamston NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Gamston C of E Primary Gringley NCC anticipate that housing described in local plan would require contributions towards an additional classroom. St Peter's Primary is on a restricted site, so expansion would be problematic, though reconfiguration may be possible. Further discussion and feasibility would be required. Leverton, incorporating Habbleshthorpe, and North and South Leverton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Leverton C of E. Mattersey NCC anticipate that housing described in the neighbourhood plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Mattersey Primary Misson NCC anticipate that housing described in the neighbourhood plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Misson Primary Normanton on Trent, incorporating High and Low Marnham NCC anticipate that housing described in the local plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at St Matthew's C of E Primary. North Wheatley, incorporating South Wheatley and Bole NCC anticipate that housing described in local plan would require contributions to create an additional classroom. North Wheatley C of E Primary is on a restricted site, so expansion would be problematic. Further discussion and feasibility would be required. Rampton, incorporating Woodbeck and Treswell with Cottam NCC anticipate that contributions would be required to create 3 additional classrooms within the span of the local plan. Rampton Primary is on a restricted site and would be difficult to expand, so feasibility would be required. The development at Cottam Power Station is anticipated to add a further 1,150 houses after 2037, which would necessitate a new primary school and potentially land on which to build it. Ranskill, incorporating Barnby Moor, Scrooby and Torworth NCC anticipate that developments in the local plan would result in a small deficit of places at Ranskill Primary. If expansion was indeed required, the school site should be large enough to allow it although this would be subject to final confirmation. Shireoaks NCC anticipate that developments in the local plan would result in a small deficit of places at St Luke's C of E Primary. If expansion was required, the school site should be large enough to allow it though feasibility would be required. Sturton NCC anticipate that housing described in the local plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Sturton C of E Primary Sutton-cum-Lound NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Sutton-cum-Lound C of E Primary</p>	The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure necessary education infrastructure associated with development is delivered. This information will inform policy development and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
1196694	Resident	The vision of Bassetlaw attracting highly paid work, new business and growth in business, is based on an assumption that providing more business land will achieve this. Not aware that there is a shortage of such land at present. Bassetlaw already has the locational advantages of proximity to road links and Doncaster airport, yet these businesses are not attracted to locate here. Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that of the new developments: 81% are greenfield and 19% are brownfield. This is an appalling scenario for our environment. Bassetlaw is ahead of schedule to meet its targets for housebuilding by 2037. It should not be approving plans to build on so much greenfield land. It should continue to review what brownfield sites become available in the decades to come. There will be new brownfield sites available before (and after) 2037 which can be considered for residential building. 5.1.49 refers to building more quality housing than is required – this cannot be justified: once greenfield land is built on, it is lost forever; there is nothing sustainable about this approach.	National policy requires the Council to provide housing and employment to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.
1196694	Resident	Parag 3.30 – the contribution of tree planting – is this annual figure referring to the amount absorbed once trees reach maturity? What number of years is being allowed to reach maturity? In the interim the amount of carbon absorbed would be negligible and far less than any mature trees felled for development.	Paragraph 3.30 states that this the figure refers to trees at maturity.
1196694	Resident	4.1.3 and 5.1.40 - The vision of Bassetlaw attracting highly paid work, new business and growth in business, is based on an assumption that providing more business land will achieve this. Not aware that there is a shortage of such land at present. Bassetlaw already has the locational advantages of proximity to road links and Doncaster airport, yet these businesses are not attracted to locate here.	Sites at Manton Wood and Symmetry Park are being developed at the moment. There is a need to identify land to meet the needs of the D2N2 growth sectors to attract better paid higher skilled jobs to the District.
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	Applaud the vision of a positive framework. Appreciate consideration of the implementation of the Local Plan so that the true ambitions remain the priority, and that our beautiful countryside is not lost and our local towns remain empty and without investment.	Support noted and welcome.
REF253	Fisher German	The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The proposed role of Retford as a 'Main Town' reflects the town's role and sustainability credentials. Retford benefits from significant service provision and excellent transport connections and is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is also supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 60% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. This approach is supported as it focuses development in the most sustainable locations. Concerns are however raised in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In addition to the above approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements to be delivered. This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan.	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020).
1196906	Resident	There is a single reference to infrastructure provision for electric vehicles post 2035 within the scope of this entire strategy. To suggest populations will be drawn towards public transport links in new developments, particularly the proposed 'Garden Village' and Cottam sites is naive and blinkered at best. Isolated developments such as these will create increased vehicle movements to other employment/leisure/shopping sites. This strategy MUST include electric vehicle infrastructure provision to offset these carbon loading issues.	Policy ST45 and Policy ST50 requires all new development to incorporate appropriate infrastructure to enable the connection to an electric vehicle charging point in future. This future proofs development by ensuring that over time, and as technology develops, different charging units can be installed which reflects consumer choice.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>The Local Plan states that Bassetlaw forms a vital part of the wider Nottinghamshire and SCR economies. Therefore, Bassetlaw sees a significant level of out-commuting in addition to in-commuting from neighbouring authorities. Economic composition is, therefore, interlinked between these authorities. Agree with paragraph 3.2 that “the performance of the local economy is a key driver that shapes Bassetlaw into a successful and growing location” and that growth of business is integral for creating a sustainable local economy for the District’s continued prosperity. The Council must make sure that the opportunities for investors to deliver change in the District are seized; this can only be achieved through providing the economic conditions for growth; including levels of housing development to support that growth which is not overly reliant on the supply of labour elsewhere within the region. The People Bassetlaw’s growing population puts an increasing pressure on the Council’s housing. Paragraph 3.12 states a projected population increase of 3.8% by 2037 equates to over 4,350 additional residents which puts increased demand on the need for housing across the District. However, the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA OAN Update (October 2017) within the Council’s evidence base provides the projected population growth for Bassetlaw as per the latest (2014 based) Sub-National Population Projections published by ONS in May 2016. The data shows the 2014-based population of Bassetlaw was 114,143 and projected to increase to 120,927 by 2035 (5.9% increase). The above population projection reflects a higher increase as set out within the Draft Local Plan and does not take into account the significant level of economic growth and step change within the District which is likely to further drive growth of the population. It is our position that this puts additional strain of the need for new homes. Paragraph 3.13 indicates the population of 16-64 working aged population is projected to fall by 7.3% over the plan period. These demographic changes reinforce the importance for substantial housing delivery across Bassetlaw and the delivery of sufficient employment land to provide jobs and retain the declining working population. Policy within the Local Plan must seek to change the direction of those trends beyond what the current policy approach has achieved. The retention of existing young people and attraction of in-migrants of working age will only be achieved through the provision of suitable job opportunities, provision of affordable and attractive housing to younger and working age people and through the provision of vibrant and attractive towns. The Place Paragraph 3.17 sets out that, as of 2018, 67% of the District’s population live in Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes. Only 15% of the population lives in Large Rural Settlements and 18% in the remaining Small Rural Settlements. Provides a basis that the Plan should amend the proportion of housing requirement in the Main Towns and reduce the proportion allocated for rural settlements to appropriately reflect the needs of the District. Agree that Bassetlaw benefits from strong transport links by road and rail, including a strong network of bus services in some locations. The Local Plan refers to the sustainable accessibility of Retford at paragraphs 3.18 and 3.19. Retford train station provides direct access to the East Coast Mainline and London within 2 hours. Paragraph 3.19 states Retford bus station provides access to the wider District whereas rural parts of Bassetlaw have less frequent coverage. Advocate the suitability of Retford for an increased proportion of growth compared to less accessible locations due to its established and sustainable transport network. The effective cycle network in Worksop and Retford is identified within Chapter 3, making them sustainable locations for development by enabling sustainable movement between residential areas, work and leisure. Worksop and Retford have expanded along with their population and the delivery of new homes has spearheaded regeneration in these areas, acting as a catalyst for investment. The Local Plan emphasises “the need for new housing remains as important as ever” at paragraph 3.24 which we support, suggest the Local Plan should review its spatial housing strategy in order to reflect these needs of new homes in the Main Towns.</p>	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy. This will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development appropriate to their needs that maintains and supports local services and facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF270	Barton Willmore	Chapter 4 sets out the Council's vision and objectives for Bassetlaw in 2037 for increased access to quality homes, high skilled jobs and a range of quality facilities and services. Support those aspirations; stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in its ability to achieve that vision.Strong concerns over the plan's ability to do so. The vision for Retford set out in paragraph 4.1.7 is that it will have "retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events". Support the delivery of town centre improvements and public realm strengthening. In the first instance, the vitality and vibrancy of the town, as with most other towns within the country will rely on growth and investment; and expenditure from future residents which is not reflected in the Councils vision for Retford. Suggest the vision for Retford in 2037 should be more ambitious by supporting more housing development in the area and performing its existing role as one of the strongest housing market areas to drive forward housing growth in the District. Retford is a significant contributor to the delivery of new homes within the District and a clearly desirable location. As the district looks to make a step change in its economic performance it will be reliant on inward investment and economic in migrants being attracted to live in the district. Whilst some Rural Settlements will require small-scale and sensitively located development to support local needs and to support local services and facilities, the level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the large rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. Oppose the Council's vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village, consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. It should be the Council's priority to enhance existing settlements such as Retford and Harworth where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which we consider not to be viable.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy. This will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development appropriate to their needs that maintains and supports local services and facilities. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible.
REF270	Barton Willmore	Supportive of the Local Plan's spatial strategy promoting a 'step change' for Bassetlaw's economy with growth focused around strategic corridors and growth zones and the three Main Towns as articulated at paragraph 5.1.2. 2.34 Disagree with paragraph 5.1.3 which states the Local Plan is in accordance with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development and that it "seeks to fully meet the demands for new homes, jobs and services in the District in the most sustainable manner". This same paragraph reiterates that the Main Towns are the primary focus for growth, do not consider that those aims will be realised with the current drafting of the Local Plan. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan proposed a 'hybrid' approach to its spatial strategy. In our previous representations we supported this hybrid approach in principle which sought to distribute development based on the scale, role, service provision, land availability and opportunities for investment and growth of settlements to benefit wider rural communities. This meant directing growth towards Worksop, Retford and Harworth and supported by rural settlements. The 2020 Draft Local Plan has reintroduced a settlement hierarchy for the District in Policy ST1. Paragraph 5.1.13 states that Policy ST1 acknowledges the importance of reducing the need to travel and prioritises major growth in the three Main Towns which we support. This is not only vital in terms of localised movement, but has an impact on regional transport networks as evidenced by the comments within the Doncaster SOCG. The growth needed to support the district's aspirations needs to be realised within the district as far as possible. Have significant concerns with how the spatial strategy has proportioned growth across the District; specifically in relation to the low level of housing requirement proposed for Retford, the overstated requirement for rural settlements and the proposed Garden Village. Despite the three Main Towns being placed at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy, the growth required for the District to meet its economic aspirations has been underestimated and the subsequent development requirements have been understated. Paragraph 5.1.19 highlights that Retford has a population of 22,013 residents and boasts a wide range of services, facilities, shops, employment opportunities and transport links. As well as being designated as a Main Town at the top of the settlement hierarchy, Retford is also described as "a good location for development" at paragraph 5.1.20, which should be supported by policy within the Local Plan rather than constraining development in this sustainable location. The Spatial Strategy Background Paper 2019 states Retford is the second largest town in the District,	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		population of 22,000 and is a key infrastructure and service centre. Retford is described as the main hub settlement for Bassetlaw's central and eastern rural areas and is well connected by highways and rail links. Understand the point made at paragraph 5.1.21 of the Local Plan that "Retford is not expected to accommodate as much economic growth in the plan period". Stress that this is not a justification for the constraining of development at Retford and misunderstands the potential role of the town in meeting the development needs of the district as a whole.	
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>The level of housing requirement currently proposed for Retford is 1303 homes (equating to only 14% of the overall housing requirement). Paragraph 5.1.22 of the Local Plan sets out that the requirement for Retford is based on the same level of housing identified within the Core Strategy (2011) which equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. Fundamentally disagree with the above approach. The Core Strategy is, by the Council's own admission, based on out of date evidence and cannot be taken as an up to date position on the housing needs of the district. The housing requirement for the district, and the distribution of that requirement must be based on proportionate and justified evidence. Even if we were to accept the approach of projecting the Core Strategy requirement of 87.4dpa over the Local Plan period that would equate to a requirement of 1,661 dwellings over the plan period. However, the Local Plan seeks to apply the Core Strategy requirement over a period between 2010-2037 and then reduce the level of development proposed at Retford by the 1057 dwellings delivered since 2010; resulting in a residual requirement of 1,303 dwellings for the plan period. Even if the overarching requirement was sound, which it is not, the residual requirement bares no resemblance to the calculation of need for the plan period. The Local Plan explains that 666 dwellings currently have planning permission in Retford and 109 dwellings have a resolution to grant, leaving a residual requirement of only 528 dwellings in Retford up to 2037. The result of the above mechanism is a wholly under -representative housing requirement for Retford that will constrain the level of development permitted at Retford significantly below the level of development it can and should deliver to meet the district's aims. Retford, as a rural hub for the centre and east of the District, and an area for employment growth is ideally placed to meet the bulk of the housing needs in the rural part of the District; subject to the plan identifying and meeting specific needs of the rural and local service centres. Strongly object to Retford being allocated only 1303 of the overall housing requirements for the District as set out in Figure 1 below. Retford, as the District's second largest town , has been allocated the second least amount of housing development among the existing settlements despite its position in the settlement hierarchy. This is despite Retford having suitable sites for development and a proven track record of delivering housing where other settlements within the District have been less successful. The above allocation will lead to the undue restriction of development towards the end of the plan period and leave no reasonable flexibility in the supply of housing land through the plan period to respond to change. This is completely at odds with the economic aspirations of the plan. Consider that a sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has simply not been evidenced based on what levels of growth are required to support the rural area. Such an evidenced based approach is vital to understanding, and planning for, the future health of rural settlements. It is not clear from the Local Plan or its evidence base how the final apportionment of development across the District has been determined or how the site selection methodology for identifying sites has been arrived at. Whilst it is not necessary to stick rigidly to a settlement hierarchy, it is necessary to take an evidence -based approach to distributing development based in the needs of those settlements.</p>	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF270	Barton Willmore	The Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2016/17 sets out the level of housing completions in the District between 2006/7 to 2016/17. Across the whole district, 3474 net housing completions were made over that period. 2,619 of those completions were within the 3 Main Towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. Some 1,321	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		<p>completions were in Retford which comprises 38% of the overall completions across the entire District and over half of the completions within the District's Main Towns. The AMR demonstrates that 2005/06 to 2016/17 Retford has delivered 384 more dwellings than Worksop. The AMR states that, notwithstanding the recession, from 2005/06 to 2016/17 Retford averaged the delivery of some 110dpa which increased to an average of 152dpa in the 6 years since 2010/11 when recovery from the recession commenced. The monitoring demonstrates that the proposed distribution of development in Local Plan dramatically underestimates the role of Retford in the housing market. Retford has clearly provided the backbone for the Bassetlaw's housing delivery within a District that has struggled to meet its Core Strategy housing requirement. Crucially, the above evidence demonstrates that Retford is a desirable location within the district to buy a home. At a time that the Council is seeking to deliver a step change in the economic growth and aspirations of the district, it is vital that its most popular housing market is utilised to its full effect. Delivering sufficient homes in a location where people want to live will be a key to the success of the district. Consider that it is perverse for the Council to seek to deliver a level of growth at Retford of 87.4dpa, which would be realised as a target of circa 60dpa once completions from 2010 are taken into account, which is less than half of the delivery in the last 6 years and which has been the best performing market area across a District that has a track record of struggling to deliver its housing requirement elsewhere. That unduly low level of development becomes even more difficult to understand with the Council having failed to provide any substantive evidence for such a reduction in the housing requirement and in the face of an excellent supply of suitable and developable Sites, including our Client's Site to the south of Retford. Recognise that the distribution of development to rural settlements is important to support existing facilities and meet local needs, the proportion of housing requirement in these rural settlements is currently excessive and unjustified. Policy ST1 should be re-drafted to reflect our comments. This includes: • Increased housing growth towards Retford; • Removal of proposals for a new Garden Village; and • Reduction in the development directed towards the Rural Area. Supportive of Policy ST1 directing development to appropriate locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, a greater housing requirement should be proportioned to support growth and development in the Main Towns. Disagree with B 2(c) of Policy ST1 which supports Bassetlaw Garden Village in accordance with Policy ST3. The requirement of 750 dwellings for the new Garden Village should be removed and re-proportioned via a revised spatial strategy. The overall minimum housing requirement for the District set out in Policy ST1 is 9,087 dwellings. This housing requirement should be amended to at least 10,640 and distributed more appropriately across the District, with a reduction for Rural Settlements and more focus on Retford. Emphasise the policy's aim to enhance the role of the District's Main Towns. This should be reflected through an appropriate housing requirement. Retford is a major contributor to the Council's overall housing delivery, consider that the level of development in Retford should be dramatically increased in recognition of its fundamental role in maintaining the sustainability of the rural east of Bassetlaw. It is vital that the vitality and viability of the rural area is maintained and some growth in those areas will be necessary, object to the proposed minimum housing requirement of 1,764 dwellings for Large Rural Settlements and 1,090 for Small Rural Settlements is not justified and is not a sound approach. The level of development to be delivered in the rural settlements should be based on a robust assessment of each of those settlements which establishes the level of appropriate development for each settlement, taking into account its development needs and constraints. Further work is required to establish the appropriate level of development in those locations.</p>	
REF275	Consultant	<p>In Chapter 4, the vision for Retford is described "retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events". Wholly support it is our concern that this plan is not able to achieve this. The success of this town of reliant on investment and growth,, it appears in this plan that this will not be achieved. Suggest that Retford should be supporting further housing development. Retford has proved to be one of the strongest housing markets in the area with no indication that this would not continue. With further housing will come increased use of the town centre and job creation helping to drive the local economy. Support a modest growth of rural settlements, however, with limited infrastructure and facilities currently in place, the growth should remain in keeping with their</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		current size to retain the character of these communities. The growth of Retford would only work to serve these communities for their local services and needs.	
REF275	Consultant	Generally supportive of the spatial strategy presented (ST1), which is promoting growth focused around strategic corridors, growth zones and the three main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. Disagree that this is aligned with the NPPF and its presumption in favour of sustainable development which is stated in this local plan. This section is promoting the main towns as the primary focus for growth and yet this is not realised further in the rest of the plan. Despite these main towns being places at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy the aspirations economically have been underestimated and as such the developmental requirements have also. The plan states that Retford boasts a wide range of services, facilities, shops, employment opportunities and transport links. It goes on to suggest that Retford itself is a good location for development. This is not supported by the policy within the local plan, instead, it is covered with a policy designed to constrain any growth, despite being a sustainable location. Retford is the districts second largest town and yet it has been allocated the second least amount of housing. This does not align with the balanced increase across the district as stated in the plan. Given that Retford has plenty of available and sustainable locations for development, as well as plenty of successful examples of delivering the site, this position is unsubstantiated.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	The Parish are supportive of Bassetlaw's economic aspirations for the district. Concerns regarding how those aspirations are proposed to be delivered and concerns in relation to how the Local Plan proposes to meet the needs of its communities. Chapter 4 sets out the Council's vision and objectives for increased access to quality homes, high skilled jobs and a range of quality facilities and services. Support those aspirations; stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in its ability to achieve that vision. Strong concerns over the plan's ability to do so. Concerned that the emerging approach to spatial distribution of development is unsound. Consider that the Local Plan fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns, and consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas is excessive and not based on sound planning principles; including the proposal for a 'garden village' within the parish of Babworth and the allocation of housing to Ranby village which the Parish objects to. The Parish's main service centre is Retford which the Parish is reliant upon for the provision of most of its day to day needs. The vision for Retford is that "Retford will have retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events". Support the delivery of town centre improvements and public realm strengthening. The vitality and vibrancy of the town is reliant on an appropriate level of growth being delivered at the town. Oppose the Council's vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	Policy ST1 of the Local Plan should be re-drafted suggest that a greater housing requirement should be proportioned to support growth and development in the Main Towns and larger settlements. Object to Part B2(c) of Policy ST1 which supports Bassetlaw Garden Village in accordance with Policy ST3. The requirement of 750 dwellings for the new Garden Village should be removed. Emphasise the policy's aim to enhance the role of the District's Main Towns this should be reflected through an appropriate housing requirement. Retford is a major contributor to the Council's overall housing delivery, and the level of development in Retford should be dramatically increased in recognition of its fundamental role in maintaining the sustainability of the rural east of Bassetlaw. It is vital that the vitality and viability of the rural area is maintained and some growth in those areas will be necessary, object to the proposed minimum housing requirement of 1,764 dwellings for Large Rural Settlements and 1,090 for Small Rural Settlements. The level of development to be delivered in the rural settlements should be based on a robust assessment of each of those settlements which establishes the level of appropriate development for each settlement, taking into account its development needs and constraints. Further work is required to establish the appropriate level of development in those locations.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF278	Fisher German	The Spatial Strategy proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, concerned in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. Approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements (including Treswell). This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan. The Council need to do more to ensure that the number of dwellings assigned to the Small Rural Settlements will be delivered.	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the inclusion of a settlement hierarchy at ST1 B.2. This directs development to the most sustainable locations and provides clarity for decisions on planning applications over the Plan period.	Support noted and welcome.
1197063	Resident	Para 1.9.2 CIL monies are provided to support the infrastructure required for additional housing. This should remain as is, smaller rural villages require this additional money to increase amenities etc. than larger rural areas. CIL rates are also a way of reflecting the overall impact that development may have on an area from the surrounding villages and the new garden village for example.	The Council is proposing to retain CIL in the District. Site allocations of 50 or more units are exempt from CIL but will be delivering infrastructure through developer contributions instead.
1197063	Resident	Unclear how the calculations around growth have been conducted. Worksop is twice the size of Retford. The policy acknowledges this and the environmental differences between Retford and Worksop, yet it appears that Retford is required to deliver houses in excess of 70% of Worksop's required increase for 2010-2037 (2360-2180). Why is this and what is the rationale when the policy also acknowledges the constraints required re "safeguarding the landscape setting, preventing coalescence with neighbouring settlements, avoiding areas of flood risk, protecting the heritage and the ecological value of Retford's environment"? The figures and calculations are (deliberately?) confusing. Figures quoted are not comparable as they refer to different time periods i.e. Retford' calculated figure is from 2010-2037 (para 5.1.22) whereas Worksop's figures seem to be for 2018-2037 (para. 5.1.17). To avoid confusion and clarity the figures quote throughout the document must be drawn from a consistent time period.	Worksop already has a significant amount of land for housing with current planning commitments. This needs to be deducted from the requirement. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The time period for Retford is 2018 to 2037. The reference to 2010 is to highlight housing delivery since the adoption of the current Local Plan (Bassetlaw Core Strategy).

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy			
ST01Bassetlaw's			
1197063	Resident	Para 5.1.32. states that for small rural settlements, there has been a total of 1747 dwellings already allocated within Neighbourhood Plans. This exceeds the required value of 1090 dwellings required at 20%. This is again confusing as it suggests that Neighbourhood Plans are already delivering over and above what is required. Villages who have produced a Neighbourhood Plan have undertaken significant work required to consult with local residents and identify growth needs in line with continuing to keep the character and amenities of the village. The Local Plan does not acknowledge their importance and should have been developed using these figures as a framework. So use the figure they have already created and impose the cap should be for villages where a Neighbourhood Plan is not in place?	The level and distribution of housing has been amended following consultation in January and updated evidence. Policy ST1 proposes a revised settlement hierarchy and the distribution of growth which includes around 1400 for the Large Rural Settlements and 1500 for the Small Rural Settlements. This in combination with neighbourhood plan allocations, housing commitments and completions means that the majority of growth has been permitted in these areas. However, Policy ST2 allows for some flexibility in how the proposed distribution of housing is managed locally and how the Council will treat additional growth beyond that proposed in the Local Plan through the focus of community development in neighbourhood plans. Growth in rural Bassetlaw will be monitored regularly to give communities and developers and up-to-date picture of housing commitments in these settlements. It is recognised that this will change frequently as permissions vary in their delivery and lapse rates. The proposed cap in previous versions of the Local Plan has been removed and replaced with a requirement per eligible settlement. This is detailed in Policy ST2 and evidenced within the revised Rural Settlement Study 2020.
1197063	Resident	Para 5.1.44 To ensure a sustainable strategy is delivered, the number of homes must be balanced with the number of jobs expected to be delivered in the District. Where are the jobs being created in the District? Apart from additional builders of course.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. 10 sites are identified for employment growth, 8 already have planning permission. The main areas for new employment are in Worksop, Harworth and Retford and along the A1/A57 strategic growth corridors.
1197063	Resident	No potential reduction in village sizes acknowledge anywhere in the Local Plan? This could happen.	The Plan is looking to deliver growth, not to reduce the number of homes.
REF282	National Trust	Support elements of the Spatial Strategy, in particular bullet point 1 which promotes the efficient use of land, re-use of brownfield land, and protection of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. Concerned about bullet point 2(d) which is overly permissive in relation to development in the countryside. Suggest that this should be qualified by inserting the words 'small scale' or 'of an appropriate scale'. This recognises that development in rural areas may be less inherently sustainable due to limited populations, transport, services etc. as well as the need to protect biodiversity and landscapes. Object to bullet point 2(c) which seeks to allocate 'at least 199.6ha' of surplus strategic employment land. The Economic Development Needs Assessment provides no evidence of need for this land. There is also a lack of evidence that this allocation would not impact detrimentally on regeneration of brownfield sites in the district or elsewhere. See also our comments on Policies ST8 and SEM1.	The text in ST1 is considered to be flexible "by supporting development in the countryside necessary to that location, including those which support the rural economy and where consistent with other policies in this Local Plan." There are other policies in the Local Plan which guide the scale and type of development in the countryside. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which justifies the site at Apleyhead. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.
REF285	Home Builders Federation	Policy ST1 sets out a 5 tier settlement hierarchy and HLS provision for a minimum of 9,087 dwellings (478 dwellings per annum) for the period 2018-2037. There is no certainty that Neighbourhood Plans will come forward with the inclusion of housing site allocations. The sufficiency of the Council's HLS should not be delegated to Neighbourhood Plans without evidence of the deliverability and / or developability of such sites. There is no recourse if a Neighbourhood Plan is not made. It should be clear that the Council will undertake the necessary plan-making work should the Neighbourhood Planning process not successfully deliver the strategy of the Local Plan.	The Plan does not rely on Neighbourhood Plan allocations for the majority of the housing requirement. A significant amount of development will come from sites with planning permission and proposed Local Plan site allocations. Housing delivery will continue to be reviewed on an annual basis and the Local Plan will be reviewed within five years to ensure the housing requirement can continue to be met.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF286	Pegasus Group	The overarching spatial strategy at Policy ST1 sets out the scale and distribution of development across the District, and provides a housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings for the District over the plan period 2018 – 2037 (478 dwellings per annum), 10% of which will be on sites of no larger than 1ha. This housing requirement is then distributed to Worksop, Retford and Harworth (a minimum of 5,483 dwellings), allocated Neighbourhood Plan sites in Large Rural Settlements (a minimum of 1,764 dwellings), non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans in Small Rural Settlements (a minimum of 1,090 dwellings), and 750 dwellings at the Bassetlaw Garden Village. Policy ST1 C) proposes that 10% of the overall housing requirement for the District will be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less, and this approach is supported. A wide range of sites will provide access to suitable land for a range of housebuilders; from small local companies to larger regional and national companies, which in turn offers a wide range of house types in order to meet housing needs across the District. The 2019 NPPF at paragraph 68 notes the important contribution small and medium sites can make to meeting the housing requirements of an area and notes that these sites are often built-out quickly.	Support noted and welcome.
REF288	JVH Planning	The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. The Plan is confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan] In the smaller rural settlements - 319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable as it is presently drafted.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF288	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
REF289	Lichfields	Oppose the 20% growth cap ("Rural Growth figure") that is proposed to be applied to Small Rural Settlements and consider it to be at odds with Part C (1, c) of this same policy which, in Small Rural Settlements, seeks to deliver a minimum of 1090 dwellings on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhoods Plans. Support Policy ST1 seeking to define a 'minimum' number of dwellings to be delivered across the settlement hierarchy and, subject to the conflicting growth cap for Small Rural Settlements being removed, such an approach would ensure that that the draft Local Plan is sufficiently flexible to meet the demand for new housing throughout its lifetime. Part B (2, d) of Policy ST1 is welcomed in providing support for the development in the countryside where it is necessary to that location, including where it would support the rural economy. This approach is pragmatic and reflects paragraph 83 of the NPPF's support for a prosperous rural economy.	The Strategy is seeking to ensure that there is a mix of development in all areas of the District. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy ST01Bassetlaw's			
REF290	JVH Planning	The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. However the Plan is confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that In Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan] In the smaller rural settlements -319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF290	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which we consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
REF291	Heyford Developments Ltd	This draft policy identifies that the District will accommodate a minimum of 9,087 dwellings (478 dwellings per annum) for the plan period 2018-2037. In relation to the dwellings to be provided within the main towns; large rural settlements; and small rural settlements it is understood from the Land Availability Assessment, 2019 that 6,949 dwellings have planning permission; 540 dwellings are subject to a Neighbourhood Plan allocation, without planning permission; and 2,881 dwellings are to be allocated in the draft Plan. This provides an oversupply of around 1,689 dwellings (19.5%) against the proposed housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings (also taking into account completions from 2018/19). The LAA does not appear to factor in the potential for non implementation (or a 'lapse rate') of these planning permissions and allocations. Paragraph 2.16 states "where deliverability is questionable sites will be discounted", but no further details are provided. There is no commentary provided on why lapse rates have not been considered i.e. local market conditions and/or evidence of implementation rates in the District. The suggested oversupply should therefore be treated with caution. Further consideration should be given to the level of risk associated with the potential for non-implementation of those sites identified in the supply in order to ensure the overall spatial strategy is deliverable. This would be in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance on Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessments which states that an overall risk assessment should be made as to whether sites will come forward as anticipated (Paragraph 024 ID: 3-024-20190722). Whilst the NPPF requires plans to meet 10% of the housing land supply via sites of 1 hectare or less, it should also be recognised that minor sites (9 or fewer dwellings) generally have a higher rate of non implementation given the nature of the landownership and potential developers. The evidence and draft Plan should reflect upon the degree of reliance on these small sites within the rural settlements supply. In relation to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village, the LAA assumes 60 dwellings will be delivered in 2024-2029; 420 dwellings in 2029-2034; and 270 dwellings in 2034-2037. Appendix C provides some further information on the site-specific trajectory. It states: "Evidence (NLP Start to Finish, 2016) indicates the site is developable beyond 5 years. Large sites have a longer lead in period but deliver at higher rates once established. This timescale also accords with the development of Harworth Colliery which will eventually accommodate approx. 1,000 dwellings." Further text within the LAA details that the Harworth Colliery site had a lead in time of approximately 8 years. The Site Selection Methodology Background Paper (2020) provides justification for the selection of the Bassetlaw Garden Village in relation to its sustainable location and ability to	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities. A lapse rate has been factored in to assumptions for underdelviery in the rural area.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		provide for infrastructure. No information related to deliverability is provided. No further information on deliverability is provided in the Bassetlaw New Settlement Addendum Paper (2020). Have significant concerns regarding the ability of this draft allocation to provide 750 dwellings within the Plan period, particularly in a sustainable manner. The anticipated supply set out Policy ST1 and the LAA supporting evidence should be reviewed to take account of risks related to non-implementation (lapse rates) and to provide a trajectory for Bassetlaw Garden Village that relates to the site-specific circumstances. The growth identified in Policy ST1 (and ST2) is in part reliant on the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and their ability to identify sufficient sites which can deliver the identified housing. As an example, the draft Blyth Neighbourhood Plan is reliant on one site to deliver practically its entire housing requirement, despite there being no evidence on this being deliverable or developable. This may be the case for a number of other Neighbourhood Plans and this presents risks to the Council's housing supply.	
REF291	Heyford Developments Ltd	Our comments in relation to the 20% growth 'cap' for Large Rural Settlements. The spatial strategy needs to be revisited in light of this, as well as the issues we have raised with the Council's housing land supply and trajectory. Consider further housing should be directed towards sustainable Large Rural Settlements such as Blyth for the reasons set out in our response to Policy ST2. This will have an effect on the spatial strategy and Policy ST1. Support the uplift in the housing requirement to 478 dwellings per annum to support economic growth, however the spatial strategy needs to ensure that housing and employment needs are aligned, so that housing is proposed where there is demand for employment. As paragraph 3.5 of the draft Plan notes, 'the logistics sector continues to grow, with significant investment taking place, and market interest evidenced, along the A57 and A1 corridors'. The recently upgraded A1 junction to the north of Blyth offers a significant opportunity to meet this need and assist in delivering economic growth in the District. Housing should be located nearby to ensure jobs and workers are closely located and accessible by public transport – there are regular buses running between Blyth and the A1 roundabout to the north. Suggested changes: 1. Publish a Statement of Common Ground to demonstrate compliance with the duty to cooperate in relation to outstanding matters including unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities. 2. The anticipated supply set out in Policy ST1 and the LAA supporting evidence should be reviewed to take account of risks related to non-implementation (lapse rates) and to provide a trajectory for Bassetlaw Garden Village that relates to the site-specific circumstances (see our concerns set out in response to Policy ST3). 3. A mechanism for guarding against non-delivery of housing through Neighbourhood Plans should be included (see Policy ST2). 4. In light of the matters raised in relation to Policy ST1, and issues around supply, trajectory and deliverability, further growth should be directed to the sustainable settlement of Blyth.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan states that neighbouring authorities have agreed to meet their own housing and employment needs. This will be evidenced through forthcoming Statements of Common Ground. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities. A lapse rate has been factored in to assumptions for underdelviery in the rural area.
REF292	JVH Planning	The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. However the Plan is very confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that In Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan} In the smaller rural settlements -319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF292	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which we consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy			
ST01Bassetlaw's		hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.	and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
1197091	William Davis	Overall the spatial strategy is supported. Worksop is considered to be the most sustainable settlement and provides a good range of services/facilities and employment opportunities. The Housing Trajectory identifies a total supply of 10339 dwellings; this represents a 13% buffer over the housing target. The Local Plans Expert Group recommended that a 20% supply over the housing target should be included in the Local Plan to provide flexibility; providing this would be consistent with national policy (paragraph 59 regarding the need to significantly (our emphasis) boost the supply of housing) and would meet the tests of soundness. Bassetlaw should aim to have a supply of deliverable/developable sites of at least 10904 dwellings during the plan period and preferably more; this requires additional allocations of around 565 dwellings; a further buffer on top of this would also be appropriate to address any shortfall due to delays at the proposed new settlements. As the most sustainable settlement, Worksop represents the most appropriate place to make these additional allocations. Some of the growth at rural settlements is to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans; there are risks with this approach. Neighbourhood Plans may not allocate any land, allocate insufficient land or allocate non-deliverable sites. This could mean that housing need is not delivered meaning the plan is not effective, failing one of the tests of soundness. It is necessary to ensure that sufficient sites are allocated in the Local Plan to deliver the housing requirement of at least 10904 dwellings during the plan period. The trajectory identifies that a number of these sites have been submitted by landowners who have confirmed their availability in the five year period; while a number are non-major development, it is unclear if there is a housebuilder involved with the major development sites and whether there is the clear evidence to demonstrate they meet the NPPF definition of deliverable.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. In terms of housing supply in a Local Plan, the NPPF does not recommend a 20% buffer. The NPPF does apply three buffers in relation to the five year housing land supply, 5%, 10%, and 20%. The higher 20% should be applied where housing delivery has not met it's housing requirement target over a sustained period. Bassetlaw has consistently delivered well in excess of the housing need figure over the past four years. As such, a 5% buffer should be applied to the Five Year Housing Land Supply. Upon submission for examination, the Local Plan is likely to have a larger buffer due to the number of commitments and site allocations. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
1197164	The Planning & Environment Studio	Objection: Development Boundary – London Road, Retford. Autism East Midlands (AEM) is a registered charity established in 1968. Its mission is to advocate, provide and develop high-quality services, information, and support, in partnership with others, for all those whose lives are affected by autism. It strives to recognise and respond to the needs of the individual, enabling autistic people to live their lives with dignity, choice and independence. To help achieve these aims AEM provide a wide range of services to help individuals to live their lives the way they want, including support for independent living. Autism East Midlands own property and land on the southern edge of Retford at South Lodge, London Road (see attached plan) as a registered care home, including specialist supported living units. The development limit is not clearly justified nor reflects significant sustainability benefits or settlement character function. It is also inconsistent with the town's Conservation Area boundary. Moreover, the proposed development boundary adjustments elsewhere across the town would serve to have far more significant impacts upon character and settlement form than the changes proposed in this representation. The Settlement Development Limit for the area around South Lodge and London Road is not proposed for adjustment in the emerging Regulation 18 consultation local plan. The established limits for the south of the town within the adopted Core Strategy take a convoluted line to enclose the Allison Avenue housing estate to the east, before narrowing markedly to return back along Grove Road, before returning southwards to enclose two large properties and their curtilages at The Hardmoors and Montague House fronting London Road. The SDL then crosses London Road to enclose properties to the west of London Road. There is no explanation for the specific reasons why this line has been retained in the emerging Local Plan apart from through apparent historic inertia. The evidence base used to justify the policy framework of the adopted Core Strategy – from its 2009 Issues and Options Paper to the 2010 Publication Draft and on to adoption does not include any reference to a settlement development limits study or review. No case is set out in adopted policy why the development boundary has been drawn as it has. Whilst AEM does not challenge the overall logic for most delineation between the settlement and open countryside, it is equally not satisfactory that historic delineation is maintained without justification or evidence, when it is seen appropriate	The request for a revision to the proposed development boundary for Retford has been considered during the revision of the local Plan. The request however does not meet the stated methodology for reviewing the development boundary as identified within the revised Spatial Strategy Paper 2020. Therefore no change to the development boundary is proposed to this part of Retford within the November 2020 Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		that many other elements of the plan are (and should be) periodically reviewed through the Local Plan process. As such it is vulnerable to failing the tests of soundness in respect of being positively prepared to support sustainable development and justified - being based upon evidence. The implications of the SDL are significant in relation to spatial policy which would apply within or outwith that line, and as such has sustainability consequences. AEM proposes that through the current Local Plan process the SDL to the immediate west of South Lodge, should be re-drawn to follow the southern boundary of the site, immediately south of the long-established driveway to South Lodge from London Road. The existing SDL and our proposal is indicated on the Policies Map extract below. The proposed change to the SDL is justified as follows: Settlement Form. There is no logical justification for the exclusion of South Lodge from the SDL. The large detached dwelling and its curtilage/associated paddock is a clear continuation of the character of the established area of large dwellings found to the southern reaches of London Road known as White Houses. South Lodge is a large property of Edwardian heritage which associates closely with Montague House and Hardmoorlands in terms of proximity, scale, setting and character, yet those properties fall within the SDL and South Lodge does not. There are no clear and defining permanent boundary lines to the north of South Lodge which physically or perceptually indicate the edge of the town, nor separate the house and grounds from the town and immediate neighbourhood. The prominent coniferous hedgerow / treeline and post-and-rail fencing south of Montague House is neither a permanent, historic nor positive contributor to local character. The existing (and by definition 'proposed') SDL around the White Houses locale includes the large mid 20th century housing estate at Allison Avenue.	
1197164	The Planning & Environment Studio	This area is of a wholly different character but actually extends the SDL to the east and south of South Lodge. South Lodge and grounds therefore do not represent an outlying or disconnected element of the built framework of Retford and there is no discernable break (having regard to established character) between it at other large dwellings within the SDL. Conversely there is a clear and established break in character and physical delineation to the south of South Lodge, far more identifiable than the existing SDL boundary line. The hedgerow and driveway serving South Lodge from London Road has been established since the house was built in the early 20th century (O.S. historic maps confirm this), and this presents a long-standing physical boundary feature. It is the landscape/townscape character change which is most abrupt and definitive immediately beyond this line, and which sets an appropriate and functional SDL than the existing. The character to the south of this line is wholly arable and the change is abrupt. A very large, open field sets the immediate rural hinterland to the town. The scale of the landscape and its low broken hedge to London Road are clearly a significant change in character to that north of the gateway to South Lodge. To the south there is no pavement and soft verges affording a rural landscape character typical of the landscape character area. The prominent gateway to South Lodge announces the southern edge of the town, with pavements, ornamental hedgerows and street lighting to both sides of London Road and change in speed limits emphasising the entry to Retford. The remodelled gateway itself is of a substantial ornamental design and prominence, recently approved under (18/01532/FUL) and otherwise generally not characteristic of the rural landscape. The vehicular entrance to South Lodge can therefore be seen to announce the entry to Retford itself on arrival from the south. The frontage to the South Lodge site includes the end point of the domestic and managed long hedgerow which continues northwards to fro Montague House and Hardmoorlands as a strongly residential feature. This abrupt change in character from arable farmland to leafy urban area is maintained immediately east of South Lodge along the same parallel by the same sudden transition from the Allison Avenue estate to the arable open landscape. However in that area the SDL does follow the break from farmland to residential area. Conservation Area designation and boundaries are not necessarily reflective of urban and rural setting or delineation. South Lodge it is pertinent to note that Retford Conservation Area boundary follows the South Lodge driveway as proposed as SDL in this representation. The Conservation Area Analysis (BDC) is reasonably recent, adopted in 2009. This describes the special character of the White Houses area. This recognises the semi-independent history of the area to that of Retford and describes its low density character where the large	The request for a revision to the proposed development boundary for Retford has been considered during the revision of the local Plan. The request however does not meet the stated methodology for reviewing the development boundary as identified within the revised Spatial Strategy Paper 2020. Therefore no change to the development boundary is proposed to this part of Retford within the November 2020 Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy			
ST01Bassetlaw's			
REF298	Axis PED Ltd	<p>In relation to 8-hectare site at Carlton Forest. The east of the site benefits from planning permission (reference 18/01093/OUT) for employment uses. Pre-application discussions have recently taken place with the Council regarding employment uses on the western part of the site. It is anticipated that a planning application for employment uses for the western part of the site will be submitted within a few months. These two areas are shown on Figure 2. Part of the site is previously developed land and the entire site is underutilised since the site's former use as a quarry ceased. Support the Council's proposed overall strategy and objectives in relation to economic growth and development. The Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the right areas. FCC's site is suitably located to deliver employment land in a location which, whilst outside of the settlement boundary, is well connected to the main urban area of Worksop. Further, employment development has already been established on part of the site through the granting of planning permission (ref: 18/01093/OUT). Anticipate that this development will commence in 2022. The west of the site is currently the subject of pre-application discussions and is to be leased this year and developed as the tenant needs to move from their existing premises within Bassetlaw, this will allow an existing business and significant employer to remain within the District. FCC's site lies to the north of Worksop adjacent to existing development and employment sites. Worksop is identified as the most sustainable location for significant growth and provides the best opportunity to deliver the objectives of regional and local industrial strategies. Support paragraph B1 which promotes the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations. In accordance with the NPPF this will help to achieve sustainable development including economic growth in the appropriate locations. Historically been subject to quarrying activity, part of the site is previously developed therefore the proposed employment uses are an efficient use of the currently underutilised site. Broadly support Policy ST1 which sets out the Council's Spatial Strategy and settlement hierarchy. This Policy directs development to appropriate locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. The land to the south and south west of FCC's site forms part of an existing employment site and mixed use allocation. When developed, this would bring continuous development up to FCC's site from Worksop. It is considered that greater support should be provided within the supporting text for sites within the rural area, but outside of rural settlements that are sustainably and well located to contribute to the Council's employment land supply. FCC's site is well related to the existing settlement of Worksop and is suitably located to deliver sustainable economic development in line with the aspirations of the Local Plan and NPPF.</p>	<p>Planning permission exists for part of the site and an occupier is in place to develop the remainder in 2022. On that basis, there is no need to allocate the site a tenant is lined up to occupy. Therefore there is no need to allocate this land. The planning permission and development management process is addressing the needs of the site.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Broadly support the Council's proposed spatial strategy which seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth in line with the Council's ambition to achieve a 'step change' in the local economy. The spatial strategy will be delivered through a range of sites in sustainable locations including a Garden Village and a Priority Regeneration Area. Support the exploration into the delivery of a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas, of the view that the spatial strategy should be modified to acknowledge the scope for further sustainable development at Bevercotes Colliery over the course of the plan period 2018-2037. The inclusion of Bevercotes as an additional Priority Regeneration Area for mixed-use development, aligns with the overall spatial strategy for the district which seeks to prioritise the regeneration of previously developed land and strives for a step change in economic growth. Policy ST1 criterion B1 would also benefit from a modification which makes clear that development, in addition to the sites identified within B2(A), should be directed towards sites on previously developed land which can be made sustainable through their re-development, namely Bevercotes Colliery.</p>	<p>The former Bevercotes Colliery is covered by local Wildlife Sites and is identified by the Bassetlaw HRA as having the potential to host breeding and foraging protected bird species associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Allocating the site is therefore contrary to legislation and national planning policy. However, the site has planning permission for employment development which is considered to be deliverable as a mitigation package has previously been agreed.</p>
REF300	Natural England	<p>Welcome the vision and the emphasis that it gives to the green agenda particularly the recognition of the need to address climate change. Pleased to see that the benefits of multi-functional green and blue infrastructure have been highlighted and its importance to health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>
REF300	Natural England	<p>Note that this paragraph makes reference to Bassetlaw Garden Village Background Paper, 2019 (note that there is an addendum 2020 version). Concerned that the potential impacts on the Clumber Park Site of Special Scientific Interest have not been sufficiently considered. Welcome the inclusion of bullet point B1 which includes the protection of Best & Most Versatile (BMV) land which complies with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>	<p>A Recreational Impact Assessment is underway in partnership with Natural England to better understand the potential impacts of the Garden Village on Clumber Park SSSI. Support for the reference to agricultural land is welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy			
ST01Bassetlaw's			
REF308	Resident	There are many references within the Draft Plan to 'sustainable development'. The Plan adopts the World Commission on Environment and Development's definition of 'sustainable' (1987) - ie: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Glossary P 182). This is a profound statement which has been widely adopted as THE definition of sustainability. It is a contradiction of terms to talk about sustainable development on greenfield sites, particularly where it is prime agricultural land. Destroying food producing land clearly compromises the ability of future generations to meet their needs. This amounts to 'greenwash' and references to sustainable development on all greenfield sites should be removed or, the definition of 'sustainable' should be changed in the Plan. In the plan, it would appear to be more in keeping with the Government's definition as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework - which involves securing net gains from three overarching objectives ie - economic, social and environmental though this in itself, makes a mockery of the concept of sustainability.	Paragraph 7 of the NPPF indicates: 'At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. This accords with the aims and objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.
REF316	Fisher German	The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The proposed role of Tuxford as a 'Large Rural Settlement' reflects the town's role and sustainability credentials. Tuxford benefits from a range of local amenities and services including shopping, doctor's surgery, public houses and educational facilities primary school and Tuxford Academy. Tuxford also has excellent transport links, particularly the A1 from the which the wider motorway network is available with good rail links at Retford to the north and Newark to the south. It is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is also supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 20% of its housing requirement in the Large Rural Settlements of Tuxford, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe, Langold, Misterton, Cottam Garden Community. This approach is supported as it focuses development in the most sustainable locations. Concerns are however raised in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative, therefore, to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In addition to the above approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements to be delivered. This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan.	The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
REF321	IBA Planning	Support the Plan as presently drafted and welcome and support the inclusion of their land as part of the Peak Hills Farm housing and employment land allocations. Worksop is quite rightly identified as the principal town and most sustainable location for significant growth within the District and provides the best opportunity to deliver the objectives of regional and local growth and regeneration strategies. Its identification as a main town within the Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy (Policy ST1) is supported. The Draft Plan is considered to be appropriately ambitious to achieve the Council's stated Vision and Strategic Objectives for the Plan period up to 2037, yet sufficiently realistic (certainly as far as delivery on the Peak Hills Farm allocation is concerned) to provide stakeholders and ultimately the Examining Inspector with confidence over delivery in line with annual projections and certainty regarding issues of soundness and compliance with national planning policy. The increased annual housing requirements of 478 dwellings per annum (resulting in a minimum housing provision of 5483 dwellings in Worksop, Retford and Harworth) under Policy ST1:C.1a is supported, as is the increased employment provision in appropriate locations to meet future economic development needs and safeguard existing employment sites for B1 offices, B2 industry and	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		B8 storage and distribution under Policy ST1:C.2. The proposed employment allocation at Carlton Forest (EM005 – 10.6 hectares) is welcomed and supported – with 5 hectares of this, of course, already having been consented under LPA reference 15/01477/OUT.	
REF323	Emery Planning	This Policy seeks to set out the Spatial Strategy for development in Bassetlaw over the Plan period. Support the focus of the policy on delivering sustainable development and growth through, amongst other things, promoting the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land, which our client's site is well placed in assisting with. Note and welcome the fact that housing and employment targets set out are identified as minimums.	Support noted and welcome.
REF325	Consultant	The draft Local Plan aspires to encourage economic growth: "To make a real step change in economicconditions in the District" (paragraph 1.5.1). This approach is supported. The Plan also notes, (paragraph 3.5) the continuing growth of the logistics sector, with market interest "evidenced" along the A1 corridor in particular. The Council-approved commercial development at Blyth, known as Symmetry Park, is an acknowledged response to this interest. It is understood that the developers intended to develop the site speculatively – that is, the developers were aware of and responded to market forces but that the initial commitment to the site was made with no end users in place, thus emphasising the strength of these pressures. Suggest that the number, size, type and distribution of employment areas is inadequate to meet the Council's over-arching aspirations in two main and related respects. Whilst the emerging Local Plan correctly notes the attractiveness to employment developers of sites close to main transport links (and the A1 corridor is specifically mentioned in this regard) and also identifies a need to attract footloose businesses, the range of sites proposed for employment development does not respond to either of these factors. Footloose businesses by their very nature can pick and choose between sites to achieve their optimum location. If suitable sites in one area are not available, the businesses simply locate in areas where they are. This suggests a need to allocate as wider a choice of sites as possible consistent with other Local Plan objectives. At paragraph 5.1.57 the draft Plan notes the potential for economic growth above that provided for in the Local Plan as currently drafted with particular reference to strategic logistics growth (i.e. growth related to the transport and distribution sectors) and, at paragraph 5.1.58, notes specifically the increasing prominence of the A1 corridor.	The draft Local Plan allocates over 287 ha of employment land which the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 recognises is appropriate to meet the needs of the District to 2037. The Local Plan allocates a range of sites capable of identifying a range of business needs in a range of locations, close to the Main Towns and along the A1/A57 growth corridors therefore meeting a range of different end user needs. Sites are expected to come forward over the plan period to meet changing needs.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Para. 5.1.26 Figure 5 Perhaps the picture Figure 5: Housing Distribution would be better placed before para. 5.1.15 or at the end of section 5.1 as a recap. Para. 5.1.32 Small Rural Settlements Please clarify !!! this says that small rural settlements up to a maximum of 20% will be supported. BUT, is this an ASPIRATION, not a REQUIREMENT. However, every comment we hear is that this 20% is a mandatory REQUIREMENT. Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy This says (amongst other things) "...that meets the evidenced needs for new houses and jobs..." and "...supports the necessary improvements to infrastructure and services...". Scrooby Parish and Neighbourhood Plan Team - Comments on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 Date: 25th February 2020 Page 2 of 6 How does Item A talking about evidenced needs and infrastructure improvements reconcile with the blanket numbers based on a nominal incremental value of 20% in Policy ST2 being enforced upon us.	The spatial strategy in particular the approach to the rural area has been revised in response to updated evidence and representations to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy and that the term used are clear for all users.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Policy ST1 seeks to direct development to appropriate locations in accordance with a settlement hierarchy. Small Rural Settlements ("SRS") fall second on this hierarchy, and where housing growth of up to 20% is supported, in accordance with Policy ST2. It notes that the distribution of the minimum number of homes will include 'a minimum of 1,090 dwellings on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans for the SRS'. Ranby is an SRS. The growth of SRS is supported, particularly at Ranby, where it is considered additional growth can be accommodated on land owned by the college to the east of the settlement, along Straight Mile. One of the main objectives of the NPPF is to significantly boost the supply of homes, noting the importance of ensuring a significant amount and variety of land can come forward for housing (paragraph 59). Paragraph 60 requires local planning authorities to plan for a minimum number of homes. The test should be whether development can be proven to be sustainable, (e.g. avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the SRS and comply with other development management policies), rather than imposing an arbitrary cap on new housing. Imposing an arbitrary cap on the maximum number	This policy accords with Paragraph 65 of the NPPF which indicates: "Strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) 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 allocations." The approach taken to the rural area, in conjunction with other policies in the Plan is considered to be flexible and consistent with the NPPF.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		of homes supported for such areas is inconsistent with the NPPF, which renders this policy unsound. In order to make the plan sound, Part B.2.b) of Policy ST1 should be amended to remove reference to the 20% cap, or make it clear that the 20% figure has been used to identify a reliable and deliverable supply of housing land, but should not be used as an absolute cap on development. Beyond the SRS the settlement hierarchy also supports development in the countryside necessary to that location (Part B.2.d.), and where consistent with other policies in the draft BLP. This general approach is supported, but it should also allow for flexibility around exceptional circumstances such as providing enabling development for a major community benefit, beyond a blunt assessment of need.	
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Policy ST1 takes a positive approach to meeting future employment needs, allocating 108ha of new employment land (of which at least 81ha is expected to come forward by 2037) and at least 199.6ha of 'of strategic employment land to address a subregional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business'. The Apleyhead Junction site (Draft Policy 9; SEM1) falls within this latter 'category' of strategic sites. Supporting text also seeks to focus growth to Worksop as one of three main towns and recognises the strategic importance of the A57 and A1 for employment. These overall ambitions are supported by Caddick, especially the ambition to enable the identification and release of suitable employment land on the A57 and A1 corridor. This support is predicated on the importance of ensuring that this ambition is not frustrated by site specific policies not aligning with this strategy. The release of land at Apleyhead Junction to meet employment needs is both welcomed and logical. Without an intervention of this nature, it would not be realistic for the Local Plan to achieve the step change in regeneration which is clearly sought by the Council. Whilst the identification of land releases to meet employment ambitions is welcomed, Policy ST1 Part C2 (Employment) should simply be confined to identifying the spatial approach to the employment allocations. Any reference to the type of employment that is intended to be provided within each location is not relevant and should be a matter for site specific policies. For the Local Plan's strategic vision of delivering a step change growth to be realised, the total employment land being proposed (307.98ha) (simplified to 308ha) must be met. If any part of this need is not delivered, then the overall vision and economic growth objectives for Bassetlaw would be unfulfilled. Indeed, the plan evidence base recognises the importance of all sites in the overall employment land offer. Policy ST1 should be amended to refer to the provision of 308ha of employment land to meet the economic objectives and the vision for Bassetlaw to 2037 and beyond. The emerging policies are inconsistent in their terminology. However, these policies can be remedied with simple revisions. For example, the policies use varying terminology, in referring to a mix of sub-regional /regional / footloose / major occupiers, which does not provide a clear description of the preferred uses and overall ambitions. This should be amended for consistency. Apleyhead Junction should be identified for a range of employment uses. That way, the key employment policies can align with the strategic vision and detailed policies including site allocations can follow on. Suggested policy changes 2. Employment: provision of land in appropriate locations to meet future economic development needs and safeguard existing employment sites for B1 offices, B2 industry and B8 storage and distribution as follows: a) At least 22.1 ha of employment land completed; b) At least 108 308ha of new employment land, of which at least 81ha is expected to come forward by 2037; c) At least 199.6ha of strategic employment land to address a sub-regional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business.</p>	The Housing and Economic Development needs Assessment 2020 clarifies the approach taken to Apleyhead. It provides the justification for a strategic employment need: to address the regional/sub regional investment needs of significant indigenous growth and national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period. The employment land policy will be clarified on that basis. It is appropriate for Policy ST1 to recognise that difference between the two categories of employment land. Terminology will be clarified for consistency.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
REF352 -	North and South Wheatley Parish Council	At the higher level, note that: • The population of Bassetlaw is projected to increase by 3.8% between now and 2037; an increase of 4350 (Para 3.12). • The population increase will be in the 65+ and 80+ age groups but a reduction is expected in the 16-64 age group. • The new housing requirement for Bassetlaw between now and 2037 is 9087 (Para 5.1.46). Do not see how and increase in population of 4350 would generate an increase in required housing of 9037 – over two houses per extra head of population	The increase in population is just one factor that is taken into consideration in determining the housing requirement for the District. Many existing households in Bassetlaw contain 'concealed households'. This happens where younger household members are unable to afford to buy or rent their own home. Also, there is a lack of the right types of home available for first time buyers, downsizers, families and specialist homes for older people. There is also a requirement to ensure there are enough homes to support jobs growth in the district. A growing older population means that there will be fewer people to take up jobs in the district. The calculation of the housing requirement takes into consideration all of these factors. The Council has undertaken an assessment of housing need in accordance with national policy (NPPF) and guidance (PPG on Housing and Economic Needs).
REF363 -	Resident	There again seems to be a mismatch in the number of houses to be built over the plan period. In the 2019 document on page 14 you quote a population increase of 5000. In your present document this figure is down graded to 4350 (without evidence where this figure comes from). Also in your 2019 document you proposed to build 6630 houses for this increase however in your latest document you propose to build 9087 properties to accommodate a smaller increase in population. Later in your present document on Para 5.1.42 you quote a figure of 307 houses required over a period of 19 years which equates to 5833.	The changes in housing numbers change to reflect changes to evidence baseline statistics. The housing requirement for the District takes into account 'concealed households'. This happens where younger household members are unable to afford to buy or rent their own home. Also, there is a lack of the right types of home available for first time buyers, downsizers, families and specialist homes for older people. There is also a requirement to ensure there are enough homes to support jobs growth in the district. A growing older population means that there will be fewer people to take up jobs in the district. The housing requirement and the changes seen reflect this. The Council has undertaken an assessment of housing need in accordance with national policy (NPPF) and guidance (PPG on Housing and Economic Needs).
REF366	Broadgrove	Policy ST1 states that “Development will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement, that meets the evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerates the District’s town centres, and supports necessary improvements to infrastructure, services and facilities.” Harworth and Bircotes is identified as one of the Districts three main settlements and acknowledgement of the opportunity to focus investment and new development to support the regeneration of Bassetlaw’s third largest settlement and in particular the town centre. Paragraph 3.23 states “The delivery of new homes has spearheaded the regeneration and renewal of many parts of the District – acting as a catalyst for physical change and often well-needed investment in social and environmental infrastructure - Harworth & Bircotes for example will effectively double its size in the future, attracting new industry and national retail chains as a result of the growth in the town.” Harworth being geographically located within the north of the district and has excellent connections to South Yorkshire and access to the A1. It also serves an important role for facilities to support a large number of rural villages in the north of Bassetlaw. Despite the focus for regeneration the level of housing is disproportionate to the level of employment land being provided across the district. There is a substantial level of employment land proposed in Harworth and Bircotes but no new housing allocations, which places a significant reliance on the delivery of the colliery site. Given the specific recognition of the plan to strengthen its role as a local infrastructure and service centre for the northeast of the district this brings into question again the overall housing target and lack of ambition for economic growth – contradictory to the aims of regenerating the town and improving the local centre. There needs to be sufficient housing to accommodate and assist the potential that exists for new economic investment and development. This needs to be increased from the level currently proposed. The NPPF and NPPG do not provide	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. A significant number of planning permissions have been granted in Harworth and Bircotes in recent years, which will result in the delivery of approximately 2000+ new dwellings. This is considered appropriate to meet Harworth and Bircotes needs over the plan period so it is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate land in Harworth and Bircotes as the settlements already have an appropriate level of housing supply to drive and support the regeneration of the area. Employment development in and around Harworth totals over 90ha which is considered appropriate to meet growth needs.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		<p>particular guidance on how housing need should be distributed in a Local Plan. Without such guidance, it is down to Bassetlaw Council to establish a distribution to support the Vision and Objectives of the Local Plan. The resulting distribution will inevitably represent a policy response to meeting identified need, however, it must be realistic, rational and soundly based. There is a significant disparity of future development across the north and south of the district. 100% of new housing allocations are proposed across the south of the district (including a new garden village) If there is a real intent to regenerate Harworth and Bircotes and see a step change of housing delivery, there should be greater focus on housing in the north of the district. A more appropriate strategy would be for greater development to be focussed around Harworth rather than a new garden village. The development of a greenfield garden village with a minimum of 750 dwellings will have a detrimental effect on the potential that could be generated from additional growth and regeneration in Harworth. A more appropriate solution would be for a significant increase in growth around Harworth and Bircotes to create another rural hub town of a similar status to Retford in the north of the district. One of the key issues raised in the Local Plan, and during the determination of planning applications by local residents is the lack of infrastructure required to adequately accommodate new development and provide support for existing residents of the town. The current strategy of allocating no new allocations and relying on existing permissions in Harworth is flawed and will not provide the appropriate levels of infrastructure to deal with existing shortages never mind mitigation and enhancement of the local services. The colliery site is heavily relied upon in the numbers of residential units that will be provided in Harworth during the plan period. This site, understandably given the issues around redeveloping such contaminated sites, has taken a number of years to come to fruition. Not only does this raise issues of delivery but how the required levels of affordable housing will be delivered. The colliery site owners have made a clear statement of intent by setting out that due to issues of viability they do not intend to provide affordable housing as part of their current application for the site. Dealing with affordable housing need the current strategy needs to increase the provision of affordable housing. The 2017 SHMA sets out a net need of 134 affordable units for the District. The delivery of affordable housing across the District has been poor and has exacerbated a significant shortfall. The level required has never been delivered and as can be seen below, has never reached 50% of the requirement across the District. The levels of completions in Harworth have been even more alarming from 2013.</p>	
REF366	Broadgrove	<p>Year Overall completions (District wide) Affordable completions (District wide) Harworth affordable completions % of affordable completions across the District 2017/18 551 57 52 10% 2016/17 462 64 4 7% 2015/16 338 7 0 0.02% 2014/15 241 24 0 0.99% 2013/14 249 14 0 0.05% The current policy framework has not worked, over the plan period, when considering the figures above. There is a stark difference between numbers of permissions and affordable housing delivery across the District. Between 2011 and 2035 the 2014-based household projections suggest that the average household size in Bassetlaw will fall from 2.3 to 2.2 persons per household. Applying the same proportional decrease to the average household size in Harworth, the average household size in the town would be 2.17 by 2035. As a result, there would be a need to provide around 200 additional dwellings to accommodate the additional households within the existing population alone as people live in smaller household groups (including children moving out of the family home, older people living alone following the death of a partner, increased levels of household breakdown and young people choosing to live alone). Linked to its role as an important infrastructure and service centre for the wider District, the Draft Local Plan recognises the importance of regeneration of the local centre and ability to attract national retailers. This will only be delivered with significant growth in population and ambitious housing numbers. The need to see a step change in housing delivery is also needed to provide housing numbers but also to ensure the delivery of the necessary infrastructure for to assist the economic growth. The delivery of improvements to the transport network, new education provision and other essential local services, as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will only be realised through significant additional housing growth. The level of housing proposed to be delivered in Harworth within the Bassetlaw Plan is too low. In order for the plan to deliver its Objectives and Vision, the housing proposed to be delivered in Harworth must be increased and new housing allocations identified. The site at Blyth Road also has the potential to provide a</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. A significant number of planning permissions have been granted in Harworth and Bircotes in recent years, which will result in the delivery of approximately 2000+ new dwellings. This is considered appropriate to meet Harworth and Bircotes needs over the plan period so it is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate land in Harworth and Bircotes as the settlements already have an appropriate level of housing supply to drive and support the regeneration of the area. The The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. This increases the housing requirement over the plan period. By proposing growth in excess of the Standard Method this better addresses affordable housing and infrastructure capacity needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		link road between Blyth Road and Styrrup Road. This is a piece of infrastructure that was identified during the determination of the two planning applications as potentially bringing significant benefits to the distribution of traffic and alleviating pressures from other developments in the local area. This site could support and enable the delivery of this infrastructure. The proposed site is also in a more sustainable location than some of the recent housing commitments in Harworth and Bircotes. The site is within walking distance of the town centre and also the closest site to the new employment commitments to the south of the town, which make a logical, sustainable reason for allocating as a housing site.	
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	Unless Network Rail is willing to build new railway station at the Garden Village at Apply Head it will merely become an extension of housing into the Countryside. There is little evidence that BDC has applied this to existing developments within East Markham. There is little evidence of any attempts at regeneration in East Markham. East Markham PC does believe that BDC can deliver this.	Network Rail have given in principle support for the new railway station at the Garden Village. Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be reviewed regularly to ensure they are delivering the right amount, type and mix of development. The new policies in the emerging Local Plan are seeking to deliver sustainable patterns of development of the right type and mix, including affordable housing and specialist housing for older and disabled people. East Markham PC are able to review their Neighbourhood Plan should they wish to have more influence over the type of development in their area.
REF475	Resident	Support of the overriding objectives of this Plan. Increasing housing and employment, while promoting healthy green living can only benefit Bassetlaw. A more thought out/deliverable approach to achieve the housing requirement should be considered. Creating a garden village will take enormous resource and funding. The towns in Bassetlaw are under-utilised with already improved transport links, they certainly support growth.	The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. The Garden Village will be delivered in partnership with key infrastructure partners and stakeholders to ensure it can be delivered with the right infrastructure at the right time. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. One of the main objectives of the Local Plan is to support and improve the towns. A range of development in Worksop, Retford and on the Garden Village site will assist in this process through the connections via public transport and the highway network. Improved cycling and walking and public transport will be designed to enable easy access to existing facilities and services in each town.
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	In recent years, because we didn't have a five year land supply and up –to-date planning policies, not had full control over what gets built and where in Bassetlaw. With this Plan and a land supply that is at least eight years plus, we can take back control. Therefore, in the first, five year review period, let's try to get what Bassetlaw deserves. Need to make demands to achieve our aims for greener, more sustainable development. In regard to meeting our affordable housing ambitions, our infrastructure asks, our housing mix and quality, we should press our demands. Whilst 18 house builders commented about how we had under calculated our housing numbers, only five commented on affordable housing and just two on design issues. That's where their focus will be, unless shifted by us. Local people tell us at every Planning Committee, and it's in every Neighbourhood Plan that people want bungalows or smaller properties to downsize into. Yet the schemes we've had from developers in recent years, with one or two notable exceptions, don't reflect that. Let this plan give power to the wishes of local people in this regard. Welcome much of your description, especially emphasising the manufacturing base of local industry and Bassetlaw being a centre for large firms to locate to. What advantage is there in talking about Worksop as a former mining community? There's no mining heritage to exploit for tourism. Describing us as such, conjures up a sense of loss, a sense of past, good times that are unavailable now. Don't describe Retford as a former coaching stop, so why reference Worksop and it's mining? It's been twenty five years since the last colliery shift, the merry-go trains with	It is important context that Bassetlaw's more recent history is referenced as that emphasises how far the District has progressed but also the extent of work still needed to be achieved to deliver the step change in the economy identified by the Council Plan. The draft plan is a very positive and ambitious Plan setting out a framework to deliver the spatial planning priorities for the District over the next 15 years or so. The Plan also identifies positive plans to regenerate marnham, Cottam and other brownfield sites within our towns. Paragraph 5.1.57 acknowledges Bassetlaw's links to Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. As the Plan for Bassetlaw it would be inappropriate to promote the employment sites of another District. the purpose of this Plan is to promote the employment assets of Bassetlaw. Acknowledge that reference to Bassetlaw's businesses should be highlighted, although several are listed in the context. The role of Welbeck will be better reflected in the rural economy supporting text.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Spatial ST01Bassetlaw's Strategy			
		their marshalling yards have gone, Firbeck and Harworth are being built over, Shireoaks and Manton are greening over and Manton Wood takes over more of Manton pit. Mining has no meaning for large sections of the population and for those moving into Harworth, Shireoaks and Gateford. Be bold, ditch the reference to our mining past unless you can be positive about it. Talk about our proximity to Sherwood Forest as a benefit to our economy; why not mention our proximity to Doncaster-Sheffield airport, its Advanced Manufacturing Park and the AMP in Sheffield/Rotherham? Describe Worksop as the destination of choice for international companies such as Cerealto, MBA Polymers, Schulz, Laing O'Rourke and Irizimar. Can a case be made for arguing its strong on aerospace and defence sectors – Cinch, Eaton, Rockford, ICON aerospace and perhaps the businesses at Gamston if they are of any sophistication? Welbeck is a business as well as a heritage asset. 250 people are employed by the estate with a further several hundred hosted by the estate through its rented offices and units.	
REF489	Chesterfield Borough Council	Fully support the continuing use of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw HMA grouping as an appropriate geography for establishing housing need. Support the housing requirement of 478 d/p/a as this would not result in a shortfall across the HMA. It is acknowledged that this is higher than both the LHN (307 d/p/a) and the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment OAN Update 2017 (374 d/p/a including affordability uplift and to support baseline economic growth). The implications of this level of housing growth should be carefully monitored and discussed as part of regular Local Plan Liaison Meetings to highlight any unexpected unintended adverse effects on other districts housing delivery within the HMA and to inform the next round of Local Plan reviews. It is suggested that this could be included within the Monitoring Framework.	The Council will continue to positively engage with neighbouring authorities and authorities with the HMA to ensure that the implications of the spatial strategy are understood and impacts managed appropriately.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1179100	Resident	Incredibly comprehensive document overall, however, what, if any, weight will be afforded by the Inspectorate in the matter of Appeals? It seems that even when BDC uphold their policies, the Appeal system overrules negating the policy in place. Further, what specific protection is being given to usable agricultural land and finally, how can the figures for rural growth be ratified with developments already granted since 2018. They do not marry up in some villages. Generally, a well thought out document with a bit of blue sky thinking in places, but clearly one intended to improve the economy and growth of the district.	Once the Local Plan is completed and is considered "sound" by the inspector, it will provide the opportunity for the Council to have an up-to-date Local Plan that is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore affords full weight in local decision making. When that occurs, it will mean that the Council will have more power to make decisions that are supported by the most up-to-date policy. Rural monitoring has been updated to make it clearer which development contributes to the rural growth.
1180212	Resident	Lound residents has been working over the last 3 years (probably longer) to gather and analyse evidence, hold public consultations and other meetings in preparation for the submission of a Lound Neighbourhood Plan to Bassetlaw Council. Their work has been marked by a careful approach, retaining the confidence of residents, especially in the allocation of sites for new housing. Clear and what was regarded as secure information about the location of development sites has been circulated to village residents. The Plan is scheduled to be submitted to Bassetlaw Council in the next 2 weeks. The work completed has now been placed into question by a near doubling of Lound's target for new housing (42). The criterion used by Bassetlaw to calculate the new target is crude, taking no account of, for example, residents' views of the character of the village and adequacy of its existing amenities, transport links, the density of present housing provision together with the gain from large developments planned on North Road, for example, or any other important criteria. It seems that the government has set a target that Bassetlaw is chasing without regard for the implications in small rural communities. In Lound, this means that the work undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee including, crucially, residents' views about the type of housing wanted and where it should be located, has been cast into	Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		the air Confidence in Bassetlaw's approach to policymaking and their understanding of the time and difficulties of drawing up a Neighbourhood Plan has been diminished. It would be appreciated if Bassetlaw Council would not immediately enforce the new target for Lound, complicating the good work achieved so far. Sites for 21 houses, have been identified by Lound residents and placed in the Lound Draft Neighbourhood Plan. This is a sizeable number in a village that is basically organised around two roads, Town Street and Little Top Lane. If the character of either of these locations is changed by the needless imposition of new targets, damage will be done to the character of the village and to its residents. Please remove the obligation for Lound to revise its Neighbourhood plan, finalised within the last month. One approach would be to reassess progress with Lound's existing plan in 5 years' time. At that time, it would be possible to assess if new targets are necessary. Economic growth in Bassetlaw, population movements into or out of the area, whether sites like North Road have provided enough houses in line with overall need, and other important subjects could then be considered. That strategy would allow time for needed adjustments and avoid the present doubling of village targets when Lound has undertaken what was required by the Council in the very recent past. An alternative, practical solution is for Bassetlaw's overall small settlement target to be pooled. The inflated target for Lound could then be reallocated to villages wanting more development than their revised quota permits. That would be a fair and just way of developing an alternative policy, returning Lound to its original, planned target. Lound will deliver 21 new homes. To now require the village to develop sites for 42 houses just as a plan for 21 has been agreed is unwise and a policy that should be revised urgently.	
1185614	Resident	The increase from 10% requirement to 20% cap is a considerable increase for small rural settlements. For villages such as Lound this means an increase from 21 to 42. This increase will change the character of the village and undermines the views and wishes of the villagers as identified in the draft neighbourhood plan. Small rural settlements vary in size considerably, there is need for further consideration on the demands of a one cap fits all.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1188560	Resident	The housing requirement increase from 10% to 20% is too many and that Bassetlaw's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. I propose that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fairer result.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1189264	Resident	One of the redeeming features of bassetlaw, particularly the north east section are its rural villages and communities as apposed to the poorly thought out and ugly urban centers like Worksop. People often move to these areas to escape the urban sprawl, over crowding and ugly new builds. It therefore seems counter productive to encourage new developments in these areas, simply to maintain the population. Simple solution; encourage more small businesses in the area, entrepreneurs etc and you will soon find people moving back into these rural villages to escape the rat race.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1189654	Resident	Lound is a small rural village designated as an SRS. To double its housing requirement to 20%, 42 in total clearly is not necessary and this is demonstrated in BDC's own figures. Our infrastructure would not support such a large increase and would cause environmental issues that go against a number of the aims of the Draft Local Plan. Infrequent public transport which makes car usage necessary, a high volume of HGV traffic through the village to Charcon Industires and the Anaerobic Digestion Plant from early morning and through out the day, inadequate drainage systems which even now lead to flooding of some properties are but some of the existing problems the village faces. An increase as suggested of 20% is totally unfair on this village.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1189633	Resident	I have noticed that you state the requirement for houses in small rural seetlments is 1090. Your allocation of 20% to each settlement means that you have increased your requirement (if that is what it is) by over 1,000 houses. There is no explanation for this increase which, to say the least, is unfortunate and surely the cause of confusion. This 'discrepancy', however, allows flexibility and the reallocation of housing numbers from village to village. Small villages that wish to remain small (there can be no objection to having small villages in Bassetlaw) should be permitted to transfer some extra numbers to settlments that want more than a 20% increase of housing numbers. If settlements wanting more than 20% are allocated extra numbers and others accept the 20% rise there is surely felxibility to leave Lound's commitment to 21 houses (a figure arrived at after 4 years of difficult work) to remain as its allocation. That would allow you to deliver your requirement of 1090 and probably more. After such a long period of sustained work I think it is very unfair to raise Lound's allocation. We do not have the infrastructure for 42 houses. Car numbers would be increased meaning a increase in C)2 emissions, which is in conflict with the national planning policy that palces sustainability as one of its 3 main principles. Bassetlaw's increases of 20% to each village is surely in conflict with its objective of sustainability. Villages do not have shops and other facilities. Each household is likely to have 2 cars and an increase of houses means a very large increase in journeys to towns with required facilities. This is undesirable.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1189633	Resident	Currently face the joint existential threats of climate and biodiversity collapse. Hoping to see a plan which reflected the need for housing to be located in areas which minimise the need to travel and maximise the ability to make trips by sustainable modes of transport. Highlight this in your plan, along with the fact that you wish to develop higher densities of development in the most accessible sites. See a lazy approach of just adding 20% to all rural settlements, with apparently little or no thought as to the points above. I live in Lound, and as a committed environmentalist I can confirm that it is impossible to travel effectively outside of the village for work (where you have to arrive not wet and not muddy) without use of a private car. Therefore, the placing of an additional 42 homes within the village will increase car travel in the district significantly. Challenge that this is in direct opposition to your aims of ST45. Our infrastructure would not support this volume of extra homes. Assuming, from the lack of care given to this process, that you have not visited Lound. Had you done so, you would know that in a number of places the road through our village is single track, so unable to support an increase in traffic. Our sewerage system is over capacity with the current number of homes. Support the construction of a small number of homes within Lound, if they were built to the highest possible environmental standards, and certainly should not be built with fossil fuel heating systems.	The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1189746	Residents	Concerned that the Plan has changed so dramatically. We believe that this will have an extremely negative effect on our village, LOUND. We understand that the Housing Requirement for small local communities has doubled from 10% to 20% but that that Bassetlaw's own figures do not support the need for this substantial increase. For our village specifically this means an increase from 21 more houses, which was accepted by our parish council, to a total of 42 houses. The impact of this on the village will be substantial. An increase of 42 houses is likely to result in 84 more cars since the bus service is infrequent and expensive. The local plan emphasises the need for small starter homes but the cost of any home in this village would be above the starter home price band. The roads in and out of the village are poorly maintained and Chainbridge Lane is already subject to frequent heavy commercial traffic to Charcon and the autodigester at Sutton Grange. The main village street, Town Street, is very narrow with narrow pavement. Street parking already causes problems for buses, agricultural vehicles etc. There are no facilities in the village apart from a public house so residents have to travel for all amenities ie. schools, shops, medical care etc. Welcome new residents to the village, especially young ones, to increase the diversity of the population but it must be on a sustainable basis, in proportion to the overall infrastructure of the village as it is at present.	The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%.
1189759	Resident	See that each small rural settlement which includes Lound had had its housing requirement doubled from 10% to 20%. Where has this figure come from and how can it be justified in such a small village. In Sutton cum Lound many of the new properties are not selling so in my opinion demand is not there! How can the villages small infrastructure support 40+ properties. It was challenging enough for 20 I would refrain from this and revert back to 10% which might just meet the needs of the local area. Other villages where they are building are not selling so supply is greater than demand coupled with the increased environmental impact on our villages and others	The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%.
1190131	Resident	Not happy about the fact that the housing requirements has doubled from 10% to 20%.As a village we were quite prepared to look for a 10% increase but 20% will totally alter the character of the village. People move to a village because they want a small close knit community and don't expect to see this increase by such a large amount. Although I would like to see housing for first time buyers and young families I am concerned that such a large increase of properties will overwhelm the school . I suggest the percentage be reduced to the original figure.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1190145	Resident	Feel very strongly that the proposal to increase Lound's Housing Requirement from 10% to 20% is totally unacceptable. Our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Committee has worked with parishioners who have generally accepted the addition of 21 houses. However, doubling this number would be unsustainable as the infrastructure would not support the increase - drainage, public transport etc.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1190215	Resident	It is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. I think this is too many and that Bassetlaw District Council's own figures suggest that this number is not required. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRS's be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their neighbourhood plan supports this according to local needs.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1190489	Resident	<p>Have followed the ongoing discussions and played an active part in meetings relating to the proposed development affecting our village, Lound. It is with significant concern that we have learned of the proposed changes, effectively doubling the housing requirement for the village. This appears to be a contradiction to the Council's own figures which demonstrate that this number is not required. We are particularly upset by the apparent lack of respect for the years of work done by the team of volunteers on behalf of Bassetlaw Council in establishing and developing Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Was all of this work completed in vain? Accepting the need to contribute to the wider development and supply of homes nationally, believe that from the evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years, there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) Cannot understand or accept that doubling this is realistic. Understand that the number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. Fail to identify how the village of Lound could support the revised target. Lound's infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has costly, infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and serves only to encourage increased dependency on private transport and defies the stated aim of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. A provision of smaller, starter homes is highly unlikely. Given the Council's Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that, for Large Rural Settlements, 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans. We would strongly suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF024	Resident	<p>It is unacceptable after the village steering group has undertaken a lot of work based on the councils original premise ,to then revise the local plan to basically double the number of houses expected to be built in Lound. It will significantly damage the way of village life and although we were willing to accept some change as inevitable,to double the numbers is unacceptable.please register my objection</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>
REF031	Residents	<p>See that it is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. This is too many and that Bassetlaw District Council's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses(10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. Do not have a school or shop to support a growth of 40 plus additional households. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide.Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. The requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF032	Residents	As a resident of Lound, Retford, express my strong objection to the housing requirement for Lound which is outlined in the above draft Plan. Over many years, our village Council and representatives have taken very seriously the responsibility to consult residents and formulate their views, latterly in specific response to the BDC Local Plan, January 2019. Evidence clearly indicated a general, if reluctant, acceptance of 21 new houses in line with the Plan. In less than 12 months, this has been doubled, contrary to all residents' opinions about the nature of requirements in their village, particularly ignoring the basis on which the draft Lound Neighbourhood Plan 2020 is based. Response to a Residents' Survey in 2016 clearly indicated that the people believed little, or indeed, no new housing was needed in Lound and that any development should be based on encouraging sustainable, low-cost housing for families and pensioners. If you genuinely do take resident views into effective account, it is clear that the new figure, in ST2 of the above Plan, of 42 new houses, is unsupportable, unfair and unrealistic.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF034	Residents	See the housing requirements has now doubled from previous 10% to 20% this is far to many for a small village like lound. And would completely spoil the village. We have a very infrequent public transport to the village meaning new houses will depend on private transport. Would like no more than the 10% increase for the village off lound	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF038	GPS Planning and Design Ltd.	As Bassetlaw is predominantly a rural District, support the positive and proportionate distribution of housing growth spatial strategy approach to rural development advocated in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. This seeks to deliver a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement over the Plan period for the Small Rural Settlements, with proportionate growth of 20% per Parish settlement. Welcome the encouragement given to Neighbourhood Planning Groups and the local communities to allocate sites to meet their housing requirement themselves. Agree that Scrooby should rightfully be included in the list of settlements contained in Policy ST2: Rural Bassetlaw where growth is supported. Whilst we concur that there should be minimum housing requirement set for each of the rural settlements, a precise quantum 'cap' for housing growth, in the case of Scrooby at 29 units, is far too restrictive.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Scrooby will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1190900	Residents	Reluctantly agreed to accept the requirement of new housing in Lound, one of the designated small rural settlements, but the target for homes in the amended draft BDC plan has been doubled from 21 to 42 new homes. This will completely change the character of the village. It is also not feasible on the grounds of the limited infrastructure of the village i.e utilities such as power supply and drainage as well as limited public transport facilities. The number of houses envisaged is also an over-provision on the number stated in your own plan. This is not Nimbyism but common sense and in any case, surely the real need is for starter homes for young people which is unlikely to be needed in a small village. Surely, it also makes sense to use existing brown-field sites and not to further impinge upon greenfield areas unnecessarily? With the continuing closure of factories and shops, couldn't buildings be converted and areas previously used for commerce be utilized? Builders of course need an incentive to clean up such areas as it is currently cheaper for them to build on "virgin" land. Support the 10% increase but not the 20% increase in new homes.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1191130	Residents	Having read the above plan, especially the requirement for SRS housing increase from 10% to 20% think that this is too much for Lound and that BDCs own figures show this increase is not required. The facts gathered by our Parish Council's neighbourhood Plan steering group over the past 4 years shows there is a general acceptance of 21 new homes(10%)but a doubling of this unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement stated in ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. Your BRC states that many villages are already using the 20% requirement so there should be no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. The Lound infrastructure will not support such a large increase. The village bus service is infrequent and really unusable so any increase in families will have to depend on private transport. The national average number of cars per household is 1.88 so therefore almost 80	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		more cars will be in Lound. This goes against the aim of DLP to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with the provision for more development if Neighbourhood plans support this according to local needs. This in my opinion would be much fairer.	
1191848	Barnby Moor Parish Council	A village the size of Barnby Moor to have an increase of 23 dwellings will mean these properties being built on good farm land.	Barnby Moor has remained a small rural settlement but the level of growth has been reduced to 5% dwellings in the revised version of local plan.
REF067	GR Planning and Architectural Design Ltd	Support for Section 5.2 and Policy ST2. This identifies the importance of the contribution that new rural housing can make to the broader sustainability of villages and that all rural settlements have a role to play in achieving this objective. The draft policy is consistent with Government Guidance as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework that supports sustainable development that will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. In recognition of the well established planning principle that any new development should respect the identity and distinctiveness of the settlement it is important to relate the size, scale, form and character of new development to that of the settlement in which it is located. In order to identify settlements that could accommodate new housing whilst satisfying these requirements the Councils Spatial Strategy 2019 assessed all 103 settlements in Rural Bassetlaw. Settlements that could not satisfy the identified requirements either because they were too small or too dispersed were not identified as being able to accommodate any new housing development and will be classified as being in the countryside. Styrrup is identified as a settlement that is capable of accommodating new housing development in accordance with the agreed principles. In order to protect rural settlements from excessive development that would not be proportionate to the size and scale of existing settlements and as a result would be harmful to local identity and distinctiveness the Draft Local Plan proposes that the amount of new housing development should be limited to 20% of the existing number of dwellings. There will be the opportunity for local communities to increase the percentage of growth through the inclusion of 'exceptions housing' referred to in the policy. This provides flexibility to allow the local community to choose how they plan for growth, with options to determine the most appropriate location and type of housing in accordance with the overall spatial strategy. The emphasis is therefore clearly on the need to make provision for the future controlled growth of rural settlements. Draft Policy ST2 entitled "Rural Bassetlaw" states that: C. Small Rural Settlements. Residential development in the Small rural settlements within the Parishes listed below, will, collectively accommodate a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement. Parish. Base number of dwellings 20% housing increase August 2018 in dwellings to 2037 Styrrup 131 26 D. Identifies 6 criteria that new housing development within Small Rural Settlements should satisfy: 1. Proposal should not increase number of dwellings by over 20% 2. Site should be within settlement boundary identified in Neighbourhood Plan - there is no Neighbourhood Plan for Styrrup. 3. A single proposal should not exceed 10 dwellings. 4. There should be no conflict with existing character and built form. 5. It should not lead to coalescence with neighbouring settlements. 6. Must comply with Nottinghamshire Minerals local Plan. E. Deals with Rural Exceptions Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 is therefore supported and recognises National Planning Policy that aims to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It is a positive policy that reflects a spatial growth strategy that should be commended.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF068	Resident	Concerned by the proposals within the 2020 draft version of the Local Plan to target Small Rural Settlements (such as Lound) to increase their Housing Requirements to 20% of their current size. A target of 10% growth, as required by the 2019 draft, was feasible (though unpopular in Lound) but the higher figure is neither fair nor sustainable in many SRS. They simply do not have the infrastructure or suitable tracts of land to support your proposals without adverse effect. Would urge you to reword the emerging Local Plan to target 10% growth in SRS, though allowing flexibility to those communities which demonstrate a need for higher growth through their Neighbourhood Plans.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1192465	Resident	Do not beleive that doubling requirements for SRS is sensible A, As per Bassetlaw plan its not required B, Local infastructure is not sufficient C, No areas big enough to support building of first affordable homes so we get more developments of large expensive homes that as seen in local villages do not sell.	The Local Plan has revised its settlement hierarchy for the rural Bassetlaw through Policy ST2. This policy has split the rural settlements into 3 tiers based on there size and the level of services and facilities. Growth has then been distributed accordingly.
REF082	Residents	Lound, as a small community, is unusual in hosting two very traffic heavy industrial elements. The A.D. Plant at Walters' farm, while being a welcome addition to the generation of cleaner electricity, is also a very heavy road user. Tractor and trailer traffic, at the X roads heart of the village, is often continual. Leaving aside air pollution and noise this can represent a barrier to smooth traffic flow along Town Street. Additionally, the second site Charcon, which produces concrete products, also necessitates the passage of much lorry traffic. There is rarely a quiet period in any day, partly because this business is a significant employer and the enterprise generates a considerable amount of service traffic. Unsurprisingly most of the employees use cars to get to site. All this amounts to a noisy and busy village at its core X roads. Suggest this be properly surveyed to establish current road use before the proposed increase to 20% in your plan.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF084	East Markham Parish Council	Object to Policy ST2 and ST2E. It is outrageous that the ST2 policy is rendered irrelevant by ST2E which allows for the 20 per cent growth limit to be set aside. There is considerable public disquiet in East Markham regarding damage being done by the overdevelopment of this village. And the current wave of house building of over 100 homes has barely even begun. Speaking as a Parish Councillor and someone with a 100 year family connection to East Markham, have never known a time when so many complaints - formal and informal - have been made about the state of our village. Object to any further growth in housing in East Markham. In the past 6 months East Markham has experienced ...• Raw sewage on High Street pouring from public drains • Raw sewage on Church Street pouring from public drains • The months long and ongoing closure of Priestgate over the A1, increasing traffic problems in the village. There are no confirmed plans to ever reopen this vital entry/ exit road into the village • Multiple recent car crashes on Farm Lane, leading to the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing • The introduction of double yellow lines and announced plans for further double yellow lines in the village to deal with parking and traffic chaos. Double yellow lines in a village !!!!! • Repeated closure of Mark Lane, for days at a time, meaning that 2 of the 4 roads from the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing were closed • Severe parking/ congestion problems on Farm Lane leading to the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing, especially at school drop/ collection times • Multiple residential addresses flooded on Low Street/ York Street • Agreement to increase the size of our primary school • Severe parking/ congestion issues adjacent to the primary school, already - which will only get worse Going back 20 years, East Markham used to have 4 main car routes in and out of the village - it now has just 2. More and more houses keep getting approved before the real world impact of 100 already approved/ under construction has even been experienced. Despite all this, there are no plans for any infrastructure improvements in East Markham whatsoever. Lives have been devastated by flooding. Fear that one of our traffic accidents will soon see serious harm done to a child. Over 100 new houses already have planning permission in East Markham. The Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing will become profoundly dangerous when these new houses, the majority of which are clustered around this junction, are built. Unlike Worksop, East Markham has practically no social amenities. No supermarket, Dr, leisure centre, coffee shops, restaurants, youth clubs, library, hospital, car park, pedestrianised areas, proper bus service, sources of material numbers of jobs, taxi firm yet we now have dangerous congestion, chronic parking issues, residential flooding and sewage running in multiple streets.	East Markham has seen a significant level of growth over the past ten years - largely down to infilling and the redevelopment of existing sites such as the old poultry factory off Mark Lane. At the same time, the village has also lost some vital services and facilities. Since 1st April 2018, the level of planning permissions for homes have counted towards meeting the proposed growth figure for the village as identified in the Local Plan. The revised Local Plan has also reduced the level of growth in line with other small rural settlements and following responses from the previous public consultation to 5%

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1193046	Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan	As a resident of LOUND, & a member of their Neighborhood Development Plan (NDP), am concerned about the proposed increase in the Housing Requirement (HR) for the Small Rural Settlements (SRS) being raised to 20%. Lound NDP worked in good faith on the 10% HR that was part of the dBLP 2019. Our consultation process has given us a yield of possible sites for new dwellings that hardly reaches 10%. Looking at your outline for SRS, BDC states that it needs 1090 new dwellings whereas the individual allocations village by village comes to 2124. So which is the operative figure? Does BDC have any idea as to the likely yield from these proposed HR allocations or is it simply a matter of "Hoping for the best?" In any case, you would do better to site your HR for Social housing nearer to the hubs that provide the services that these new residents will need. I am therefore against this proposed increase in the HR for SRS to 20%. Note on p36, in the section on Large Rural Settlements (LRS), there is a place for Neighbourhood Plans to play a role in deciding the how the HR is delivered. In the paragraph dealing with SRS, there is no such provision. PLEASE could you add such a clause making reference to NP as this would give BDC the necessary discretion to allocate more new dwellings to SRS that are planning for more, & those SRS such as Lound, which require much fewer new dwellings can have a lower figure. Would BDC consider organizing WORKSHOPS for SRS so that you can work out a consensus that better fits the varied requirements of all the different settlements. This would have the added bonus of allowing your stakeholders to better draft your plan with you, this would thus ensure that your are more likely to reach your overall target for new dwellings.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1193046	Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan	Would BDC also consider developing the sites of Ranby Prep School & Eaton Hall also as sites for new housing developments?	No sites within Small Rural Settlements will be formally allocated for development in the Local Plan. However, Neighbourhood Plans can allocate sites for development at a local level if the community support proposals.
1193061	Resident	States that Neighbourhood Plans, once agreed have the same planning status as the Local Plan. In creating Lound's Neighbourhood Plan the Steering Group followed advice provided by BDC before the publication of the draft Local Plan. The housing requirement was then 10%. The Neighbourhood Plan is now almost ready for submission and on that basis stands a good chance of acceptance by residents. An increased requirement to 20% will not be accepted. Lound's NP must not be judged on the basis of the, yet to be agreed, Local Plan. It must be judged alongside all previously agreed plans. The vision for Small Rural Settlements (SRS)s is for small scale development to support local community objectives to meet local housing needs and sustain village services. Increasing the housing requirement to 20% will not deliver this vision. Lound residents are prepared to accept 10% (21 houses) - 20% would place too great a strain on existing infrastructure (drainage, power supply, broadband accessibility, roads and the very infrequent public transport. The original 20% cap has now evolved into a 20% requirement. BDC states that the target for houses for SRSs is 1090. A 20% target will provide 2124 houses. Some villages are already taking up the 20% target, so there seems little need for Lound to increase its target. Lound village has a public house and a village hall. It shares a church and a school with Sutton cum Lound. There is no shop and poor public transport (one two hourly bus to and from Retford except Sunday. A 20% housing requirement would mean an increase in the number of cars. there is already a huge parking problem. The Local Plan emphasises the importance for smaller homes. these homeowners would be likely to need jobs and would be dependant on public transport. An increase in the housing requirement for small rural settlements is unacceptable. In Lound, the infrastructure would not support such and increase. Public transport is infrequent and therefore unusable so such an increase would result in an increase in private transport - against the stated objective of mitigating climate change. Drainage is already overloaded. Superfast broadband is available to only a few.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1193162	Resident	There is no way that many of the smaller, rural villages can sustain a growth of 20% unless there is significant investment in the infrastructure supplying that area and in the Local Services that support the community. In Lound, the Superfast internet is already well under the 'guaranteed' speed that Ofcom specify and an additional 20% of housing will further slow this speed down to an unacceptable level for modern life. The roads to Lound cannot reasonably cope with the increase in traffic that 20% more properties will bring as the LGVs already driving through Lound are a large enough hazard. The proposals for new roads to be provided a very close distance from the main Mattersey to Sutton road will result in an unacceptable road hazard. It is also the case that the plan does not allow for the increase in population through extending existing properties which should be another way in which a rural village could increase its population. By allowing homeowners to create additional bedrooms and/or annexes will also allow for an increase in population and this should form part of any plan. Any increased growth should also be accompanied with a pro-rata increase in services such as GP and dental places, hospital beds, etc. Ill thought out and to impose a fixed increase of houses will lose character in rural communities.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF087	Resident	Objection to the proposed 100% increase in the Housing Requirement of Small Rural Settlements, such as Lound. Been involved in producing a draft Neighbourhood Plan for Lound which met the conditions of the 2019 vBDC Local Plan, despite some local objections that it was too ambitious. Extensive surveys and consultations with parishioners, landowners and planning professionals, helped compile a draft NP which was realistic and deliverable. It was a compromise between strong local voices for no new building and providing our contribution to Bassetlaw's need for additional homes. Very careful consideration had been given to the infrastructure of Lound, which has severe limitations. No doubt several other SRSs face similar issues. Doubling the new build in Lound, and other SRSs, would be highly detrimental to the character and defining features of its built form and surroundings. An examination of the new Housing Requirement figures shown in Policy ST2, shows that an increase from 10% to 20% of SRSs would create an over-provision exceeding 1000 new dwellings, so it is as unnecessary as it is unsustainable. Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements "Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans" they will provide 20% growth. No such provision is afforded to SRSs, suggesting there is less importance to their Neighbourhood Plans. This should be rectified. SRSs should be targeted to provide 10% growth within the period of the BDC Local Plan, with those communities which have a desire to grow at a higher rate being encouraged to demonstrate their needs through Neighbourhood Plans. Frequent reviews are built into NPs to ensure they will fulfil their purpose.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF094	Resident	The Lound steering group have worked extremely hard over the last 3 years, with the villagers to submit a Lound Neighbourhood Plan to Bassetlaw. After many long hours of consultation and meetings, it was decided that a minimum of 21 new houses should be considered. Am opposed to any further increase in new houses in the village. Lound is a very small rural settlement, with few amenities. There is already a long-standing problem with drainage issues and a sewage plant at capacity. Extra housing would create an even greater problem for existing residents. Find it astounding that BDC now have revised the number of new homes to 42! This will have a great impact on the character of our lovely small village. Understand the village steering group and Parish Councillors have rigorously protested with Bassetlaw officials, regarding this increase of new housing. Hopefully BDC will take notice of the village views and concerns. Hope you will revise your policy and accept the housing volume laid out in Lound's Neighbourhood Plan and not push forward with more unwanted housing in the village.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1194092	Resident	Do not agree that Lound could sustain a doubling of a further 21 houses being built in this small rural community: Lack of frequent public transport does not support first time buyers/smaller starter homes. There are very few local jobs or industry, hence own transport would be essential. Poor road networks do not support any increase in traffic. Have been negotiating for many years to obtain speed restrictions in & out of the village, as yet without success. The infrastructure in Lound ie, current drainage, water & electricity supply would not support such a large increase. Parish Council has spent the last 4 years collecting evidence to produce its Draft Neighbourhood Plan with a general acceptance of a 10% increase & a doubling of this is not supportable at this time.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1194094	Resident	See that it is proposed that each small Rural Settlement (the category into which Lound falls), has it's Housing Requirement doubled from 10% identified in 2018 to 20% in 2020. This increase is not required especially as Bassetlaw District Council's own figures predict a 3.7% population growth. The infrastructure in Lound would not support such a large increase. Drainage is already stretched, public transport limited, poor internet and mobile phone connection and there is no school or shop. I believe that a 20% increase in housing is not sustainable and should be reduced to 10% which would fulfil your area requirements.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF114	Ranskill Parish Council	There appear to be discrepancies between figures stated in the Plan relating to Smaller Rural Settlements. Para 5.1.32 it states, "a minimum, combined, housing requirement of 1090 is proposed for the Small Rural Settlements". However, the 20% requirement stated in Policy ST2 will provide a total of 2,124 homes over 100% more. Please can this be clarified. The Parish Council are concerned that a blanket approach has been taken to housing allocation outside of the main towns. The Plan states that "Large Rural Settlements will be the main focus for development in rural areas". However, they are only required to take the same 20% growth as the Smaller Rural Settlements, regardless of the fact that these Larger Rural Settlements have far more in terms of infrastructure (a fact acknowledged in para 5.1.28 of the Plan). Smaller Rural Settlements, according to page 33 para 5.2.6, are only required to have "at least one of the following: a Primary School, Doctors Surgery, a community centre and a convenience store, a church or public house". A Smaller Rural Settlement with just a church and a village hall is being asked to support the same percentage increase in terms of dwellings as a Larger Rural Settlement and at the same time take a more than 50% cut to the CIL money provided by developers to improve infrastructure and facilities for residents.	The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan now includes a revised approach to Rural Bassetlaw by reducing the growth percentage for Small Rural Settlements to 5%
REF118	Lound Parish Council	Lound Parish Council objects to an arbitrary uplift of 20% housing growth being applied to all Small Rural Settlements (SRS) as detailed within the Draft Local Plan policy ST2. Many areas lack the infrastructure to support such an increase, some are listed by Bassetlaw District Council as Areas of Conservation; as having Heritage assets or; as Areas of SSSI and, as such, special considerations should have been taken into account. Additionally, each small rural village should be individually assessed in detail and further diversity applied to the housing growth requirement to protect heritage assets, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Conservation areas, (or equivalent), areas of greenspace, greenbelt, Nature Reservations and the surrounding biodiversity. The current methodology of imposing an arbitrary increase demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and of local requirement.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF119	WH Bett and Sons	As a resident of Darlton, it should have the opportunity of some new housing so that the village does not become stagnated. Share the same view for Ragnall. These very small, rural villages appeal to a lot of people and it would be good to given a few more people the chance to live in these villages.	Growth in rural Bassetlaw through Policy ST2 and through the development of Neighbourhood Plans.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF120	Residents	The residents of Lound, a Small Rural Settlement, came together and there was a general acceptance for 21 new properties to be built. An increase of 10% of Lound's present size, still maintaining it's Small Rural Settlement feel in which the residents of Lound choose to live. It has now been proposed that the 21 properties be increased to 42, this seems to be a vast increase of this Small Rural Settlement. The infrastructure in Lound is already under strain. Surface water and sewerage in particular cause flooding in and around various properties with in the village. Any further building would increase these problems, the present systems being somewhat out of date. This will only become worse with the present climate change situation, together with infrequent public transport, poor internet connection and other amenities, the village would not be conducive to small/starter homes. Lound put together a Neighbourhood Plan in which made Small Rural Settlements exempt from complying with the 20% growth of Large Rural Settlements. This makes a nonsense of all the hard work and consultations that people have put in, to protect this Small Rural Settlement. It appears to me that with all the proposed projects in and around Retford the Draft Plan ST 2 more than reaches its requirement and this Small Rural Settlement should be recognised as just that, and left with a 10% increase in housing and not 20% as is now being proposed.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1194599	Residents	20% regrowth for rural growth is to high and not what was agreed and approved by the NDP steering group. As a resident do not wish to see anymore new builds in our rural community. Bassetlaw have met their quota on new builds already. I move to this area to get away from the hussle and bussle of daily life not to be crammed back into another.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1194662	Residents	Support up to of housing capped to 20% allocated to Rural areas	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF124	Bolsover District Council	Bolsover District Council supports the aims of the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan to deliver sustainable development and meet the employment and housing needs arising in the district within the district. However, there are a number of areas where we would welcome further clarification/ discussions under the Duty to Co-operate as the Publication version of the Plan is developed. These are: Discussion of how the employment land requirement figure has been reached; How this has impacted on the proposed housing requirement; § How and where the proposed housing requirements for the small rural settlements of Cuckney, Holbeck, and Nether Langwith abutting or close to the boundary with Bolsover District are to be met. It is anticipated that the first two elements above would feed into a refresh of the Joint Housing Market Area (HMA) wide Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).	The matters raised will form part of future discussions relating to the Statement of Common Ground.
REF133	Consultant	Support Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 . This identifies the importance of the contribution that new rural housing can make to the broader sustainability of villages and that all rural settlements have a role to play in achieving this objective. The draft policy is consistent with Government Guidance as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework that supports sustainable development that will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. In recognition of the well established planning principle that any new development should respect the identity and distinctiveness of the settlement it is important to relate the size, scale, form and character of new development to that of the settlement in which it is located. In order to identify settlements that could accommodate new housing whilst satisfying these requirements the Councils Spatial Strategy 2019 assessed all 103 settlements in Rural Bassetlaw. Settlements that could not satisfy the identified requirements either because they were too small or too dispersed were not identified as being able to accommodate any new housing development and will be classified as being in the countryside. Misterton is identified as a Large Rural Settlement that is capable of accommodating new housing development in accordance with the agreed principles. The specific site in question has been allocated in the past for residential development including the Bassetlaw Local Plan Consultative Draft 1993 in which it was designated as H77 and referred to as Old Forge Road with an area of 1.78Ha. In order to protect rural settlements from excessive development that would not be proportionate to the size and scale of existing settlements and as a result would be harmful to local identity	All settlements will be subject to strict design policies either through the Local Plan or made Neighbourhood Plans for those areas. The Council is also producing a Design SPD to provide more detail on certain parts of the District. This will be closely linked to other SPDs and the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		and distinctiveness the Draft Local Plan proposes that the amount of new housing development should be limited to 20% of the existing number of dwellings. There will be the opportunity for local communities to increase the percentage of growth through the inclusion of 'exceptions housing' referred to in the policy. This provides flexibility to allow the local community to choose how they plan for growth, with options to determine the most appropriate location and type of housing in accordance with the overall spatial strategy. The emphasis is therefore clearly on the need to make provision for the future controlled growth of rural settlements.	
REF133	Consultant	Misterton has a neighbourhood plan in which the particular site in question (see plan below) is not allocated for development. However the site falls clearly within the heart of the settlement and its development for residential development would be entirely consent with surrounding housing. Policy 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that there might be suitable development opportunities within the settlement boundary in addition to the specific allocations. Policy 5 states:- " Proposals for residential development within the development boundary will be supported subject to the following criteria: a) They would not cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of properties in the immediate locality; and b) They would be consistent with the character and appearance of the immediate locality; and c) They would provide suitable vehicular access. Proposals for residential development outside the development boundary will be supported where the accord with the principles included within Policy DM3 of the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Management DPD." Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 of the draft Local Plan is therefore supported and recognises National Planning Policy that aims to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It is a positive policy that reflects a spatial growth strategy that should be commended. Furthermore the development of the site shown edged red in the plan below is consistent with the principles embodied within Policy 5, entitled Windfall Sites, of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Thank you for your comments.
REF136	A and D Architecture	3) Policy ST2 should be similarly modified and include new sub-section E as follows: "E The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites."	The Housing and Economic Development needs Assessment 2020 identifies no need for Park Home development. There is no need for this type of housing to be specifically referred to in Policy ST2.
1195111	Resident	20% is too greater number of properties. This equates to 70 dwellings, the infrastructure cannot cope. The impact to water levels. Carbon zero environment, how this be achieved, no bus service, no trains, no medical centre in the village, little in the way of shops.	The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan provides a re-classification of settlements and the level of growth according to their size and service provision.
1195161	Resident	An available residential site at Gringley Road Misterton has been put forward since 2008. In the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan it was identified as NP03 Policy 9. This site should be added due to:- It was the democratic decision of the community, BDC supported "the development boundary will not be a consideration in the new local plan and Gringley Road has recently had permissions granted outside the said development boundary", The Minimum Housing Requirement is already out of date following planning approval on NP02 Policy 8 in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan which had been identified as allocation for 12 dwellings but was approved for 4 dwellings showing a shortfall of 8 from the Housing Provision. ADD SITE TO ALLOCATION	Misterton is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size and level of services. The Local Plan is supportive of the recently adopted Misterton Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for development and the Local Plan does not seek to allocate any further sites within the village.
1195187	Resident	The plan is a blanket development of 20% that is not sustainable in some areas. The strategy is for a blanket increase in housing of 20% where some of the outlined communities cannot support this. As question 1, some communities can expand well beyond 20%, some cannot.	The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan provides a re-classification of settlements and the level of growth according to their size and service provision.
1195216	Resident	20% is too high and will drastically change the nature of these villages. Where is the evidence that these homes are needed?	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF149	Resident	Object to an arbitrary uplift of 20% housing growth being applied to all Small Rural Settlements (SRS) as detailed within the Draft Local Plan policy ST2. The village of Lound falls into this category. This demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and of local requirement. Refers to The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) section 15 details. Lound Village is a conservation area and therefore as a non-designated asset. It has a number of listed buildings; it has areas registered as designated sites of Special Scientific Interest and is surrounded by Nature Reserves. Yet all this has not been identified within Bassetlaw's Green Gap Report or within the New Settlement Study Methodology. The village cannot support a 20% housing growth uplift without serious impact on the aesthetics of the village, its wildlife or without the loss of Greenspace /Greenbelt, agricultural land or natural environment. Imposing such an increase will be disastrous. Our village has narrow streets which are not designed to take large traffic volume The water treatment plant is already at maximum capacity and lorries are driving to the plant numerous times a day to empty this facility already causing damage to the road, the hedges and subsequently wildlife on a daily basis In addition: Policy ST45 Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation has not been taken into consideration. Lound does not have a school, or shop and an infrequent bus service but does have green fields, woodlands and tranquility that sustain a variety of wildlife and fauna which you are wanting to destroy by building on green belt areas, which Teresa May, when in office, stated should be protected at all costs.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF150	Resident	It has been suggested previously that sites identified as part of the 2017 Land Availability Housing Assessment will be considered as part of this new plan process. This previously identified 5 sites in Clayworth, all of which were not considered further, as at that time, the previous Local Plan process did not identify the village as suitable for growth. It would appear unlikely that Clayworth would have suitable sites to accommodate even the minimum proposed housing requirement of 14 units, without contravening the Local Plan policies. Would expect that the Council seeks to apply its own proposed policies as part of the site allocation process i.e. now, rather than relying on them to protect settlements from unsuitable development post-allocation. Highways This is of relevance to Clayworth given it is served by only a single B road (B1403) which runs from Hayton through the village then up to Gringley on the Hill, alongside an unclassified road from Drakeholes through the village to Wheatley. The addition of 14 to 28 new dwellings would add significant pressure on the road network, within and surrounding Clayworth, which it is entirely unable to accommodate. This should be considered as part of the housing numbers allocation process.	Clayworth is considered a small rural settlement due to its size and level of services. This enables a small level of growth in the village over the plan period subject to it meeting other relevant policies in the Local Plan. But the Local Plan does not allocate sites in the the Small Rural Settlements. Their growth is more appropriately managed through Neighbourhood Plans or through appropriate planning applications. Clayworth could also look to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to manage this development in a way that is acceptable to the community.
REF159	Lound Parish Council	Have been using the Requirement of a 10% increase in our housing stock. During our consultations with the members of the village we found that the majority thought that little or no development was desirable and thus have produced a plan that meets with that response but which also allows for development to meet the Requirement. Now, find that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS) will have a Requirement of 20%, a 100% increase of the previous Draft Plan. This will go against the desires of the village and will negate over 4 years' work, wasting Local and Central Government Public funds, and innumerable hours of volunteers' time. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan to be provided by SRS is 1090, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. The current methodology of imposing an arbitrary increase demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and local needs. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is rudimentary, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, notably ST45 1a and 1c, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. Lound Village is listed as a conservation area and therefore as a non-designated asset. It has a number of listed buildings; it has areas registered as designated sites of Special Scientific Interest and is surrounded by Nature Reserves. Yet none of this has been identified within Bassetlaw's Green Gap Report or within the New Settlement Study Methodology. The village cannot support a 20% housing growth uplift without serious impact on the aesthetics of the village and its wildlife or	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		without the loss of Greenspace/Greenbelt, agricultural land or natural environment. Imposing such an increase will be disastrous. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...they will provide 20% growth'. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this obviously diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Where these plans have been assessed and approved by the local authority and are supported by the local community through a referendum, they should be given the same importance as Neighbourhood Plans for Large Rural Settlements, and their influence should be reinforced in the process of the determining of planning outcomes. The requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs should be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.	
1195333	Resident	The 20% increase in housing is too large. When the Neighbourhood Plan was first mooted it was considered that in rural villages there would be a 10% increase in housing. This, in itself, led to some resistance from the residents in Lound but after some public meetings it was agreed that there should be approval for 21 houses, ie 10%. However, the latest draft local plan now states that 20% more housing should be provided. Double what was originally suggested and which I think will put unnecessary stress on the infrastructure and change the nature of rural villages	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1195356	Resident	These areas are rural for a reason. People buy homes here to be rural not be linked to the next village or town. If they wanted to live in a town or village they would buy homes there . Made rural.... leave it rural	the majority of growth has been directed to the larger settlements and settlements in the rural areas. The majority of the countryside is being protected.
1195365	Resident	Building 20% worth of extra houses on Lound would not be realistic and would damage the village in terms of its character. Also the infrastructure only just about supports the residents now. We moved to the village because it was quiet and rural and would hate to see this destroyed. If this happened we would most likely have no choice but to move and find somewhere else akin to Lound as.The bassetlaw District council own figures demonstrate that this number is not required?	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF175	Resident	Raise concerns regarding the Housing Requirement being imposed on Lound in the draft Local Plan. The village of Lound is a rural community with limited infrastructure. The increased Housing Requirement figure of 20% is far too large and will be severely detrimental to the rural nature of the village. Lound's Neighbourhood Plan has identified support for reasonable growth of 21 homes. This figure represents significant growth for such a small village however the proposal to double this through the introduction of a 20% increase is ridiculous. Understand that the 20% requirement will actually provide more than the 1090 new homes that you wish to generate from the Small Rural Settlement category and that you already believe that some villages will perform at 20% anyway. There is no need to enforce additional housing requirements on other settlements, especially when this risks undermining an emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The Housing Requirement figure must be reduced back to 10%. This will meet your own requirements and allow the Lound Neighbourhood Plan to continue to be supported in its delivery of positive housing growth in the village.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1195879	Hamlin Estates TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services	The 20% cap for identified Small Rural Settlements is counter-intuitive and contradictory to the requirement for these to provide a 'minimum' of 1090 dwellings. This 'cap' should be either removed or it should be made clear that the 20% targets are 'around the minimum level of housing delivery required'.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1195884	Resident	Disagree with good agricultural land being taken out of use for housing. The brownfield sites should be developed first and scrubland not used for agriculture. Also further development at Oldcotes and Styrrup is not really feasible as any development at Oldcotes, firstly would be outside the parameters of the village and the nearest amenities being at Langold or Harworth and at Styrrup would be like a separate settlement. There is no employment as such in either place.	The Local plan has allocated a number of brownfield sites and encourages the redevelopment of these over the plan period but there is not enough to meet available sites to meet identified needs. So some greenfield land is required. Styrrup and Oldcotes are considered separate settlements in Policy ST2. In addition, the Langold Neighbourhood Plan identifies a "green gap" between itself and Oldcotes to help maintain the level of separation.
1195911	Aspbury Planning Limited	Support the principle of organic growth up to 20% in the Small Rural Settlements, concern lie with ensuring that delivery of the housing actually occurs within these settlements since policy ST1 indicates that the minimum provision of 1090 dwellings will only come forward on nonallocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans. Figure 7 sets out options for delivery ranging from complete organic growth (no allocations) through to all growth delivered by Neighbourhood Plans. At what point will the respective Neighbourhood Plan groups have to commit to either of the 5 options set out in Figure 7 so that landowners can respond accordingly with submissions to an NP review or planning applications to BDC. Unless clarity and timescales are set out there is huge potential for confusion, delay and conflict and for anti-development communities to potentially stall logical development opportunities. Clarification needs to be given confirming what the base number of dwellings as at August 2018 actually comprises in terms of unimplemented dwelling commitments (outline and full) granted prior to August 2018 and whether they form part of the base supply or part of the 20% growth allowance. This clarification of a cut -off point between current base dwelling supply and future growth is critical if this policy is to be considered effective and positively prepared in the tests for soundness.	The housing numbers and distribution has been revised in the latest version of the Local Plan in response to comments through the previous consultation period and the latest evidence base. Those numbers still include growth in our rural communities and the allocation of sites within the larger settlements across the District. See revised Policy ST1. The rural monitoring framework has been revised to provide more clarity for users on the points identified.
REF183	Resident	For Clayworth have concerns with the Council's rationale for taking a 20% blanket housing growth allocation across smaller settlements, which does not take into account their relative status i.e. whether they are Conservation Areas or not. Have concerns that this allocation does not take into account the ability of each settlement to practically accommodate this number of new dwellings due to the lack of specific housing site allocations for these smaller settlements (outside of Neighbourhood Plans). This leaves these smaller settlements open to the potential for speculative development by land owners who wish to press a case against the other policies within the plan. Whilst it could be said that the policies aimed at protecting the character and form of Conservation Areas could be used as a form of protection against unwanted development, the simply fact that the Council has declared that villages such as Clayworth could accommodate these means that there is a risk that in the push to achieve the housing targets, developers will seek to work around rather than with policies aimed at protecting this status.	Clayworth is considered a small rural settlement due to its size and level of services. This enables a small level of growth in the village over the plan period subject to it meeting other relevant policies in the Local Plan. Clayworth could also look to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to manage this development in a way that is acceptable to the community.
1195921	Resident	Building 20% worth of extra houses on Lound would not be realistic and would damage the village in terms of its character. Also the infrastructure only just about supports the residents now. We moved to the village because it was quiet and rural and would hate to see this destroyed. If this happened we would most likely have no choice but to move and find somewhere else akin to Lound .The bassetlaw District council own figures demonstrate that this number is not required?	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF194	Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	Further concern is the way that the Local Plan sees the allocation of sites which were granted planning consent before the August 2018 deadline. Many of these sites have not been built, therefore, no houses. If the Plan is genuinely looking for extra builds then these, surely should count towards any allocation. A further problem, that of 'legal starts' also denies the part which previous consents can count towards required numbers. Have one such site which has 'legal start' applied to it. This was granted Consent around 2005 and was started. These houses are not being built, why is the planning permission not rescinded and perhaps the land opened for new proposals to be brought forward. The site in question is both unbuilt and a blight on the Parish with overgrown hedges and land.	The Local Plan allows for developments since 1st April 2018 to be counted towards the rural housing requirement. 2018 is the base date for the plan period and is also largely when Neighbourhood plans have been proposing sites since.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF194	Clarbrough and Welham Parish Council	Want to ensure all housing development and business development is consistent with the vision and policies set out in the Clarbrough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan. Want to ensure all development retains the character of our Parish and the two separate villages. It is not convinced that some of the proposals of the 'Draft' Strategic Plan allows this to take place in a way which is beneficial to our Parish.	The Local Plan supports developments that are of high-quality design. Further detail on design will be produced through a Supplementary Planning Document
1196000	Resident	Whilst the intended cap of 20% housing increase seems sensible in principle, there is no obvious consideration that this may be appropriate for some villages, but not others. It may be that the available suitable land in one village, for example, would warrant a higher proportion of housing increase than in others. On the face of it, the 20% increase therefore seems arbitrary, and takes no account of the specific requirements/capacity of the various communities. This links into a further concern about the increases in housing. For some villages the increases may mean that it might be appropriate to provide additional services and resources - e.g. shops, transport infrastructure, healthcare. A more cynical view taken of the 20% cap might be that this means the allocation of additional services will be less of a requirement, even though the spread of housing may be better served by having greater numbers in certain locations over others.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
1196060	Resident	only support in line with neighbourhood plan of 20% increase for each community not a disproportionately large housing project as proposed in ST5	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF198	Consultant	Para 5.1.32 This proposes a 20% cap per parish as though it were a "one size fits all" policy. It is not. Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe have engaged, researched and produced a document embracing and promoting residential development. They have done the legwork and found that to maintain the villages' viability, including its existing services and with a hope to advance service provision, a constant number of families need to be consistently attracted to the village. This is something that appears lacking with this 20% cap justification and most certainly is lacking in many Neighbourhood Plans where control is the main theme.	Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe have produced a Neighbourhood Plan and have appropriately planned for growth as identified in the previous version of the Local Plan. The NP can be reviewed in time if the community wishes to do so.
REF199	Stancliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake	Have concerns however regarding the proposed Spatial Strategy, particularly in respect to Rural Villages. Support the objectives of sustainable development and recognise that a balanced approach to growth should be adopted in order to achieve this, the approach taken to large and small rural settlements is not fully evidenced; this undermines the soundness of the Plan.	The spatial strategy has been reviewed in the latest version of the Local Plan. This has also updated the proposed settlement hierarchy and the distribution of growth.
REF199	Stancliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake	Large Rural Settlements are in the same category as Main Towns and there is provision for allocations in these categories of settlement, which we concur with. The policy also allows for appropriate forms of development within their settlement boundaries. It is considered that in order to allow for greater flexibility provision should be made for sustainable development adjacent to settlement boundaries where there is clear evidence that the Council do not have a 5 year supply of housing land or they are failing to deliver the required amount of housing per annum. The table included with Policy ST1 also defines which settlements fall into each category. The background paper on the revised spatial strategy stated that: 'The role of each level of the strategy reflects population size, their location in respect of other settlements and the range of services present and their ability to expand to accommodate the needs generated by new development'. Policy ST2 sets out the number of dwellings in each settlement rather than the population size and in the evidence base there would not appear to be any analysis of the population size of the rural settlement has been undertaken. In the most recent 2018 population estimates, Blyth has a population of 1,214 (a reduction in population since the 2011 Census) and Shireoaks has a population of 1,394 representing an increase. Shireoaks has been identified as a 'Small Rural Village' whereas Blyth is categorised as a 'Large Rural Settlement', despite the fact that Shireoaks supports a larger number of dwellings. Although Shireoaks does not have a medical centre it supports all of the other facilities listed at paragraph 5.2.5 of the draft Local Plan. It also benefits from a railway station with good connectivity to Lincoln, Worksop and Sheffield. In addition, there is an industrial estate within the settlement that supports a number of businesses, thereby providing employment opportunities for residents of Shireoaks and the wider area.	The level of growth per settlement is based on the number of dwellings as of 1st August 2018 and the number of services and facilities. The revised Local Plan has provided an update to policies ST1 and ST2 and the justification reflects those changes. Large Rural Settlements are not in the same category as Main Towns. Main Towns are in the top tier of the hierarchy so are expected to take more growth proportionate to their position in the hierarchy and sustainability credentials.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF199	Standcliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake	Draft Policy ST2 should be reworded. B. Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans or through a masterplan framework agreed with the Council, residential development in Large Rural Settlements within the Parishes identified below or in the case of Cottam within the redline boundary identified on the Policies Map, will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1764 new dwellings of the District's housing requirementThe scale and density of development proposed should be appropriate to the character, shape and built form of that part of the settlement and should not normally exceed 1 hectare in size should conform to the principles of sustainable development Small Rural Settlements C. Residential development in Small Rural Settlements within the Parishes listed below, will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement Parish Base number of dwellings, August 2018 20% housing increase in Dwellings to 2037 Shireoaks 645 129 Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plan or Part E of this policy applies, additional development in Small Rural Settlements over the plan period will be supported provided that all of the criteria below are satisfactorily met, and the proposal is consistent with other policies in this Plan: 3. A single proposal should not exceed 10 dwellings, unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide a community benefit, including affordable housing or open space provision As drafted Policy ST2 is not positively prepared and is unsound as it lacks flexibility to deliver the long-term strategic growth of the District.	The level of growth per settlement is based on the number of dwellings as of 1st August 2018, its population and the number of services and facilities. The revised Local Plan has provided an update to policies ST1 and ST2 and the justification reflects those changes.
1196242	Resident	As a rural district, should be looking to protect and keep as many of our rural communities and small towns/villages as they are. Nature is great for people wellbeing and we need to make sure we protect that.	Thank you for your comment.
REF206	Resident	Ragnall The proposed plans will effect our village mainly the volume of traffic ,at the moment it is terrible heavy vehicles day and night ,the road has been surfaced but it will need doing again.The crossroads is an accident waiting to happen they are dangerous and traffic going down into and out of Dunham do not exceed the speed limit it needs reducing .My son was killed on that road 3 xmas ago how many more families have to go through the pain of losing a loved one.I wrote to the highways about my concerns but they did not even reply to my letter ,we are a forgot on village something needs to be done .	In terms of the growth of sites in the area. Highways safety is an important part of traffic management for new development. Further traffic assessment has been undertaken on those roads to look at capacity and also highway safety. The work also looked at what mitigation is needed. This work will be developed further through the masterplanning and planning application process for sites so that it includes the most up to date information about a sites proposed uses, the level of growth and its proposed access points etc...
REF214	Oxalis Planning	Disagree with the 20% cap on growth proposed at paragraph 5.2.8 in the supporting text for Policy ST2, which is formalised within the Policy itself. The proposed 20% cap for the number of dwellings to be delivered in the Large Rural Settlements will be restrictive in the long term. The cap may become an issue if anticipated delivery elsewhere slips behind schedule requiring the Council to look towards the Large Rural Settlements for additional housing growth. In this context, the concept of an arbitrary cap appears unnecessarily restrictive and it should be revised or removed to ensure that the Plan is supportive of sustainable growth. 20% could be used as a guiding figure, but it should not be used as an inflexible cap on development. The Plan period covers 17 years and therefore the Plan needs to include the capacity to respond to any possible changes and challenges which the District may face over the entire lifetime of the Plan.	The majority of growth in the large rural settlements has now been accommodated either through planning permissions or through the allocation of sites through Neighbourhood Plans. The 20% or 5% threshold is a significant level and this growth is supported by existing infrastructure and is therefore seen as deliverable. it is noted that additional development above the % requirement may be supported if there is need for additional growth or though the review or development of a Neighbourhood Plan and there is community support.
REF215	Trustees of H S Wallis	There is a clear need to resolve the disparity between ST1 and ST2 and surely that must be in the favour of ST1 as far as housing is concerned if the "Strategic Objectives" set out at Section 4.2 are to be achieved. Draft Policy ST2 as it stands sets out the approach to distributing the numbers of dwellings needed in LRS's up to 2037. The number for Blyth is 111 using (correctly?) a rate of increase of 20% from base number of 553 and base date of August 2018. Since the Draft Local Plan does not appear to be making any housing allocations in "North Blyth and IF the Draft Blyth Neighbourhood Plan is correct in policy terms in seeking to apply the 20% limit, this appears to result in no more than a further 8 dwellings to be permitted for the remaining plan period i.e. a further 17 years !!! At 2 dwellings per year for the next 17 years that will not help to deliver the step change sought by the Local Plan nor provide the sort of choice in the housing market that Policy ST1 and National Policy seek. However, Policy ST2 seems to recognise that there will be other housing development in these settlements and indicates that they will be on sites not normally larger than 1 hectare so long as they meet	Policy ST1 and ST2 have now been revised following the feedback from public consultation. The revision hopefully provides a clearer link between the policies.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		"...local housing needs..." Interestingly because of its shape and other limitations the subject site in "North Blyth" has a net developable area of around 1 hectare.	
REF217	Resident	Concerned about the approach taken to the allocation of houses for Smaller Rural Settlements and the fact that these SRS of which Lound is one, are required to take the same increase in housing as the Larger Rural Settlements (20%) regardless of the fact that they have far fewer amenities and facilities, a fact which you yourselves acknowledge in the Plan. In the latest version of the plan Lound has had it's housing requirement doubled from 10% to 20%. This is too many in a village where the only amenities are a small village hall and a pub. There is also a discrepancy in the figures given in the Plan regarding SRS - on page 27 it states that a minimum housing requirements of 1090 is proposed for SRS and then in policy ST2 the figures provided give a total of 2,124 - a 100% over-provision. So why is there a need for Lound to have it's requirement doubled? The requirement for a 20% increase should be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if a Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local need.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF222	Notts CC	Minerals and Waste Part D, 6 of the policy states that any non-mineral development proposal in a Mineral Safeguarding Areas will need to meet the requirements set out in the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. This is in line with the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and is welcomed by the County Council.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1196532	East Markham Parish Council	At the last census, (2011) East Markham had 490 dwellings, this had increased to 524 by August 2018 representing a rise in Housing stock of 5.7%. In contrast, Clarbrough and Welham (also defined as a small rural settlement within the plan) has since an increase in dwellings from 480 in the census to 495 by August 2018. This represents an increase of 3.1% in their housing stock. Since April 2018 East Markham has seen applications for a further 35 residential properties reflecting the rapid change in our village with little thought to overall design and planning. The increase in dwellings over the last 9 years has produced a lot of pressure on narrow village roads. Recent construction of dwellings on Beckland Hill and High Street have seen congestion on the village's roads with little apparent thought given to the infrastructure of the village. East Markham PC requests that BDC view each application in the wider context of development in the village rather than on an individual basis. At the time of writing there are 59 houses either being developed or approved around Mark Lane / Beckland Hill. Little apparent thought appears to have been given to the impact that these 3 separate developments will have on roads and drainage in this area. East Markham PC has concerns about the ability of the Council to adhere to the notional 20% cap within the lifespan of the plan. East Markham parish council believes that recent development already has had an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the village. The proportionate cap of 20% has been in existence for some time but there is little evidence that BDC has taken character and amenity into consideration.	The Local Plan has considered existing commitments for each settlement from 1st April 2018. This takes into account some existing planning permissions and completions. This will be monitored through the Council's Rural Monitoring Framework. In addition, the impact of new development on local character is important and the design policy in the Local Plan will be supported by a more detailed "design supplementary planning document". However, if the PC would like to undertake more localised work on its local character, then a review of the made Neighbourhood Plan could support this through the production of a character assessment for East Markham.
1196544	Resident	Disagree with ST2. Many other aspects of the plan are really good.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1196544	Resident	Strong objection to your plans which could see the building of over 40 new dwellings in Lound. My main reason is that there is no infrastructure to support new dwellings. We have a very infrequent bus route. We have no schools or nurseries, no doctors surgery, no dentist, and no shops. The people who live in Lound rely on driving a car. If a family move in, and one partner is working, the other partner will also need a car in order to get around. Thus you will be increasing the number of cars needed on the road, and pollution. Compare this to building homes in areas where there are already facilities and good eco friendly transport links. My husband and I have shared a car for decades. On moving to Lound in 2019, we found we needed to purchase another car, so that we could go about our normal lives. I know of one mature lady, not a driver, who used to live in Retford, and access many activities and the shops. She regrets moving to Lound as she now finds it very difficult to access her activities, causing a sense of isolation. Your policy seems like a very general one size fits all plan which is actually not a plan. It is not thought through, there is no logic to it. It does not consider the impact on the environment and the need for infrastructure which will enable people to live well. There must be many areas with necessary facilities and links which could easily have room for new homes, where people could join communities and lead fulfilled lives. Unless you intend to build more facilities and substantially improve transport links, Lound is not such a place.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1196559	Resident	Regards to the Housing Quantities there appear to be discrepancies at Bothamsall. The document lists 114 dwellings. However, within the PARISH there are 105 that I am aware of, with only 75 being within the settlement. Not been able to get a concrete answer as to where the 20% extra are to be located. In the first consultation I was advise that the extra housing was to be within the 'settlement', i.e. in the VILLAGE of Bothamsall, not the Parish. If this is the case then the 20% should be of the 75 dwellings within the settlement, not the number in the Parish.If the location of the housing is to be withing the PARISH, then the 20% should be of the 105 (not 114 as listed in the Document).	Noted. The number of dwellings for Bothamsall and the parish have been checked with our Council Tax department and updated. There are 102 properties in the parish and only 74 within the village of Bothamsall and therefore it has been removed from the list of Small Rural Settlements.
1196642	Resident	The 20% cap on rural developments does not make sense. It is far too permissive. The caveat (pg 25) "Whilst Large Rural Settlements will be the main focus for development in rural areas, proportionate growth to a maximum of 20% per Parish settlement - as identified by the previous two draft Plans 5,7- will be supported where it will not have an adverse effect on the character or amenity of the settlement." No confidence this will be adequately monitored and when unsupported development to this extent has taken place, it will be too late. Strongly support a lower cap, say 10% and exceptions to be made where it is clearly demonstrated that there are sufficient local amenities including transport to properly support and maintain such growth. Most of the rural communities have inadequate resources, particulary for young growing families, support the main thrust of the policy to develop amenities and housing in areas where they will clearly delivery quality living and good value for money.Some rural communities should expand by up to, and in some cases, more than 20% but these need to be carefully selected for their potential to have the wider investments needed.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework which is updated monthly to provide a robust basis for monitoring the policy and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
1196674	Resident	Live in Ranby Village and am opposed to any further housing development within the village due to the infrastructure i.e. roads, drainage, walkways etc, in my opinion is unsuitable for any further development. Have inadequate drainage for the amount of houses currently and frequently have flooded roads and blocked drainage, Footpaths are narrow and some places nonexistent and poorly maintained with inadequate street lighting. It is my belief that any further development in the Ranby Village would put extra strain on the already weak infrastructure that is currently in place. Any further development would also increase air pollution due to extra traffic in the area along with disturbing wildlife and the natural beauty of the village.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF239	Consultant	Oppose the proposal to build 51 dwellings in the village as we do not believe that it is fair to allocate the whole parish's commitment to the building plan to one village alone. Ranby has only 89 dwellings currently and therefore an increase of a further 51 would mean a 57% increase. • The village has very few facilities which do not require, or would benefit from, a further increase in population • The village dwellings are predominately heated by means of oil, a fossil fuel, and any additional houses are likely to be on the same • There are already parking issues around the school which is situated on one of only two 'main' roads in Ranby. • There are no employment opportunities in Ranby and therefore any new residents will be commuters to Worksop, Retford or much further afield impacting on noise, air pollution and generating a greater carbon footprint for the area. • The village already has two areas which regularly flood. Further buildings and hard surface areas will only increase the flooding and impact the local residents • The village has only limited broadband and further users would again impact on the current local residents. The potential solution would be to allocate the whole of the parish's allocation to the proposed Garden Village east of A1/A57. The Garden Village is expected to be for 4000 dwellings and all the infrastructure to support that population will be provided at the same time with employment being potentially provided by the industrial estate to be built nearby. The environmental issues could be planned for making all of the dwellings carbon neutral, provide electric car charging points and proper drainage to deal with climate change.	The housing requirement for the Small Rural Settlements has been updated following consultation. In addition, the spatial strategy and District housing distribution has also changed. See ST1.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1196688	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>As part of the revision of Sturton Ward's Neighbourhood Plan, in 2018, asked local residents for site submissions from across the whole ward, including the village of Bole. Only one site – NP27 – was put forward near Bole, and this site was rejected as part of the "initial sift" for the following reasons: BDC Planning Policy commented "Separate from the built form of the village"; NCC Highways commented "This site is not considered to be a suitable location. The Highway Authority would only consider replacement of the exiting use with limited residential". On this basis, we would like the target for Bole – 12 properties – to be reduced and/or removed entirely because we do not believe that there are any suitable sites for this number of houses in the village. ** As part of the revision of Sturton Ward's Neighbourhood Plan, in 2018, we asked for site submissions from across the whole ward. Over 40 sites were submitted in total, and we have subsequently analysed the potential of each site – with partners such as AECOM – to meet the target 10% increase in housing requested by Bassetlaw, subsequently increased to 20% in January 2020. The numbers currently appear as follows: *NORTH LEVERTON* New housing target (January 2020) - 93 Permissions granted since April 2018 (based on BDC figures shared by Will Wilson on 19/02/20) - 46 New housing identified for suitable sites put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (February 2020) - 46 Delta - 1 *STURTON LE STEEPLE* New housing target (January 2020) - 43 Permissions granted since April 2018 (based on BDC figures shared by Will Wilson on 19/02/20) - 7 New housing identified for suitable sites put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (February 2020) - 15 Delta - 21 *NORTH AND SOUTH WHEATLEY* New housing target (January 2020) - 53 Permissions granted since April 2018 (based on BDC figures shared by Will Wilson on 19/02/20) - 14 New housing identified for suitable sites put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (February 2020) - 24 Delta - 15 *BOLE* New housing target (January 2020) - 12 Permissions granted since April 2018 (based on BDC figures shared by Will Wilson on 19/02/20) - 0 New housing identified for suitable sites put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (February 2020) - 0 Delta - 12 This means the ward is currently only able to deliver 76% of the target 20% increase in housing requested by Bassetlaw in January 2020. We would, therefore like to reduce our target increase from 20% to 15%. There are a five main reasons for this. Firstly, we have reviewed each site put forward carefully, and believe that the remaining sites are not suitable for housing. Secondly, there are genuine concerns about flooding in the ward, given houses in Sturton and Wheatley were flooded in November 2019, as was Wheatley School. All three villages were flooded in 2007. There isn't currently a drainage board in place to maintain water channels to the west of key settlements, meaning the risk of flooding would further increase as a result of excessive development in North Leverton, Wheatley and Sturton. Thirdly, there is a lot of development already / potentially taking place in the ward (Tarmac quarry near Sturton, closure of West Burton A power station, potential construction of West Burton C power station, closure of nearby Cottam power station, potential construction of a 233-acre solar farm). A 15% increase in housing, on top of all this activity, feels more than sufficient given the likely increase in traffic volumes associated with these developments, and the impact that this will have on resident lifestyles. Fourthly, several sizeable planning permissions were approved across Sturton Ward in the 24-month period BEFORE April 2018 (Bassetlaw's cut-off date for housing contributions to the Local Plan period). These houses won't contribute to our 2037 targets BUT are being constructed right now. This means that the ward is delivering new housing supply TODAY which isn't being accounted for in the above numbers. If these houses were included, we expect that we would be close to the 20% figure anyway. Finally, there are concerns about the safety of North Leverton crossroads which is used by hundreds of ward residents on a daily basis. Over 1,000 residents have recently signed a petition calling for Nottinghamshire County Council to review safety measures at this junction. We simply don't believe that the ward can absorb 201 houses (and, with it, potentially c.400 cars) without FIRST making this extremely dangerous crossroads safer. Irrespective of how many houses are built in the ward, we would like the updated Local Plan to consider proper investment to address this structural deficiency, and recommend making this a prerequisite for any further development in Sturton Ward.</p>	All housing commitments and completions are monitored through the Council's Rural Monitoring Framework, updated monthly and this has influenced the revision to the policy. The Local Plan sets the overall framework for directing growth across the District - it's policies are high-level. The level of anticipated growth in these settlements has now been revised to 10% following comments made to policy ST02 during the previous consultation. This will hopefully be in line with the review of the Neighbourhood Plan and support its ongoing work.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1196689	Resident	The parish of Babworth is a large rural parish with about 250 homes. It is unrealistic to arbitrarily add 20% and expect all 20% (Or 50) to be added to Ranby village that has less than 100 houses. .	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	Applaud the vision of an ambitious, innovative and positive planning framework for addressing the District's housing and economic needs and other social and environmental priorities by 2037. Concerns reagrdng the implementation of the Local Plan and am seeking clarification on a few of the finer points with the Parish of Babworth. With regard to the small rural developments, Ranby has been assigned 51 new homes, based on 255 existing dwellings. There are two errors herein: 1. Ranby is not a Parish, according to the Bassetlaw website: " Babworth is a village and civil parish... In addition to the village of Babworth the parish also includes Ranby". Assume that the document will be corrected so that Babworth is included in the Plan? 2. There are - 100 dwellings in Ranby. How the figure of 255 dwellings was calculated? Have the authors calculated all the dwellings in the Babworth Parish (including Ranby) and assigned this total to the village? If this is the case, the Bassetlaw Local Plan is in breach of its own policy of "proportionate growth to a maximum of 20% per Parish settlements". Assigning the full 20% of dwellings to Ranby is not proportionate.	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.
REF249	Pegasus Group	Langold is considered to be a sustainable settlement suitable for future residential development. The Council's Sustainability Appraisal (January 2020) at Table A.3.1 identifies Langold as functionally linked with the settlement of Carlton in Lindrick. It is recognised that these settlements have a good range of services, facilities and employment opportunities. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The identification of Langold as Large Rural Village is therefore supported and considered appropriate. It is considered that the housing figures provided within the consultation document should not be seen as a cap for development, instead it is important that the Council identify opportunity sites such as our clients as discussed in Section 6.	Planning permissions in Langold more than meet the proposed 20% level of growth in the settlement and therefore any additional development would need to be justified. The emerging Langold Neighbourhood Plan has included a policy to support infilling within the proposed development boundary of the settlement.
REF259	South Leverton Parish Council	The proposed cap for new build housing of 20% of existing houses in the designated parish area. At recent neighbourhood plan meetings with BDC representatives we were given a new build directive to include for a minimum of 10% of existing houses in the designated parish area with a cap of 20% of existing houses in the village area. We interpret this new single criterion as BDC proposing to double the minimum option for new builds to be included in neighbourhood plans. Village Existing Parish New builds Dwellings (20%) Dunham 184 37 East Drayton 105 21 Treswell with Cottam 99 20 South Leverton 212 42 North Leverton 465 93 Sturton le Steeple 213 43 Sub-total 1278 256 Add in; - Cottam station site 0 450 Total 1278 706 Ratio of new builds to existing dwellings is 55.2%. This is a gross violation of the BDC declared cap of 20%. In addition, it is argued that account should also be taken of the 90 log cabins accommodation BDC have granted planning for on the Sundown site. This will increase the adverse impact on increased road traffic through these villages. Hence there is a potential for 796 new builds. The increased number of new builds ratio to existing houses then becomes 62.3%. Bearing in mind that each new build family would drive between one and three vehicles, it is reasonable to suggest there would be an increase of some 1500 additional domestic vehicles travelling through these villages. What action could be taken to resolve this issue? BDC could lobby national government to provide funds and authority to construct suitable new roads which would provide bypass routes around these villages. The realism of such a consideration is questionable, and at least very long term before any conclusions would be announced. The immediate pragmatic solution would be for BDC to abandon their proposal to develop the Cottam power station site for housing.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. This include the percentage growth requirement and the list of settlements that classify. See Policies ST1 and ST2. Log cabins are visitor accommodation so cannot be counted in the housing growth.
REF262	West Stockwith Parish Council	For clarity, there is some confusion about the numbers of houses within West Stockwith listed in the "Base Number of Dwellings" at the survey date. Can you confirm whether these numbers include North Carr Road and Heckdyke, or have they been included elsewhere? Additionally, since West Stockwith was not included in the original site allocations exercise, can you confirm if any land has been identified as possible housing sites for the council to consider?	The number of dwellings includes all dwellings within West Stockwith parish coundary on 1st August 2018.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1196914	Resident	why does new housing need to be built on good grade 3 agricultural land. why build in green belt taking good grade 3 agricultural land out of food production	The Council prioritises the redevelopment of brownfield land and includes available suitable sites in the Local Plan. But there are not enough areas of brownfield land in sustainable locations to meet identified housing needs, so the Local Plan has to look at the release of greenfield land for future development.
REF275	Consultant	Appreciate the importance for growth in rural locations and villages, cannot understand the reasoning for the plan to exceed the requirements of villages and rural areas with no clear evidence base for the actual needs. This evidence base is fundamental in the future planning and strategy ensuring the future prosperity of the district. It is for the above reason that we oppose the approach taken in ST2. It is not clear how the local plan has arrived at these apportionments or indeed the method of selecting the appropriate sites. It is appreciated that the hierarchy may not need to religiously adhere to, having some evidence is imperative. This plan fails to demonstrate this.	The Local Plan has taken the approach to support some growth in rural communities - especially those where there has been very limited development and there is now a need for some additional growth. 80% of Bassetlaw is considered rural and settlements have lost a number of local services and facilities and there has been an undersupply of affordable or low cost housing in these areas. In addition, a number of communities in the District have produced a Neighbourhood Plan to support and encourage new development with the aim to support local housing need and local services and facilities.
REF276	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Small Rural Settlements (SRS) are required to accommodate a minimum of 1,090 dwellings of the Districts housing requirement. This requirement is mentioned in Policy ST1 and detailed in Policy ST2. Policy ST2 shows the 20% housing increase applied to the base number of dwellings (those that paid council tax as of August 2018). The sum of the uplift of 20% across the parishes totals 2,124 dwellings rather more than the required 1,090 dwellings hence some scope for paring the overall requirement back to around 10%. The imposition of a broad brush uplift across the SRS's and indeed the large Rural Settlements is arguably the poor mans approach to allocating against housing needs. What is required is a housing needs assessment based on an assessment of the actual requirements and characteristics of a Parish taking into consideration the individual circumstances, the existing infrastructure, schools, shops (none in Sutton Ward) and impact on areas of natural beauty and historical interest. Failing a more rigorous and realistic approach to assessing housing needs across the board uplift of around 10% does seem to fit the bill of those parishes that have existing or emerging Neighbourhood Plans.	The spatial strategy and housing distribution for the District has been reviewed and changed in the most recent Local Plan. See updated Policy ST1 and ST2.
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	The Council's wider approach to planning for the rural area is also flawed. A sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has not been evidenced based and does not reflect the levels of growth which are actually required to support the rural area. Such an evidenced based approach is vital to understanding, and planning for, the future health of rural settlements. With specific regard to Babworth, the Parish is a large rural parish comprising predominantly a farming based community. The parish has circa 250 homes within the parish boundary and the largest settlement is Ranby. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan subsequently seeks to allocate 51 dwellings towards Ranby on the basis of that comprising a 20% uplift to the settlement's size, this is factually incorrect, as Ranby Village has c.78 Dwellings which would total 15 dwelling uplift at 20%. This allocation is still too high as Ranby has very limited services and any increase in settlement size would lead to more traffic and pollution as car travel is the main form of travel. It is the Parish's view that proposed allocation is entirely unjustified and does not reflect the size or function of the village. It is not an appropriate level of growth for such a small, rural village. The development needs of each individual village should be properly assessed, evidence-based and then carried out sustainably. Building another 15 houses in Ranby village would be disproportionate. Ranby village has green fields and open spaces amongst the houses, and the character of the village would be severely compromised by inappropriate levels of growth. Whilst some Rural Settlements will require small-scale and sensitively located development to support local needs and to support local services and facilities, we consider that the level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Ranby will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the small rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district.	
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	Support the criteria at D. and E. They are suitable for achieving the right balance between meeting local housing need (rather than just market demand) without overwhelming existing settlements and damaging their character. The policy and the criteria allow enough flexibility to provide affordable housing while seeking to ensure this is done with the support of the community. The requirement for pre-application community consultation at E. is particularly welcome in this context.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1197063	Resident	The requirement for a 20% growth figure for small rural villages is too high. The Local Plan has not taken into account the impact of this increase in small rural settlements, or the impact that their combined growth will have upon each other. Many small villages are interlinked by roadways, Sutton cum Lound for example is a direct route from several small villages into Retford and adjoining A1. Increased growth in the surrounding villages of Lound, Mattersey, Ranskill will have a correlated impact upon the village in terms of increased traffic through the village. The cap is set at 10% for villages who do not have a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Small rural settlements will remain but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF288	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF289	Lichfields	Broadly support the draft Local Plan, concerned that it unduly restricts the potential for growth within Bassetlaw's Small Rural Settlements; an area of the district where housing delivery has, historically, been strongest and where individual settlements have varying capacity to be able to accommodate new growth. Accordingly, the 20% growth cap for Small Rural Settlements is considered to be unsound and should be removed from the Local Plan. We trust that the above representation is helpful and will be taken into account in the further preparation of the Bassetlaw Local Plan.	The level of growth in the revised policy ST2 is based on up-to-date evidence and feedback from the community. The policy support some growth in the rural areas where it has previously been resisted.
REF290	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF291	Consultant	Suggested changes: 1. The draft Plan should revisit the arbitrary 20% cap applied to Small and Large Rural Settlements. Additional growth should be directed to more sustainable settlements such as Blyth. This should consider the relationship between employment and housing growth. The Sustainability Appraisal needs to assess this as a reasonable alternative. 2. The policy should remove reference to the weight to be afforded to local community support in determining applications as this could undermine the assessment of an application on its merits. 3. The policy should incorporate an ongoing monitoring of delivery and supply within the Parishes, with a policy basis to support additional supply in the event Neighbourhood Plan allocations are not being delivered.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF292	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small Rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target.	Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans.
REF300	Natural England	Note that additional housing development is proposed at both Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold both of which are in proximity to the Dyscarr Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The policy maps of these two sites do not show the location of the SSSI. Development allocations in these locations must provide satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the proposals would not significantly damage or destroy the interest features for which the SSSI has been notified.	The proposed allocations in both Carlton in Lindrick and Langold have all gained either outline or full planning permissions as of March 2020. SSSIs will be added to the Policies Map.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF306	IBA Planning	<p>Outline the approach to development across the District and define those 'Small Rural Settlements' which will be permitted to grow by up to 20% over the plan period. The Council has identified fewer 'Small Rural Settlements' than the 'Defined Rural Settlements' identified in the the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan 2019, reducing the number of rural settlements permitted to grow from 73 to 42. The latest version of the Plan is far more restrictive than the previous which allowed growth in a far greater number of rural settlements to ensure an equitable distribution of growth across all settlements in Bassetlaw and to promote rural vitality. In reaching the reduced number of 'Small Rural Settlements', the Council has based its assessment of whether a settlement is suitable for growth or not on the number of houses in the settlement rather than its population. The Council considers this to be "more appropriate" (p 12 Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper (January 2020)) but it is unclear exactly why housing numbers are considered to be a better indication of the size of a settlement and its suitability for growth or why the threshold of '50 or more dwellings' for classification as a 'Small Rural Settlement' has been chosen (p 15 Spatial Strategy Background Paper). The Council suggests that its latest approach has been designed to support the vitality and prosperity of rural settlements, is more proportionate in its distribution of housing and its emphasis on employment-led housing growth, and is more inclusive (P 13 and 14 Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper (January 2020)). However, by excluding many settlements previously considered suitable for housing growth from the list of 'Small Rural Settlements' (thereby denying them the opportunity to grow), the proposed strategy is clearly not as inclusive and will result in stagnation in some rural settlements, damage to their vitality and prosperity, and exacerbation of existing affordability issues. Indeed, it is the smaller settlements which are most likely to stagnate without growth and so the Council's approach is even more damaging to these smaller settlements. The Council seeks to justify its new approach on the basis that the ability of rural settlements to accommodate growth in keeping with their character and form varies (paragraph 5.1.27, page 27). Our experience that even very small settlements are capable of accommodating a small amount of additional development without having an adverse impact on their character and form as long as it is of a suitable scale and design. The above is endorsed by paragraph 67-009-20190722 of the NPPG which confirms that a wide range of settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas so blanket policies restricting housing development in some types of settlement will need to be supported by robust evidence of their appropriateness. This supports our position that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development irrespective of their size and present level of services. Policy ST2 is not wholly consistent with this advice and the Council have not published any evidence demonstrating why many of the smaller settlements in the District cannot make a valid contribution towards supporting services other villages through the provision of limited amounts of housing development. Policy ST2 is not wholly consistent with national planning policy in terms of enhancing and maintaining the vitality of rural communities and allowing villages to grow and thrive. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Many of the settlements now denied any opportunity to grow are close to other villages with services and so restricting growth in such settlements as proposed not only conflicts with paragraph 79 of the NPPF but also limits opportunities to support important services and facilities in neighbouring settlements. Cannot support the Council's approach to rural housing growth which prevents any housing growth in many smaller rural settlements in the District previously considered suitable for limited growth and request that the Council reconsider its approach to rural housing provision and revert back to that in the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan (see the 'Defined Rural Settlements' list in the 2019 version of the plan) and better aligned with national planning policy. If the Council are concerned about allowing housing growth in some of the smaller rural settlements on the basis that they are more sensitive to such growth, could split the expanded 'Small Rural Settlements' category into two groups, with larger settlements permitted to grow by 20% under the current guidance that no single proposal exceeds 10 dwellings (Section D(3)), and smaller settlements allowed to grow by 20% but under a separate criteria that no single proposal can exceed 2 dwellings, for example. This would enable a more equitable distribution of growth across the settlements in the District and help better support the long-term vitality and</p>	The Local Plans progression has been based on updated evidence and feedback from consultation. The revised settlement hierarchy identifies the most updated approach to growth across the District. Policy ST2 also provides a revised approach to rural settlements and the level of growth settlements are to receive. The approach to baseline data will be clarified.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		prosperity of the rural area and prevent rural stagnation and the exacerbation of affordability issues whilst ensuring that growth remained proportional to each settlement and compliant with the Council's overall spatial strategy. This Policy appears to be using 1 April 2018 as the base date from which the 20% cap in housing growth will be calculated (see Section D(1) and the two Tables within this Policy). However, the rest of the plan uses data dated 30 November 2019 for monitoring purposes - paragraph 2.6 of the Local Plan states that "All monitoring data used to inform this draft plan is taken from the 30 November 2019. This applies to housing, employment and retail commitments and completions".	
REF306	IBA Planning	To ensure a consistent approach is taken and that decisions are made in accordance with the most up-to-date evidence, Policy ST2 should also adopt a base date of 30 November 2019 and be reworded (and figures in the tables appropriately recalculated) to reflect this. Second, we have previously submitted representations on the 2019 Local Plan requesting additional flexibility be introduced to Policy ST2 to ensure that the 20% housing cap does not arbitrarily rule out perfectly acceptable and sustainable windfall sites in the centre of villages that might come forward after settlements had been allowed to grow up to the cap via peripheral sites. Pleased to see that Section E(3) has been amended to incorporate some additional flexibility – it now permits wider regeneration schemes and the development of existing brownfield sites within or adjoining Large or Small Rural Settlements as an exception to the 20% cap. This is welcomed, ask that this section is further amended to include reference to the redevelopment of existing sites within Large or Small Rural Settlements as well, as this would enable, say, the redevelopment of a farmstead within a village which would not fall under the definition of 'an existing brownfield site' and thus would be excluded from this exception.	The Local Plans progression has been based on updated evidence and feedback from consultation. The revised settlement hierarchy identifies the most updated approach to growth across the District. Policy ST2 also provides a revised approach to rural settlements and the level of growth settlements are to receive.
1197217	Resident	A 20% increase in housing in Carlton in Lindrick is too high a number in an area which has already seen a significant amount of new housing without any increase in amenities. It is losing its identity as a village and becoming a small town.	The made Carlton in Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan does allocate enough land to accommodate the proposed 20% growth identified in the Local Plan. This will be delivered through the identified site allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan.
REF309	Resident	In previous local plans Clayworth was considered as not suitable for growth. This was something we looked into before moving to the village nearly 3 years ago. The fact that it was not suitable for growth and that it is a conservation village is what I consider being key to the village's character and presumably the council agreed with this view at the time. Concerned at the 20% growth allocation that has been applied across the smaller settlements and does not appear to consider whether they have conservation area status. To progress with growth allocation of this scale in Clayworth would be completely at odds with the conservation area status and will encourage developments of a size and nature which would not be in line with protecting the conservation area status. Has the council considered if there are specific suitable sites for this level of development within the village? There are not suitable sites. The specific character of our village will be damaged by any development on the scale being proposed. There are considerable sized developments going on in near by settlements. If they exceed their targets will that reduce the targets elsewhere? There are other issues that concern me. The last two years have seen considerable flooding to my property and others in the village. Something somewhere has changed to cause this as it hadn't occurred in the years preceeding. Any development will not improve this situation and no organisation seems interested in helping find the cause. The road network would not be able to cope with increased housing developments. Are a rural village with a rural road network. Increased traffic to and from the village or through the village is a major concern. The roads cannot accommodate this. There is a lack of services in the village and surrounding area which will not support future development. The rural nature of our village and the relatively small number of dwellings in Clayworth means that we are blessed with some wonderful wildlife as there are the habitats available to them. Development at the levels being suggested would be devastating to local wildlife, the bats, owls, etc. Welcome the council reconsidering the allocation of housing growth in Clayworth to a more manageable, significantly lower level as part of the Bassetlaw Plan.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District.. Clayworth will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. In line with other settlements.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF310	P&DG	In previous representations raised concerns with the application of a 20% cap for growth in rural settlements at a time when rural clusters were being considered. It is recognised that the District Council has continued with the cap and abandoned the proposal for rural settlements to be treated in clusters. Continue to have strong concerns with the way in which a blanket 20% cap for growth is applied, since this is not as flexible, proactive and positively prepared as may appear. The proposals in draft Policy ST2 stipulate that proposals should not increase the number of dwellings in the Parish by over 20%. By 'capping' the number of proposals permitted within settlements would frustrate the overall aim of the National Planning Policy Framework to promote housing in sustainable locations and severely limits flexibility required during the course of the plan period in the event other sites, proven in other ways to be sustainable and deliverable, can come forward during the course of the plan period. It is understood that the Framework now builds in greater requirements for Local Plans to be reviewed but ideally policies for the supply of housing should be as flexible as they can in the first instance to support the soundness of the plan as a whole. As a consequence of this, recommend that the 'cap' is removed to make the Plan compliant and sound.	The spatial strategy and distribution of housing has been amended in the Local Plan. This includes the level of required growth in rural Bassetlaw in line with national guidance and local evidence. See policy ST1 and ST2.
REF310	P&DG	Within the Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper 2020, it states that for a settlement to be considered a Large Rural Settlement, it must have a village shop, a health facility, Post Office, Primary School and village hall. When the wider settlements adjoining Nether Langwith are considered, the settlement will have all the facilities required to make it a Large Rural Settlement. Even when the wider settlements are not considered, the village demonstrates all of these facilities, and more, save for the direct inclusion of a primary school which are within reasonable distance. Policy ST2 also highlights the instances where development within Small Rural Settlements that are not allocated within a made Neighbourhood Plan, or which exceed the 20% cap, will be supported. There must be a "demonstration of clear local community support", which could include the inclusion within a Neighbourhood Plan, pre-application consultation wherein "the majority of respondents are positive" and support from a Parish or Town Council. Until the point at which a Neighbourhood Plan is made, we would have concerns as to how this is going to be gauged. Concerns with the omission of Norton in the settlement hierarchy.	The settlements in Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck parish do not qualify as a large rural settlement. They also do not qualify as a Small Rural Settlement. Cuckney is the only local settlement that qualifies to have some allocated growth. The distribution of growth and settlement in the parish have been classified as per Local Plan. However, any future revision to the Neighbourhood Plan can look to re-distribute the growth within the parish and look at a larger number if it can be justified.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1197255	JHWalter LLP	<p>The settlement hierarchy allows for each applicable settlement to accommodate new development which is congruous to its existing size, location and level of sustainability. This approach is considered to be a step-forward from the previous hierarchy which restricted new growth for settlements within the 'All Other Settlements' tier of the existing Core Strategy. The emerging growth allocations will allow these small sustainable settlements to appropriately expand. Consider that the current criteria within Part D of Policy ST2 is itself restrictive of growth within these villages. The start of Policy ST2, Part D states that "unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans or Part E of this policy applies, additional development in the Small Rural Settlements over the plan period will be supported provided all the criteria below are satisfactorily met, and the proposal is consistent with other policies in this plan". This paragraph is poorly worded but nevertheless implies that the criteria below will apply when a proposal is not promoted by a Neighbourhood Plan or is a Rural Exception (Part E). However, the second criterion Part D (2), directly reverts back to a Neighbourhood Plan by stating that development is to be located within an existing settlement boundary in a Neighbourhood Plan. Part D (2) is fundamentally flawed and is potentially very restrictive, as to be accepted, proposals would not be promoted by a Neighbourhood Plan but would still have to be inside a development boundary. Being located within a Neighbourhood development boundary would suggest that the principle of development has been considered and is generally supported, creating a situation where the Part D conflicts with itself. Furthermore, not every village may have a Neighbourhood Plan which would automatically mean that Part D (2) cannot be met and a proposal would not be policy compliant with the policy in its current form. This is concerning as the growth allocations are required to collectively meet a 'minimum combined housing requirement of 1090' and there appears to be only currently 9 settlements within this tier of the hierarchy which have a made Neighbourhood Plan and they do not all have development boundaries. The criteria conflicts with itself, with Part D (2) conflicting with Part D (4). Part D (4) states "The location and size of the proposal does not conflict with the existing character and built form of the part of the settlement and it can demonstrate how i responds positively to the development principles as identified by Policy ST32 and relevant characterisation studies as part of a made Neighbourhood Plan". Whilst this criteria is individually logical, when coupled with Part D (2) regarding the Neighbourhood Plan boundary, it has the potential to impose a restrictive and inflexible policy position. There are examples in emerging Neighbourhood Plans where locations are within the built form of the settlement and are sustainably located, however have been excluded from the draft development boundary. These locations would therefore not be promoted by a Neighbourhood Plan and would fall back on the criteria within the policy. These locations would be in accordance with Part D (4), however as they are not currently within a Neighbourhood Plan boundary, would not be currently compliant with Part D (2). The current wording of Part D (2) creates a restrictive approach to spatial planning, to the point where we do not consider that it is necessary to be introduced within this policy.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 has been revised following comment from the previous consultation. The Policy ultimately supports the communities to deliver their expected growth in the most sustainable way possible. In addition, it also enables additional growth where there is a clear or identified need and where there is community support. The community support element is now linked more closely with the Neighbourhood Plan process as this is easier to manage/ control and there is a legislative process to go through.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
1197255	JHWalter LLP	<p>But it is not necessary for the decision maker to make a judgement on where development should be spatially located. If a settlement was within a parish with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, any Neighbourhood Plan boundary would be automatically part of the statutory development plan under Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Removal of Part D (2) will not weaken the decision-maker's control over where development should be located, but will allow the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan to be read both independently but in conjunction with one another as the Development Plan. This provides flexibility and allows the decision-maker to make a judgement on the planning balance and the spatial strengths and weaknesses of each individual application. The 'doubling up' of the Neighbourhood Plan boundary within Part D (2) restricts the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan to having to solely abide by the locations set within each individual Neighbourhood Plan boundary and severely limits Bassetlaw of the ability to be proactive in the determination of where development should be located. It is stressed that whether the growth allocations, which are required to collectively meet a minimum 1090 dwellings, can be tested against each individual Neighbourhood Plan, if Neighbourhood Plans cannot deliver on allocations or settlements do not have Neighbourhood Plans adopted. It is concerning that the growth allocations would be unduly restricted by the provisions of Part D and in particular Part D (2). There appears to be no further provision for development outside of the boundaries if failure to deliver within was to occur. We also consider that Part D (1) of the policy is also unnecessarily restrictive to have a definitive growth cap of 20% within each parish. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan has a similar growth allocation for 'Small' and 'Medium' villages but these growth allocations are set with baseline growth levels, rather than a restrictive and inflexible growth cap which is suggested within Policy ST2 Part D (1). Another flaw within Policy ST2, Part D (2) is that there are emerging Neighbourhood Plans which support development outside of but immediately adjacent the development boundary in exceptional circumstances. However, Policy ST2 is not transparent or flexible enough in its current form to deal with scenarios such as this. Policy ST2, Part D requires 'all the criteria below are satisfactorily met', however in this scenario the emerging Neighbourhood Plan would support development adjacent the settlement boundary but the exceptional circumstance would then conflict with Part D (2) as it is not within the settlement boundary. This is another example of why we stress that Part D (2) is neither sound nor necessary for the decision-maker to make a decision about the location of development as the decisionmaker will consider the entire development plan as a whole anyway. Overall, the allocation of development to these villages is a positive spatial strategy providing growth to these settlements. However, Part D and in particular Part D (2) has the potential to be needlessly restrictive of development and creates an inflexible position to make decisions on where development in these villages should be located. The location is entirely predicated on where the Neighbourhood Plan boundaries are, providing that Neighbourhood Plans have been adopted in the first place, despite the purpose of the criteria to be used where the Neighbourhood Plans do not 'otherwise promote' development. To reiterate, Part D (2) is not sound and the removal of this criteria would not have a bearing on the planning judgement of the decision-maker. What the removal will do is allow for the LPA to consider the locational strengths and weaknesses of proposals in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 has been revised following comment from the previous consultation. The Policy ultimately supports the communities to deliver their expected growth in the most sustainable way possible. In addition, it also enables additional growth where there is a clear or identified need and where there is community support. The community support element is now linked more closely with the Neighbourhood Plan process as this is easier to manage/ control and there is a legislative process to go through.</p>
REF316	Fisher German	<p>The distribution of growth amongst the Large Rural Settlements at Policy ST2 is broadly supported, with 20% growth on the existing number of dwellings in the Parish to each of the settlements outlined (Tuxford, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe, Langold, and Misterton). Concerns are however raised in respect of the Cottam former power station site (Policy ST5). The Cottam allocation is intended to make a significant contribution (25%) to achieving and meeting the Large Rural Settlements housing requirement within the Plan period. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative, therefore, to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. Allowing new development to come forward in villages is considered to be in line with paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF), which states that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies</p>	<p>Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Cottam. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020).</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby". New housing in Tuxford (identified as a Large Rural Settlement) will help to enhance and maintain the vitality of the existing community and the services in nearby settlements. For Tuxford, the Draft Plan 2020 assigns a minimum housing requirement of 250 dwellings. We note that the policy states that this requirement is a minimum. This is supported.	
REF319	Resident	Concerns with the significant CIL reduction, the 20% cap and the methodology use in the rural growth monitoring have already been covered in Sutton Parish Council's response. My concern relates to the removal of any sense of housing allocation figure for Neighbourhood Plan areas. The previous release of the draft had a 10% housing allocation across the board with the addition of a 20% cap also across the board. Caps are not mentioned in the NPPF and the creation of them just adds another component that is totally unnecessary. The Housing allocation figure is the cap why add something more. The Housing allocation figure should also be specific to the Neighbourhood Plan community based on several factors not a blanket figure across the District. This release of the Plan totally does away with Housing Allocations and just has a blanket cap across the District Council. Instead Neighbourhood Plan teams with little expertise are expected to determine their own Housing Allocation. Isn't the District Council absolving their responsibilities as the Strategic Planning Authority? Paragraph 101- Neighbourhood Plans- PPG I would like to see the Cap Scrapped and replaced with specific Housing Allocations for each Neighbourhood Plan Community. Make life simple. Other relevant paragraphs concerning Housing Allocations in PPG are 102, 103,104 and 105.	The Community Infrastructure Levy will still apply to rural Bassetlaw in order to support community benefit and investment in local infrastructure. In terms of the overall level of growth for communities, this has been revised and updated following the consultation and is included within the revised version of the Local Plan. In addition, communities who have a made Neighbourhood Plan - such as Sutton, can continue to monitor its effectiveness and review the plan when necessary.
1197268	Resident	1764 dwellings across the Large Rural Settlements and Carlton in Lindrick Parish is currently supplying approximately 34% of this total. A disproportionate number. Carlton in Lindrick Parish has already supplied 20% figure. Carlton in Lindrick numbers are already proportionately counting towards District's housing so there should be no more house built in the Parish. We were told a 10 year plan for the Parish.	Carlton - as a settlement - is providing 20% growth as per policy ST2. The land at Peaks Hill Farm, although in Carlton Parish, is contributing towards Worksop's numbers due to its close/ direct proximity to the north of Worksop. There is a green gap between the proposed site and the village of Carlton.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Cannot reconcile this statement of "small scale, sensitively located" developments with Policy ST2 (Rural Bassetlaw) and its drive to an arbitrary 20% increase. 20% is NOT small scale, neither is the clamour by developers to produce that 20% in ONE single development, in one build. A 20% increase to Scrooby, equating to 29 dwellings, will yield 100 more residents and increase the Parish by 35%, and 58 more vehicles and the 29 dwellings will increase the housing stock of Scrooby by 40%. In Scrooby's terms that is nowhere near "small scale". Where did this arbitrary figure come from and why is it not tested against each Parish's ability to cope with it or even desire it.	Scrooby is considered a small rural settlement and BDC acknowledge that trying to accommodate 20% within the village has been difficult through the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore the revised Local Plan has reduced the level of growth for small rural settlement from 20% to 5%.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	This letter comprises Worksop College's land ownership at Worksop College and Ranby House. In order to be sound, amendments are sought to the draft policies map, which does not correlate to the actual uses of the land within their ownership. The provision of additional development at SRS is supported. However, the inclusion of a cap on the number of homes that can be delivered in SRS is not considered sound, particularly where a development can be proven to be otherwise sustainable. Nor should it preclude development coming forward where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated, and this should be accounted for within Part E of Policy ST2. Clear support for the emphasis in the BLP on healthy lifestyles, new community facilities and promoting sport and physical activity, although a joined-up approach is necessary to secure some of these applications, and most notably those associated with a new athlete's track.	The spatial strategy and housing distribution for the District has been reviewed and changed in the most recent Local Plan. See updated Policy ST1 and ST2.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF333	Resident	<p>OBJECTS to the baseline date used in the 2020 draft LP to calculate housing numbers. Reverting to summer 2018 for the purpose of calculating %age housing increase, ignores delivered, sustainable development. OBJECTS to the 20% cap on development in rural villages in Everton's "class" in favour of a minimum 30% cap; with numbers taken away from the three major settlements and the Large Rural Villages where required. And no Garden Village. OBJECTS to the subtraction of the housing pipeline from individual settlement targets. Taken together, the above demonstrates that the LPA is prejudicing sustainable development in rural villages – in favour of a new, large, unsustainable, Garden Village? Indeed, the 1090 target given to "smaller villages" to 2037, represents less than 1 unit per annum in most identified settlements. This is not sustainable development. If the LPA is not willing to restructure the proposed settlement hierarchy in favour of the Core Strategy Rural Service Centre classification (replete with 30% minimum cap); Everton should be re-classified as a Large Rural Village and have its own expansion policy. In the context of 5.2.5, Everton delivers far more services than that required – with the exception of the Doctors Surgery that can be found in the neighbouring village (and reached by bus/electric car) The additional dwellings and larger convenience store/additional services fronting the A631, would be delivered as part of a western strategic extension that would also provide a by-pass circumventing the dangerous junction at Mattersey Rd and filtering vehicles off the A631 towards Worksop. Everton delivers more than the service provision required by 5.2.5, despite lower housing numbers, demonstrates that it has been comprehensively, artificially, constrained. OBJECTS to the 1090 target to 2037 for "small villages". Indeed, the definition of "Small Rural Settlement" at 5.2.6 is woefully inadequate as a means to describe Everton. Some development on a strategic western extension has already been approved on 3 x land parcels with topography lower than the Windmill and extensive landscaping delivery for all three schemes (which puts paid to "urban grain" arguments). This latter requirement will enhance biodiversity via Idle Valley lowland species, on grade 3 poor quality/sand farmland. OBJECTS to the restriction against the development of grade 3a agricultural land. Post-Brexit, such land will not be viable for cropping with yields typically at only 3T/acre.</p>	<p>The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan provides a settlement hierarchy which reflects a settlements size and role in the area and will deliver either 20% as a Large Rural Settlement or 5% as a Small Rural Settlement unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan. Everton does have some local services, but it is not considered to be a scale in comparison to other larger settlements in the District such as Misterton, Tuxford or Carlton in Lindrick. Therefore it is considered a Small Rural Settlement and will fall within the 5% growth requirement as per revised Policy ST2.</p>
REF334	Sutton Parish Council	<p>Rural Growth Monitoring Sutton has two sites that are not being counted in the rural growth monitoring because outline planning was granted prior to April 2018. (One of these however is incorrectly being recorded as planning was only granted in January 2019 at a judicial review 17/00300/OUT.) This cannot be unique to Sutton and the same situation must be occurring across the District. These limbo homes are not being counted anywhere, they didn't represent dwellings at August 2018 and in our case around 40 dwellings are involved. Suggest that as at April 2018 those sites with planning permissions that had a realistic prospect of being delivered should also be included in the total net commitment columns for Parishes.</p>	<p>Rural Monitoring Framework has been updated to reflect changes to policy and feedback from the community.</p>
REF335	Resident	<p>Resident of Ranby village and Babworth parish, which seems to be the "fall guy" in this plan. It is ludicrous to plan for 4000 homes in a garden village and then another 55 homes in the tiny village of Ranby. Despite what the plan says, Ranby village has only about 75 dwellings. Another 55 is not 20% anyway. Strongly object to the 20% provision in Ranby village, as this is still far too many houses for our very rural, small village. It is not in proportion. It would make an enormous difference. The village houses are separated by green spaces, which determine the character of the village. There are no shops or other services (excepting a pub, school and village hall). There is no infrastructure to support or sustain such development. Public transport is limited to a bus service, which runs very infrequently and not every day. Such development would ruin the appearance, feel and character of our village. There are some buildings and structures of historical importance in our little village, and these would also be badly affected. Please do not apply your 20% rule to Ranby village. The area of Ranby near the prison is more "concentrated" with houses and is nearer to Retford, but you have not allocated them any houses at all? Babworth is also significantly closer to the town centre.</p>	<p>Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF338	Resident	Supportive of Bassetlaw's economic aspirations for the district. The proposed quantity of development within Ranby Village and the Garden Village is unsound. The Local Plan fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns and consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas is excessive and not based on sound planning principles. A sustainable approach to planning for the rural areas needs to establish an appropriate level of development to meet local needs. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has not been evidenced based and does not reflect the levels of growth which are actually required to support the rural area. The level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the large and small rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. With regard to Babworth, the Parish is a large rural parish comprising predominantly a farming community. The parish has circa 250 homes within the parish boundary and the largest settlement is Ranby. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan subsequently seeks to allocate 51 dwellings towards Ranby on the basis of that comprising a 20% uplift to the settlement's size. It is entirely unjustified and does not reflect the size or function of the village which currently only has c.78 dwellings.	The Local Plan proposes the majority of growth, in this plan period, in the larger settlements across the District. There is some growth directed to rural Bassetlaw - including the development of a garden village and the regeneration of existing sites. Worksop however is receiving the largest share of development.
REF345	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	If the figure of 1090 for the smaller rural settlements is spread then surely if one area takes a big chunk of those because the community have planned for it and in terms of planning there is good sustainable reasoning behind then surely some kind of bank of properties could be created prior to each 5 year review that can then be reapportioned likewise any windfall developments could be banked too then smaller sites who don't want development should be able to bid for property numbers from the bank to protect their own numbers. Our housing numbers are wrong for Holbeck and Welbeck and Norton and Cuckney. In the parish of Norton and Cuckney there are 176 Properties: Cuckney 106, Norton 70 In the parish of Holbeck and Welbeck there are 119 Properties: Hobecks 96, Welbeck 23	Noted. The number of dwellings for Cuckney and the parish have been checked with our Council Tax department and updated.
REF345	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Could housing allocations across plan areas be shared out so if one NP area has reached its allocation plus 20% it can offer out its excess to other areas in simplistic terms.	Only amongst settlements within their designated neighbourhood plan areas.
REF351	Resident	It is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. This is too many and that Council's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF352	North and South Wheatley Parish Council	Considering the specific issues for North and South Wheatley, have some concerns over the proposed development at Cottam. Welcome the use of a brownfield site Cottam is relatively isolated, on the west bank of the River Trent and with poor road links to the surrounding area. The proposal to build 450 houses by 2037 and a further 1150 houses after that would have a major impact on the surrounding villages; in particular the traffic flow through Leverton (on the principal route to both Retford and Gainsborough) and Sturton (on the principal route to Gainsborough). North and South Wheatley may be less affected by traffic but we would expect some increase in flow of traffic heading to other destinations such as Doncaster. The plan mentions the requirement for additional health care provision and school places but there is little detail provided. Considering the likely change in the demographic make-up of the population the need for additional health care provision for older residents would be the more pressing concern. The plan acknowledges that rural bus services are poor and with an older population likely to be less able to drive their own cars then the matter of public transport to and from Cottam will have to be addressed. Finally, North and South Wheatley is one of the Small Rural Settlements nominated for a 20% (maximum) growth between now and 2037. This is a sizeable increase (up to 53 houses) in the size of the village and will doubtless cause concern to some of our residents yet it pales into insignificance when set against the potential development at Cottam and the Bassetlaw Garden Village.	The spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy has been revised following additional evidence and feedback from consultation. See Policy ST1.
REF363	Resident	East Markham the figure of 524 dwellings within the neighbourhood plan area, with a 20% cap of 105 houses. However in the settlement the number of dwellings falls to 481 with a cap of 96. It is my contention that the settlement area should be the figure used. Also changed the date to 1st April 2018 for which planning applications towards this cap are valid. This severely disadvantages my village which has approx. 60 applications approved and being built which will be disqualified from the cap. Given all the building work at present taking place in the village and the fact that no infrastructure improvements to roads and services have taken place east Markham should be exempt from any additional development from the period of this plan. Policy ST2 The statement in Para E5 makes a complete nonsense of the 20% cap by virtue of it being able to be overridden. Wary that this 20% cap is not a national policy but an arbitrary figure plucked out of thin air by B.D.C. and could be overruled by a Planning Inspector.	East Markham is considered a 'small rural settlement' and therefore will only support 5% growth from 1st April 2018. The Rural Monitoring Table has also been updated to reflect the change in classification.
REF365	Resident	In order to generate figures for the 20% cap on projected growth, each of the 73 settlements was assessed as to its current size. This exercise involved drawing boundary lines around each settlement, which were then used in conjunction with the District Council's Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN) database in order to calculate the number of dwellings. The figures were generated and deemed current as of 13th August 2018; the full set of figures is included here as Appendix 6. The boundary lines drawn around each settlement were produced solely for this purpose, and should not be confused with the development boundaries that currently apply to some settlements in the district, as defined in the 2011 Bassetlaw Core Strategy. For reference purposes, the maps produced for counting the number of properties in each of the 73 growth settlements are included here as Appendix 7. The 10% housing requirement figures, applicable to designated neighbourhood plan areas and provided for guidance purposes for not-yet-designated areas, were calculated on the same date using the same database (see Appendix 6).	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF373	Residents	Concerned regarding the potential for 51 new build houses in Ranby Village: Applied for planning permission to build one house on our land which BDC refused back in 2004. Appealed and the refusal was upheld. In 2018 we decided to apply for a change of use to our existing garage and games room which was also refused for the same reasons (there is no need for any further housing in Ranby). These reasons being: - Policy 5/3 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan as modified indicated that residential development within settlement envelopes will be permitted only if in character with the area, provides adequate residential amenity, does not create traffic problems and does not set an undesirable precedent. The eastern part of the village is characterised by open fields with large dwellings set in spacious well planted grounds, giving an open, leafy character to the locality. The proposed development (of one house only) would result in a more cramped form of development at a prominent position at the edge of the village, to the detriment of the character and spacious appearance of the area as a whole. As	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		such, the proposed development would be wholly contrary to the aims and objectives of the policy of the Local Plan (If this is the case for one house, surely 51 should never be considered).	
REF374	Resident	Express my dissent to the proposed increase in housing numbers to be built in this historic rural village. The village gave their answers to a questionnaire in 2016 and after considerable work and effort it was reluctantly agreed to a future increase of 10% in housing requirement. New proposal of a 20% increase in the size of the village is unsustainable. Such a large increase in population will have serious adverse effects on the character and amenity of the settlement. BDC's own report states that "the housing requirement of 20% must result in a settlement which is capable of accommodating the level of growth proposed." Lound is not capable of such a large increase in population. The infrastructure and services are already failing, the sewerage system is already overloaded, drainage of surface water problematical. Lound has no shop, no school, no GP surgery, the bus service is so infrequent and expensive (£6 return to Retford) meaning that any resident of Lound could not rely on public transport to go to work in any other area. Therefore travelling by car is essential, thereby increasing car use in the area. As a result of the Lound Neighbourhood Plan we, as a small rural setting, agreed a target for new homes but this huge increase is totally unacceptable and there is clearly no local community support. I also believe that the sale of any new properties would be difficult due to the lack of facilities for young families. Hopefully you will agree that the original plan should be reinstated and that BDC housing requirement (which apparently has been exaggerated) can be made up by extra numbers in, perhaps, the Garden Village which will have to have the necessary school, surgery and shops. I hope this exercise, which must have cost a huge sum for local tax payers, will soon be agreed and concluded satisfactorily.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF375	Resident	The proposed 51 houses at Ranby be included in the Garden Village	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF385	Resident	At the meeting on Thursday 13th February in Tuxford an official of the planning department said that the planned growth of the villages would be about 20% until the towns (I presume Retford and Worksop) slightly higher. Historically towns grow much faster than villages consequentially Worksop and Retford should be growing at about 60%-70% and the villages at about 6%-8%. In an area of a growing economy having about the same level of building growth everywhere will result in a shortfall in housing in the towns and an excess of houses in the villages. The price of town dwellings will increase causing people at the bottom of the property ladder being unable to buy property. The prices in the villages will drop causing people to travel much more increasing the carbon footprint and pollution, and congestion. To sum up build in an area of a growing economy against market forces at your peril. However, Bassetlaw is a very deprived area. Worksop has still not recovered from the closure of Manton Colliery and the exodus of the textile industry. Collieries close to Tuxford such as Bevercotes, Ollerton and Thoresby which at the sometime held the European coal extraction record for a years' output. This coupled with the rundown of supporting manufactures such as DOSCO (1 mile outside Tuxford dropping from a workforce of 750 to 250 people) has had a huge impact on the local economy. There are no signs of anything that will create real growth this and other deprived areas should be exempt from the national housing scheme. One day a BBC TV news man went to Washington near Newcastle and stood amongst 200 dwellings saying that a year earlier the builder was just finishing them and yet not a single one had been taken. He went on to say that they were all lying empty and yet in the south of England, people were queuing out for property. To sum up build in deprived area at your peril. Further to build a garden village on farmland where there is no hope of employment beggars belief.	Tuxford is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size, level of services and the role it provides to other settlements. Tuxford is a very constrained settlement and it is difficult for the town to grow naturally. However, a number of sites have been put forward to be considered for development and these were consulted on late last year and early in 2020. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which provides the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two.
REF390	Resident	Housing – need for social housing especially bungalows as part of the 39% for Dunham on Trent Our bus service is nearly non-existent, if the sites at Cottam and High Marnham are developed (even if they are not). A regular bus service from Worksop, via, Retford. Tuxford – Lincoln! Via Saxilby. There are many not clearly sign posted and not accessible in the winter months. Pavement joining up all villages will promote access and public health and economic prosperity. Village Fledborough to Ragnall to Dunham on Trent – Darlton and to Tuxford with good pavements people could walk instead of using cars and access public transport. The same for South Leverton to Treswell from Laneham to Rampton. Also joining up Cottam and High Marnham will improve the whole accessibility of the area, while not taking away the rural aspects.	There is a need for more specialist and affordable housing in rural Bassetlaw. Some communities are preparing Neighbourhood Plans for their areas to help manage development and influence the type of development in their locality. Connectivity is also important through bus services and public footpaths. The Local Plan is supporting the enhancement of existing public footpaths and encourages new developments to provide additional ones where appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
REF400	Resident	Ranby village has been allocated too many houses although we live in the parish of Babworth. The village is not able to cope with the number of houses allocated we need to know where the planned building's will be and what will be built.	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	While provision of the plan is overdue and welcome, East Markham Parish Council has little faith that it will be followed by BDC based on the scale of development within the village in recent years. At the last census, (2011) East Markham had 490 dwellings, this had increased to 524 by August 2018 representing a rise in Housing stock of 5.7%. In contrast, Claborough and Welham (also defined as a small rural settlement within the plan) has seen an increase in dwellings from 480 in the census to 495 by August 2018. This represents an increase of 3.1% in their housing stock. The increase in dwellings over the last 9 years has produced a lot of pressure on narrow village roads. Recent construction of dwellings on Beckland Hill and High Street have seen serious increases in congestion on the village's roads. Development has increased further in the last 2 years. Since April 2018, East Markham has seen 110 properties been either built or approved. This takes the housing stock of the village over the proposed cap within the lifespan of the plan. The Parish Council views the cap as meaningless. Request that BDC view each planning application in the wider context of development in the village rather than on an individual basis. There are 59 houses either being developed or approved around Mark Lane / Beckland Hill. Little apparent thought appears to have been given to the impact that these separate developments will have on roads and drainage in this area. Repeatedly raised concerns about the safety of the Mark Lane / Beckland Hill Road Junction but these have been ignored. Ask that road safety measures are introduced at that point to safeguard our residents. Request that BDC review access to the village. There are only two entrances left for traffic to the village, whereas there used to be four. This is funnelling traffic onto Askham Road, Farm Lane and Beckland Hill. This increase in traffic represents a danger as is evidenced by three car crashes on this stretch of road during the past 12 months. Requests that the access from the village from the A57 to High Street (Western Entrance) be reinstated to take pressure off traffic around the School on Askham Road, and also for the Priestgate to West Markham road over the A1 to be repaired and reopened. The infrastructure of the village has not kept pace with development is with regard to drains and sewers. In February 2020 the village has suffered from the discharge of raw sewage from drains close to the school. This was attended by Severn Trent but the problem recurred twice again that month. Church Street has also experienced raw sewage flowing across the road in front of the actual Church. There has been repeated flooding of residential properties in both York and Low Street. The Village's neighbourhood plan has a specific policy NP7 relating to this. There is little evidence that BDC have considered this in recent decisions. Recent development already has had an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the village. The proportionate cap of 20% has been in existence for some time but there is little evidence that BDC has taken character and amenity into consideration. The 20% proportionate cap is not Government policy but is BDC policy. In the event of a conflict between BDC 20% cap and the Governments no upper limit EMPC seeks clarification as to what takes priority.	The Council has produced and updated its rural monitoring table. This is directly linked to planning applications and the number of dwellings identified in Policy ST2. The table will be updated and published monthly. In terms of highway issues, this is down to NCC and their advice at the time of commenting on planning applications. The proposed 20% for East Markham has now been reduced to 5%. The base date for the monitoring of any completions is 1st April 2018. The rural monitoring table provides the most up to date picture in relation to planning permissions and the level of growth identified for each community in Policy ST2.
REF407	Resident	How do we find the actual figures that BDC has produced against the Government figures for local housing 'need'. The 20% increase in housing in BDC is unrealistic and damaging. What is the national Government figure please?	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which provides the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two.
REF416	Residents	The draft local plan has been changed to increase the housing requirement to 20% from 10%. Strongly object to this very unwelcome increase. Our Parish Council steering group found that the majority of residents in Lound thought that no new housing is needed. We reluctantly agreed to 10% but we do not want 42 new properties building in our small rural village. The infrastructure in Lound would struggle to cope with this number of properties, our roads are narrow and congested already. There is ample scope for more building in Retford to fulfil your required 20% increase across the county, where there are sufficient facilities and amenities whilst we	Policy ST2 has now been reviewed in response to comments made during the previous public consultation. Lound is still considered a 'small rural settlement', but the level of growth has been reduced from 20% to 5% over the plan period. The rural monitoring table has also been updated to reflect these changes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		have none. To reiterate we strongly object to more housing than 10% being built in Lound. There is no need to crowd our narrow road or swamp our infrastructure more than it can cope with.	
REF417	Resident	Would prefer the allocation of 51 homes for Ranby be allocated to the Garden Village as the infrastructure for the village would not be able to cope with the increase of traffic and also there is no amenities (i.e. shops) in the village.	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed.
REF423	Resident	There are not 250 houses in Ranby village. The A1 should be resurfaced with silent tarmac. The entire length of the A1 facing Ranby Village should be fitted with a sound barrier as on the motorway between Geneva and Montreaux.	The A1 and its upgrade is the responsibility of Highways England and not Bassetlaw District Council.
REF424	Resident	Please comment on maths base number how delivered 255 as only about 100 in the village itself therefore 20% = 20 not 51 dwelling increase? Also, where has been chosen for the 20 new dwellings?	Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019.
REF426	Resident	Bassetlaw are talking about creating jobs that at present there is very few or none.	The Local Plan also includes land for jobs. These are located on proposed allocated employment sites or through existing sites around the District. The plan also supports smaller and rural businesses.
REF455	Resident	Surprised to hear that Lound's Housing Requirement has doubled from 21 to 42 and believe this is just too many. The lower figure seemed acceptable but the local services and infrastructure will struggle with a substantial increase. Public transport is inadequate so an undesirable increase in private vehicle movements will result and as a householder who has twice had raw sewage on his lawn in recent years due to blockages in elderly pipework (a link to the main drain from several dwellings on Town Street passes through my property), the existing foul drainage system will surely struggle. I do not consider it "Nimby-ism" to protect the appeal of small rural villages and size is a key factor. Some people like to live in smaller quiet communities as I do whilst others prefer the convenience and facilities of larger urban settlements. Planning should respect such preferences. I am most unhappy that the considerable time and diligent effort has been spent by our (voluntary) Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group appears to have ended at the very least in considerable frustration and no doubt there are costs incurred by the Council which as a taxpayer also grieves me if the exercise proves to be partially wasted.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF456	Resident	Lound Object the plan to double the initial plan for 21 new dwellings is mainly the increase of traffic which is already dreadful with the increase we have seen and induced of heavy lorries, through the village the roads are not able to stand this constant battering and our roads are badly needing repairs and any more traffic is madness.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF457	Resident	As a resident of Lound must protest of the high handed decision of BDC. Regardless of what was agreed in 2018, it has now decreed that Lound should accommodate double the amount of housing agreed previously. Why? Records show it is not needed. Furthermore, the infrastructure is not adequate to support a greater influx of housing and people ect. The Council must realis this, if the details have been studied! It may be necessary in the future- but not now! Please reconsider, and have the honesty to admit you were wrong.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF458	Resident	You wish to increase the new housing requirement by 100%. The locals have worked hard on a village plan with due consultation with the local inhabitants. This is unnecessary as Lound is a small charming village with few amenities. Cannot think who would buy these extra houses. The bus service is very infrequent, there is no school in Lound nor a village store or post office. I wonder who will be able to afford, even the ones already agreed	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw			
		upon, without increasing the number of new homes. There has been a significant increase in nearby Sutton (which does have a few more amenities) and none of these have sold so far in the area on Lound Low Road. I consider that this decision has been made in haste, without credible thought for those who would wish to occupy these homes.	"small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF459	Resident	Appalled to see that the draft BDC Local Plan 2020 proposes to double the increase in dwellings previously required for Lound. Villagers had reluctantly accepted an increase of 21 houses (10%) but the new proposal is neither desirable nor necessary. Such an increase will place extra pressure on the local infrastructure. The village was expanded over recent years on a result of infills and conversions. Drains regularly do not cope with heavy rainfall as it is. Starter homes are unlikely here. Employment opportunities in the area are very limited. Newcomers will mostly be commuters by car or by car and rail from Retford to other towns/cities. They will also need to drive to and from Retford to access essential services and facilities. This is not eco-friendly and is at odds with government policy. There are many recent current and planned housing developments in Retford and the surrounding area including the large new village destined to replace Gamston Airport. These are more than sufficient to meet the BDC requirements. Lound is a village with character. It would be a pity if this be lost as it is gradually engulfed in urban sprawl as have so many others nationwide. Trust that the 10% increase in housing for Lound need not be exceeded.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF460	Resident	The steering group in Lound submitted their draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Parish Council for approval. Understand that the draft Bassetlaw District Council Local Plan now shows a 37% increase in housing requirement in Bassetlaw by 2037. The Lound target for new homes has been double in what is small rural village. This is wrong and completely undermines the basis on which the Lound Neighbourhood Plan was created. The Neighbourhood Plan village survey in 2016 showed most householders wanted little or no new housing development. Part 1 specified a minimum of 21 new homes. Lound's draft Plan was subsequently adjusted to meet this target and would protect the village from unsuitable development. This figure has doubled to 42 new homes, calculated 20% of homes in Lound Parish. This is totally unacceptable and not sustainable and undermines all the hard work done by the village Neighbourhood Plan Committee. Also, it does not consider the resident's views on the type of future village development needed. Bassetlaw's reputation has now been strongly damaged. Understand the village steering group, which includes Parish Councillors, has rigorously protested with Bassetlaw officials regarding their unbalanced method of finding the higher figures. This change in housing numbers wrongly punishes the small rural villages like Lound. Through the Neighbourhood Plan, villagers in Lound have undertaken what was required from Bassetlaw Council and cannot support the additional new increase in housing to How can the Strategic Objectives, enhance the quality, diversity and character of rural villages? The character of Nottinghamshire small villages must be protected and maintained for future generations and should not be spoilt by Bassetlaw's inappropriate planning decisions. Lound, as with many other small villages, does not have the infrastructure to support this additional housing growth demand. The village does not have any shops, has drainage issues, poor public transport and a sewage plant at capacity. Plus, the high cost of current housing and future housing, limits any potential interest from low income families. Revise your policy and accept the housing volume laid out in Lound's Neighbourhood Plan and consider the implications and damage to the unique character of Lound if ignored.	The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.
REF475	Resident	Rural development policies – support The villages in Bassetlaw can accept further growth. Too much may strain road links and resources.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF480	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Recognise the need for housing within the District and the responsibility for rural communities to support some additional building. Question how those villages with local plans will support a 20% growth after the extensive consultation that has already taken place. Note that in one presentation BDC spoke that some villages may support with a higher level of development. Yet to identify these locations.	The majority of made Neighbourhood Plans or Neighbourhood Plans that are currently in production have all either considered, have or are planning to, accommodate the 20% level of growth. Some settlements have not due to issues of land availability, deliverability or planning constraints. This is reflected in the revised policy ST2.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
1177432	Resident	This is an excellent idea. The site is very accessible and takes the pressure off housing demand in surrounding towns where the existing infrastructure may be poor. The new location of the garden village makes sense. Could this be increased in size if necessary?	The size of the site is the full extent of the land available for a garden village.
1180212	Resident	I think this is an excellent development.	Support noted and welcome.
1189264	Resident	The idea of a garden village (small town) so close to Retford and adjacent to one of the main routes into and out of Retford seems to be ill thought out. Where do you think people are going to work, shop, commute to and from? Roads in this area are already congested. Access into Retford along both the A620 and B6420 is already bad at peak times. It pretty clear this development wont provide sufficient jobs to employ the new residents so it will effectively create a whole load of new commuters to the more developed population centers such as Lincoln, Doncaster or Sheffield.	The site will provide 15ha of employment land to provide residents with jobs and a local centre and community facilities to meet every day local needs. Additional work on traffic will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.
REF018	Resident	Traffic congestion, the roundabout on the A1 is already very busy and the level crossing on Mansfield Road is a main line. This already causes traffic congestion and a further 750 homes would have a huge impact on this. The cross roads at Babworth again are busy and the road is not equipped for this. The crematorium as already massively contributed to the volume of traffic and I feel the road as become unsafe especially the Babworth junction. The A1 closes frequently or diverts traffic at least once a week if not more often, this again will only add to the volume of traffic. Live on Old London Road and all the congestion already as an impact on this road. This development will only force more traffic down this single track lane which is not fit for purpose for the current amount of traffic. The road can only accommodate one car at a time and can spend more time on the grass verge allowing other vehicles to pass. The road is frequently used by ramblers bikers and horses and safety would also be a huge concern as the road as several blind spots and speeding is also a problem. Previously reported these concerns to the council & highways, this proposal would only make the situation far worse.	Additional work on traffic will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.
REF047	Sport England	Para 5.3.19 and policy ST3 it is important that the evidence is available to inform sports and active recreational needs across the district and within the Garden Village. Sport England supports the plans to develop a Built Sport Facilities Strategy as part of the evidence base. Para 9.4.9., Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process.	A Built Facilities Study is being produced. Once approved, together with the existing Playing Pitch Strategy it will inform future policy development. Active Design will be incorporated into the masterplanning of the site. Reference will be added to Policy ST3 to reflect this.
REF054	Resident	Should also mitigate for noise and maintain public right of way.	Policy ST3 makes provision for connectivity to the public rights of way network. Policy ST3 will be clarified to ensure the existing right of way is maintained. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure the amenity of existing and future residents is protected.
REF061	Resident	A Garden Village is a good idea, It will focus major development in one area and allow villages to have smaller developments which will better reflect their history and the environment.	Support noted and welcome.
1191848	Barnby Moor Parish Council	If it is built on redundant sites, not farm land.	The Local Plan makes good use of previously developed land and minimises the loss of the highest quality agricultural land. But inevitably there are not enough suitable, available and deliverable brownfield sites in the District to meet identified development needs. The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2.
REF085	Retford Civic Society	Recognise that a new village could add something new and exciting to Bassetlaw. Support the proposed development at Five Lanes End as this site has great accessibility both to the trunk road network and to local towns. It is essential that this development does not start until there is a mechanism in place to ensure that	Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		retail and other community facilities, including public transport services, are in place at an early stage to serve residents. Many community facilities require a certain population to be viable and this applies particularly to the possibility of a new rail station. To ensure a successful development it may be necessary to increase the scale of building permitted in the first phase of this development.	
1193061	Resident	This is a purely aspirational plan. Do not see any real evidence to justify the need for a new town development so close to Retford and Worksop. Employment would be a major issue unless the new residents are to commute to major cities. Would need to attract a major employer to the area supplying senior and less skilled jobs. Are there any plans to do so?	The site will provide 15ha of employment land to provide residents with jobs - the aim is to attract different types of businesses to diversify the economy and provide better skilled and higher paid jobs.
1193338	Resident	The building of a new garden village seems sensible as the location sees it within a short distance of the A1. No problems with this development.	Support noted and welcome.
1193555	Resident	The location of the green village as not be considered. It too near climber park sssi that already got a large impact with visitors already. More information on how this going to be built and mitigation they could be provided.	Additional work on potential visitor impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at visitor impact from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.
1194464	Resident	Need to determine which this proposal is, It is named both a "Garden Village" and a "Garden City". Is the idea to lull the communities senses by using the "Village" name and later transforming this to a "City" ? Good productive farmland is to be used to the detriment of the nations ability to produce sufficient food crops. The proposed Rail Station will not be built either at all or until well into the proposed development if it goes ahead. This is an economic fact of life, along with all of the other services "promised". You do not have any guarantees that I am aware of that will ensure that these developments are included with the housing plan. The nett result will be more overloaded services in this area with additional traffic thrust onto the already inadequate road system and inadequate support services. No matter what 'screening' is used there will be intolerable traffic noise from the adjacent A1 Major Trunk Road which must be in line, at some point in the near future, to be upgraded to a Motorway. Who will wish to live close to this Heavy Traffic Route and the subsequent disturbance ??	The site will be a Garden Village but designed and built to reflect the Government's Garden City principles. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Once adopted, Policy ST3 will set out the infrastructure that any development at the Garden Village would be expected to provide. Without such provision planning permission would not be granted. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure the amenity of existing and future residents is protected from noise for example.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>Additional consideration should be given to the need for off-site improvements to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in vicinity of the Garden Village. Due to the existing rural location, existing walking and cycling routes are designed for low levels of usage, which could be adversely impacted by the additional usage brought by the development unless appropriate mitigation is undertaken to improve these routes. Whilst part 4 (a.vi) refers to improvements towards links direct to facilities including Retford and over the A1, it does not account for nearby pedestrian and cycling routes that could be utilised by residents for leisure and recreation. The Garden Village is approximately 1500m to the south of the Chesterfield Canal. There is potential for the canal to provide a local leisure resource for new residents as part of a wider circular walking or cycling route, which could help to meet the future open space and leisure needs of future residents, which could promote physical wellbeing and active travel. The towpath, and other existing public rights of way in proximity to the site, are designed to meet their current levels of relatively low use. The Trust maintain assets to a steady state based on existing usage. Any additional usage brought about by the Garden Village could result in additional liabilities, including the erosion of footpath surfaces, which could discourage long term use of the local pedestrian and cycle network for travel and leisure, contrary to the general aims of paragraph 104 (part d) of the NPPF. Consideration is given towards the need to ensure that nearby walking and cycling routes are sufficiently robust to accommodate the likely demands brought upon them from the new development. This could be met through the addition of an additional requirements within part 4.a) of the policy so that it is made specific that improvements to the wider walking and cycling network are considered. Suggested additional wording is provided below: "Improvements to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in proximity to the site to accommodate the future demands of residents, including account towards routes used for leisure and recreation". Alternatively, expansion of the explanatory text to include reference to the need for the potential use of the existing walking and cycling infrastructure to be considered.</p>	Off site connectivity by walking and cycling will be part of the policy progression and the masterplan process.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF116	Network Rail	<p>Whilst the provision of a station in this location could be supported in principle much more work has to be carried out as the provision of a new station is dependent on a number of factors. Service provision on this line has being increased to a consistent 2 tph under the current Northern franchise (including an hourly Sheffield to Gainsborough Central train) which could offer a reasonable level of service. However it would be required of the promoter to provide an evidence-based demonstration that any new station: • Is technically feasible – precise location, engineering, signalling etc. • Has the support of the Train Operating Company • Can feasibly be served within the timetable. The 3rd point is the important one. Whilst this line itself is not especially busy, passenger services feed into Sheffield via Nunnery Main Line Junction which is a very busy pinch point. Timetabling services through this junction is a difficult exercise and thus it is not a simple matter to add 2 to 3 minutes (our estimate) to journey times by the insertion of an extra stop. Whereas it may be technically feasible to locate a station in the vicinity of the previous one (Checker House) would first advise a timetabling exercise is carried out to assess the impact an additional stop would have on the performance through Sheffield. As an alternative may wish to talk to the East Midlands franchise about the possibility of extending the current Nottingham to Worksop service through to Retford, but again that is dependent on the turn round times at both Worksop and Nottingham as well as the availability of platforms/crossovers at Retford and any further rolling stock that could be required. It has also to be borne in mind that a fully accessible station will cost in the region of £6-10 million (based on recent station construction at Low Moor and Apperley Bridge in Yorkshire); a long term projection of around 4,000 dwellings would be able to support such investment but clearly there will need to be substantial upfront costs to deliver the station. In terms of level crossings, there are two and possibly three crossings that could be affected by the proposals (see map). These would be namely Howard's No.1 (61m 11ch), Mansfield Road (62m 24ch), and possibly Rushey Sidings (62m 44ch). Our starting point is that the closure of any level crossing is very welcome, given level crossings represent the biggest single risk to the operation of the railway system. Howard's No.1 is a simple occupation crossing which as far as we are aware has no right of way over it, and as such it would be our starting point that the crossing be closed completely as part of the overall scheme. Bridging Mansfield Road would also be a positive development but that would also be dependent on securing enough land on the north side of the railway to facilitate bridge and approach embankment works on that side of the railway – this will involve third party ownership and if we have a reluctant landowner the Council may have to seek CPO powers to deliver this. A thorough transport assessment would be required to assess the risk at the crossing (and also the Rushey Sidings crossing – as this is a current half barrier crossing it is considered to be more of a risk than the others). An alternative, given a strategic look at the road network in the vicinity of the Garden Village, would be a possible closure of Rushey LC to vehicles and its diversion over Mansfield Road. This should be considered as part of any overall assessment.</p>	<p>A rail feasibility has been undertaken which states that all three points identified can be met. This report has been agreed with Network Rail. However, it is acknowledged that additional work on traffic and rail will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. This will include impact on level crossings and potential solutions to address impacts identified.</p>
1194662	Resident	<p>Support development of Housing /support infrastructure at the A1 / A614 junction because of its good transport links and possibility of new Rail interconnection ti East coast main line.Location centrally within the district</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		<p>Gainsborough or Meadowhall. One of the advantages being used for the location is the proximity to the A1, however this also means that people will use their cars to get to the retail and leisure facilities that is sadly lacking in our area. So I envisage that far from limiting future car use, this location will actually increase the use of cars. Also the 2nd point is about maintaining the character of the area. This won't happen as the site is currently rural Retford - fields, trees, hedgerows, open green space etc and will be replaced by 4000 houses and other developments. This is evident from the change in the last version of the plan that was consulted upon as Section 8 of the old plan Rural Bassetlaw has been completely dropped as the Garden Village proposal completely contradicts the principles the original plan had. Section 8.11 from the plan was: 8.11 Following a comprehensive assessment of all 103 settlements in rural Bassetlaw, 30 settlements have been identified as either too small or too dispersed in nature to support additional housing development without this having a detrimental impact upon their character. A list of these settlements is included in figure 7 at the end of this chapter.</p> <p>The areas around the proposed site (Morton, Upper Morton and Little Morton) were listed as settlements not suitable for small scale development at that time, but now faced with a complete oxymoron in that the proposal would amount to 4000 houses being built on the site. The plan is contradicting previous principles applied and also not demonstrating why this should be progressed.</p> <p>Likewise on Historic England's website there are entries shown in their Non-Listed sites – Pastscape and Heritage Gateway on the proposed sites – Crop Markings in the fields, Morton Hill Farm and buildings (the plan does not detail what will happen to these), & an irregular series of linked enclosures (quite dense) including one circular feature. Will these historical features be retained or destroyed?</p> <p>From a personal perspective my family and I are residents in the area and will be directly affected by the plans. Point 5 in Section 5.3.8 of the local plan states:</p> <p>Strong local vision and engagement: designed and executed with the engagement and involvement of the existing local community, and future residents and businesses. This should include consideration of how the natural and historic environment of the local area is reflected and respected.</p>	
REF169	Highways England	<p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village has been proposed to accommodate a total of 4,000 dwellings, note that given its complex nature the target for this Local Plan period is limited to 750. Any development coming forward on this site should note that as the eastern boundary abuts the A1 trunk road, boundary treatment works and drainage will need to be considered to ensure the structural integrity of the network is not compromised. In addition, 22.1 ha of employment land is to be completed, 108 ha of new employment land is to be found and at least 199.6 ha of strategic employment land is to be allocated to address employment need and/or expansions to local businesses.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with Highways England so that masterplanning will ensure that the structural integrity of the A1 is not compromised.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF169	Highways England	<p>The revised Local Plan is a great improvement of the previous plan especially with reference to the development of Gamston airfield and Bevercotes pit. Accept your proposal for a “Garden Villages” is very contentious and note: • If a new village does move forward recommend that further research should be carried out to consider the possibility of developing an alternative site at West Burton before the final decision is made as the road system and positioning of the site is mid-way between the two large conurbations of Retford and Gainsborough and there are already services and facilities already in place to aid the homeowners before their own are built. • There is insufficient capacity on roads for the proposed increase in use. • The impact on the road network of any of the proposed sites that have been consulted on shows that all the sites would likely increase traffic flow on rural lanes, which are not suitable for additional traffic. • accept that the proximity of both the A1 and the rail links for the proposed Village site at Applyhead has merit, however the A1 already is highly used and when accidents occur this impacts on all roads around Retford and surrounding villages. • No consideration or evidence is included to show the effects of pollution from the A1 covering the area proposed due to increased traffic. • The loss of a significant portion of Green Belt is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which specifies it as a justifiable constraint on housing delivery. The Local Plan documents give no detail of the Exceptional Circumstances which could justify release of Green Belt. • The Garden Village site confirms that the impact on the environment, in terms of congestion and pollution, will be considerable because of the reliance on cars as the primary means of transport. • The open fields and hedges serve a very useful purpose in mitigating for the locations poor air quality as well as providing open countryside for the residents of Rural Retford’s wellbeing. • The Local Plan proposal identifies loss of biodiversity opportunities with increased urbanisation, especially with the loss of field systems and hedgerows. It also identifies the loss of significant portions of Grade 3 agricultural land which is currently producing food products. • Cumulatively the impact will be detrimental to the whole area.</p>	<p>For a site to be considered as a Garden Village it must be submitted by the landowner as available for development. West Burton is still operational and the owners have not indicated the site is available for development. Additional work on traffic impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. Policy ST3 requires an air quality assessment be submitted to ensure impacts of development on air quality are identified and appropriately mitigated. Bassetlaw does not have a green belt. However, the Garden Village would be built on greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Additional work on ecological impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at the type and mix of biodiversity on the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. There will also be a requirement that at least 10% biodiversity net gain is achieved on site and that a significant amount of additional trees are planted to enhance the site's ecological value.</p>
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	<p>• The proposal states that if the Garden Village goes ahead, some of the houses will be built before any additional infrastructure is provided. This will add pressure to local facilities which are already overstretched. The quantum of houses proposed may not bring the required infrastructure benefits. • Consideration / commitment does need to be given as to how the Council can ensure that at what stages the additional infrastructure must be provided also what percentage of land within any “Garden Village” will be allocated to open/ green and leisure spaces. • How do they intend to link a cycle routes between any village and the nearest large conurbation? There is a risk that the Garden Village will be undeliverable for some or all of the factors mentioned already, in which case the promise of infrastructure solutions for the district as a whole to be delivered by the Garden Village will not materialise. There is also the risk that the developers will choose not to deliver the housing in large enough packages because of financial factors such as market conditions. Developments could also be subcontracted to smaller builders, putting any or all of the promises of infrastructure at risk because of viability issues or even market collapse. The greater risk to the district, then, if the Garden Village is not delivered, is that the wholesale scatter gun approach to development across the district will continue adding housing without any infrastructure, only this time it will build on open spaces and the Green Belt. The strategy has very little to do with what the district needs or wants and does not reflect in anyway the results of the engagements with stakeholders to produce a shared vision.</p>	<p>Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development. The requirements for infrastructure and the timing of provision are agreed through discussion with the infrastructure providers. Clarification will be provided as to how much land will be publicly accessible open space, formal sports pitches and wildlife areas. Additional work on sustainable transport provision, routes and connectivity to the existing network will be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The Garden Village will only be taken forward in the Local Plan if it can be demonstrated that the site can be deliverable. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment states that all infrastructure associated with the site can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme.</p>
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	<p>Support the proposal for a new garden Village in the District. However, this is another completely 'new' major addition to the housing supply in the 2020 Draft Plan alongside the former Cottam Power Station and again there is little information in the public domain to substantiate delivery of the first 750 dwellings alongside the essential infrastructure necessary to establish a new settlement within the timescales suggested. It is unsafe to therefore rely on as many as 750 dwellings coming forward in the plan period requirement. In this regard it is also essential that ST14 is robust in delivering its share of housing requirement for the main towns and we consider that additional additional sustainable sites should be</p>	<p>The spatial strategy will be re-visited as part of the progression of the Local Plan</p>

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF198	Consultant	<p>Severn Trent support the principles behind the Bassetlaw Garden village and raise no objection to the proposed allocation of the site at Upper Morton. Welcome the opportunities to be part of the stakeholder groups for developing a plan for the Garden Village. Severn Trent would note that it is important that all allocations, including the Garden village consider water efficiency, drainage, and sewerage from the outset. One of the fundamental principles is that the village should be dominated by high quality Biodiverse landscape and green infrastructure. Support this approach and highlight the need to incorporate Blue Infrastructure alongside the green infrastructure creating blue-green corridors that will support an enable wildlife to thrive. This blue infrastructure is also key for the sustainable management of water, returning surface water run-off to the natural water cycle as good quality through the use of SuDS, and ensuring that the good quality water can be then reach watercourses or groundwater to support sustainable abstraction for use as potable water. The plan is to retain a connection to the rural setting, through the inclusion of trees, and vegetated areas. Support this but as there is also a need to create blue - green connections through the development. The benefits of creating these corridors include the opportunity for promoting sustainable transport, by incorporating of footpaths and cycle ways alongside key infrastructure such as SuDS and watercourses to convey surface water safely through the development ensuring that water quality and opportunities to enhance local amenity are incorporated as well as the quantity aspect of SuDS design. It is important that the Garden village is designed, with the whole lifetime of the development in mind. It is essential that infrastructure is located and designed to be adaptable and resilient to changes. Additional pressures, including climate change, urban creep and further growth and development can then be managed sustainably whilst retaining the sense of place and high quality development. The utilisation of SuDS should assists with this process, in particular the use of source control SuDS. Consideration of wider benefits including opportunities to create priority Habitats should also be considered especially where this can be undertaken as part of multifunctional space. Longer term ownership and maintenance of key infrastructure is usually, clear cut with a specific utility company / council department being the appropriate authority or the responsibility being that of riparian ownership. In more recent years the provision of services through management companies or multi-functional spaces with shared responsibilities has created some confusion. Recommend that a management and maintenance plan for the Garden Village is developed, and that this is kept as a live document to prevent maintenance of the development compromising the overall design. Support "Maximise the effective use of natural resources including Energy and water," within paragraph 5.3.11 and "Sustainable drainage should be fully integrated within green infrastructure as part of a bespoke wildlife friendly scheme."</p>	<p>Support for the principles of the Garden Village is welcome. The Council will continue to work with Severn Trent so that policy development and masterplanning appropriately addresses the requirements of blue-green infrastructure. Policy ST3 makes provision for an integrated SUDS/green infrastructure scheme. Further work will be undertaken with Severn Trent to ensure the policy wording is fit for purpose both now and in the future. Additional text will be added to Policy ST3 to identify arrangements for stewardship of blue-green infrastructure.</p>

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Strategic Highways: The policy is understandably broad-brush, the County Council supports the need for a Planning and Development Brief in the form of a SPD to be prepared and adopted to provide more specific requirements in due course. Part D, 4- The B6420 provides the only way in from the GV site boundary. There are two adjacent 90-degree bends beyond the site boundary that need straightening out by a realignment. This is potentially a significant constraint and therefore should be included within the policy as a separate named requirement. Part D, 4, (iii). - The B6420/A620 junction is poor and probably will require the installation of traffic signals, subject to TA, and potentially land to widen the approaches. This should be secured as part of the GV development rather than a contribution towards the works. The 4 (vi) ped/cycle links to Retford would require more land too. Part D, 4, (vii). - This requires a new railway station. A supporting rail technical note suggests that the provision of a new railway station will require closure of 3 level crossings in close proximity. It is not clear why and whether this 'must' happen. ST3 ought to include a review of the operation of the level crossings including appropriate mitigation which may include crossing closures and a new road over railway bridge(s) to accommodate all traffic. Part D, 4, (vii) - Contributions are likely to be needed for public transport facilities and potentially initial rail subsidy. Policy ST3 D4 should highlight this requirement.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with NCC Highways so that policy development and masterplanning appropriately address the requirements of transport infrastructure. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. A rail feasibility has been undertaken which recommends that the level crossings be closed for safety reasons. This note was agreed with the County Council. However, it is acknowledged that additional work on rail will need to be undertaken including impact on level crossings and potential solutions to address impacts identified.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Minerals and Waste: Policy ST3 states that the garden village falls within the Mineral Safeguarding Area/Mineral Consultation Area (MSA/MCA) for sand and gravel. Confirm that the land identified by the red line boundary for the garden village does not fall within an MSA/MCA and therefore this wording can be removed. Education: Primary - given the 3,250 dwellings proposed to be added to the Garden Village after 2037, a new 630-place (3 forms of entry) primary school would be required as part of the layout of the Garden Village for which land and contributions would be required in order to accommodate the full size of the settlement. The school would need to be located in the heart of the Garden Villages https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/793682/Education_provision_in_garden_communities.pdf Secondary: NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated at existing schools. The proposed Garden Village would necessitate the addition of a further c500 secondary places, for which contributions would be required. Potential expansions of existing secondary schools would be subject to feasibility. If circumstances at the time of a formal application had changed – i.e. changing population, school rolls and school capacities – and a new secondary school was required in this area, NCC would also need developers to contribute land.</p>	<p>Confirmation that the site lies outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area is noted. Policy ST3 will be changed accordingly. The Council will continue to work with NCC Education so that policy development and masterplanning appropriately address the requirements of education infrastructure to ensure that the most up to date position is reflected in emerging policy. Additional work on education impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at the projected modelling of population growth, school rolls and capacities to determine what mitigation is required to address the issues identified.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Here we are again using perfectly good agricultural land to 'pave over' thus increasing the risk of flooding and destroying the ability to produce much needed food for the nation. Does nobody at the Council understand that farmland is not being made anymore ?? The myth of Public Transport, with a Railway Station no less, will take a lot longer to realise than the building of many houses that will introduce more vehicle movements along with the Traffic Hazards and Pollution. Does the Council really think that people will walk or cycle to Worksop/Retford or a Railway Station (if built) ?? The other infrastructure required (Shops, Chemists, Doctors etc) will not happen until a large number of the houses have been built and by then the habits and customs of driving to Supermarkets will have already set in. The proposal is to build houses close to a major highway. This will inevitably lead to Noise Pollution and present a poor picture to the Visitors that we currently bring to this attractive part of Nottinghamshire and Great Britain. Further, there is anecdotal evidence of plans being accepted for houses and then different styles/sizes being built.</p>	<p>The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. A rail feasibility has been undertaken which states that a rail station is feasible. However, it is acknowledged that additional work on rail will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. This will timing and cost of provision. Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development. The requirements for infrastructure and the timing of provision are agreed through discussion with the infrastructure providers. Additional work on sustainable transport</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
			provision, routes and connectivity to the existing network will be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The design of the development will ensure residents continue to enjoy private amenity without adverse impacts from noise.
1196559	Resident	This is an appropriate area for development with links to nearby work places and transport.	Support noted and welcome.
1196560	Resident	Concerns about the Garden Village are: 1) The disruption created for all of the residents to the Parish during the build. 2) There will be a large increase in demand on all of the transport links in the area. 3) The A1 already struggles in multiple areas with flooding and the large amount of traffic it currently sustains – currently requiring re-routing through Retford which brings the town to an almost standstill. 4) The Garden Village will attract buyers from out of the area who will then commute to the cities and London thereby providing limited benefit to the local residents. 5) The increase in population will impact the transport links to the two immediate towns of Retford and Worksop. Parking in those locations will be difficult and the facilities not provided in the Garden village stretched in those towns. 6) Can the local hospitals deal with the increased demand? 7) It is suggested that there will be a rail station provided. This would impact on the current travellers journey times but worse if they were no station and they sought to commute by train the two rail stations (Retford and Worksop) already struggle to deal with the car parking required. 8) The rail company providing the transport is already substandard and has had to be intervened by the government.	Inevitably construction will lead to some disruption through the build. But the Council will work with developers to ensure this is kept to a minimum. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. Policy ST3 provides for a mix of housing on the Garden Village to met identified local needs including affordable housing, housing for older people and for families. Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development both on site and elsewhere. Bassetlaw PCT have confirmed that a financial contribution will be required to mitigate adverse impacts expected from a development of this size on Bassetlaw Hospital. A rail feasibility study states that a new railway station in the Garden Village could be achieved without disruption to journey times. This has been agreed with Network Rail and the train operating company.
REF239	Resident	The proposed Garden Village is not appropriate and the housing should be added to Retford and Worksop whose main street shops are in urgent need of more customers.	It is important that the Local Plan promotes a balanced approach to growth across the District. Worksop and Retford are being allocated a fair proportion of planned growth. It is expected that residents of the Garden Village will use facilities in Worksop and Retford for none day to day activities.
1196689	Resident	With the proposed development sites (Garden Village and Ranby, in particular), is the proposed land: - Part of an estate, which is to be sold off? - Part of existing farmland? - Part of existing woodland? If the answer to some or all of the above questions is 'yes'. question the Local Plan's ambitions of conservation and the maintenance of our greenfield sites. Like assurance that the Local Plan has investigated the development of brownfield sites, rather than opting for the 'easy option' of purchasing greenfield sites from a couple of landowners because it is easier and ticks a box.	The Local Plan promotes a balanced approach to growth across the urban and rural areas, making use of previously developed land and minimising the loss of the highest quality agricultural land. The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Six of the housing and employment allocations are on brownfield land but inevitably there are not enough suitable, available and deliverable brownfield sites in the District to meet identified development needs. All sites are put forward by the landowners/site promoters. The Council does not purchase greenfield sites from landowners to include in the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 52) acknowledges that..... The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan seeks to allocate the Bassetlaw Garden Village a site of 216ha as an area of long-term sustainable growth. It is suggested that this Garden Village could deliver up to 4,000 dwellings over its lifetime with a target delivery of 750 dwellings over the plan period. The recent Uttlesford Local Plan Stage 1 Inspectors Report highlights the problems which can be associated with a reliance upon such sites without clear and robust delivery evidence. In the case of Uttlesford three Garden Communities were proposed. The Inspector acknowledged that the Garden Communities would be responsible for the delivery of a large amount of the housing requirement. In considering the Garden Communities the Inspector identified they would not deliver the quantum of housing in the plan period that the Council's trajectory was showing. The Inspector was concerned about the lack of evidence to enable a conclusion to be made that the proposed allocations were sound and that they would deliver sufficient levels of housing over the plan period. In relation to Garden Village it is identified by the Local Planning Authority that: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland ..." Whilst it is concluded that this location has been identified as being more suitable, it is not without its constraints. It appears that the Council has been 'wedded' to the delivery of a Garden Village or Garden Villages without consideration of suitable alternatives. In addition, there is significant scope for a slippage in the timetable. Prior to development commencing, post BLP adoption, a significant amount of work is required to overcome the identified constraints, develop the identified required masterplan and appropriate infrastructure. It is probable that the timescale identified for delivery could slip leading to an under-delivery in the plan period for this site. Any slippage in the delivery of this key site will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer. If appropriate the Bassetlaw Garden Village proposal must be founded upon clear and robust evidence together with a realistic delivery timetable.</p>	<p>Acknowledge that delivery of Garden Villages comes under careful scrutiny. The Council will revisit the delivery timeframes to ensure that they are robust and achievable.</p>
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>The Garden Village is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan, the Council's delivery assumptions for the site must be realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In progressing the Garden Village allocation, it is considered that a robust review of the sites deliverability, including start dates, build out rates and having regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades, should be undertaken to ensure a sound allocation and Plan.</p>	<p>Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.</p>
REF253	Fisher German	<p>The Draft Plan's proposal for a new Garden Village between Worksop and Retford is particularly innovative and to be welcomed. The Garden Village will provide the basis for a substantial number of new homes and new employment land, with development shaped by a comprehensive set of sustainable development principles. Note the strong emphasis in the Draft Plan on active travel within and beyond the new Garden Village and would be particularly keen to ensure that this element of the proposal continues to feature highly as ideas develop. Importantly, the Garden Village proposal also includes provision for a new public transport facility including a rail station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line. This is to be welcomed and will complement other initiatives in SCR which are looking to improve this route as well as strengthen rail connections to Sheffield City Centre from the east. The Sheffield City Region Integrated Rail Plan (July 2019) provides more detail on how we see these services developing in the future.</p>	<p>Support for the Garden Village, particularly a new railway station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line is noted and welcome.</p>
REF255	Sheffield City Region	<p>Encouraged by the commitment to biodiversity, as well as the reference to public transport links, eg the railway station. What would the implication be to Morton, a hamlet, in terms of traffic? Would Morton be swallowed in a future large development, after 2037?</p>	<p>Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required including for Morton to address the issues identified. The Garden Village is expected to be developed over two plan periods. The site boundary is the extent of the whole development planned for post 2037.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF257	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	In general, in total support of the new plan especially the creation of the “Garden Village”.	Support noted and welcome.
REF262	West Stockwith Parish Council	This element has the thoroughness that might be likened to a poorly conceived GCSE planning project drawn up by a 17 year old. Appreciate that the policy is based on available land which might generate little or no objection, available links to major transport networks and housing development pressures forced upon Bassetlaw by Sheffield Authority and elsewhere BUT to use this isolated area with a convenient link to the A1 and the local rail network has to be reconsidered. This raises serious concerns for the future 'Garden Village' community and its' surroundings that this apparently simple tick box house building exercise conducted by Bassetlaw DC can answer. The current 'community consultation' for this strategy has been within this consultation document and a single piece of laminated A4 tied to a sign alongside the B6420 (now destroyed by the weather) as I understand it. I support the 'community consultation' process outlined in this section to alleviate the issues I perceive to be inherent in this strategy. My request is for this to be FULLY ADVERTISED in the communities of Retford, Ranby and surrounding areas with SIGNIFICANT SIGNAGE visible to road users erected on site to highlight this consultation process.	Planning for the Garden Village is at an early stage and further work on transport and infrastructure impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. These assessments will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and the impact new development will have on all types of infrastructure to determine what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified to ensure that sustainable development is promoted. The consultation for the draft Local Plan was conducted over 6 weeks and was fully compliant with all relevant legislation and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This included through local media, with parish and town councils in Retford, Ranby and surrounding areas with site notices used along the road frontage.
1196906	Resident	Bassetlaw DC is struggling to tackle to the issues facing Retford, Worksop and other public centres with significant retail business closures. Creation of another community which may face similar issues MUST demand that these issues be addressed before any such a proposal can be developed further. My concern is of a dormitory ghost town where economic growth directed towards centres such as Doncaster or Sheffield rather than locally.	The Garden Village will be a sustainable new settlement that will provide for living and working in the same location. Additionally the Local Plan provides for about 108ha of employment land for business growth. A key priority of the Local Plan is to reduce the amount of out commuting to Doncaster or Sheffield. Providing improved transport links to new employment sites in Worksop and Retford and elsewhere in the District will help ensure that this is achieved.
1196906	Resident	The destruction of 216ha of arable farmland and likely hedgerow habitat MUST demand a full carbon offsetting calculation to prove the objective of this statement. Low carbon in this statement should be replaced with zero carbon if Bassetlaw is committed to a truly sustainable future for it's communities and population. As stated earlier there is a single inclusion in this policy document of a strategy towards electric vehicle use from 2030 onwards. Electric vehicle infrastructure must be included in this 'Garden Village' strategy to have significant meaning.	A Natural Capital Impact Assessment will be undertaken for the site to identify the current level of natural capital and ecosystem services on site and then to ensure that a gain is achieved through masterplanning the site. This would include carbon storage, carbon sequestration, air purification, noise regulation, water flow, water quality, pollination, accessible nature, horticulture production, and biodiversity. Further work will be undertaken to determine whether zero carbon can be achieved as part of a financially viable scheme. The use of electric vehicles in the Garden Village is supported by the Local Plan and infrastructure will be required to be put in place to enable charging in new development.
1196906	Resident	Support the housing allocation of this strategy in principle particularly where it develops brown field or existing communities. Have reservations of a 'Garden Village' dormitory development which is questionable in terms of it's value to the existing local communities particularly Retford and Worksop and the environmental impact due to carbon loading that such a development, with increased vehicle movement and with improper planning might create.	Support for brownfield development welcome. The Garden Village is intended to be a new settlement and is not associated with meeting the needs of existing communities. It is identified to achieve the wider aspirations of the D2N2 SEP and Bassetlaw's Local industrial Strategy. Additional housing will over the long term provide greater resilience in housing delivery and contribute to improved infrastructure and local services. This approach will ensure that the Garden Village does not become a dormitory development. Further work on carbon impact and traffic impact will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
1196906	Resident	Policy ST3 is well written and includes all aspirations appropriate to the delivery of a new garden community. As the site will have a significant and long frontage along its western boundary to the A1, the potential noise impacts and the impact of the existing pollution arising from the A1 on this new community should be justified with supporting studies. To enhance the sustainability of the Bassetlaw Garden Village the draft Local Plan is promoting a new station on the Lincoln to Sheffield Rail link and whilst a new station to support the proposed garden village is supported, its delivery may be problematic which may have impact on the sustainability of the Garden Village and the Apleyhead Junction. There is also concern regarding the accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists over the A1 / A57 junctions and to the nearest town (i.e. Worksop).	Policy ST3 requires an air quality assessment to be undertaken to ensure impacts of development are mitigated. It is acknowledged that a similar assessment for noise should also be required - Policy ST3 will be amended accordingly. Further work on traffic impact will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. This will need to ensure that in the early stages of development if a railway station is not operational that the additional vehicle movements can be accommodated on the local and strategic road network. Policy ST3 requires new and improved pedestrian and cycle links to nearby facilities, Retford and across the A1 to the A57. However further work will need to be undertaken through a transport assessment to identify the requirements for each development phase.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	In our experience in preparing the Core Strategy, the Council was required to prepare extensive high-level documents; a Concept Framework with supporting studies to demonstrate the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of the proposed urban extension (Bassingthorpe Farm) was essential to demonstrate to the Inspector that both the Council and the landowners were supportive in bringing forward the site and that it was suitable and deliverable. A similar level of detail is likely to be required to support the identification of this new settlements within Bassetlaw, as Paragraph 72 of the NPPF refers.	Comments noted. The Local Plan recognises that a masterplan framework will be required to progress this site and to demonstrate that the site is suitable and deliverable.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Policy ST3 should be removed from the Local Plan. Disagree that there is the need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the defined Main Towns of Bassetlaw are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions , which is considered to be a more sustainable option for development. Although we are supportive of the Local Plan's ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the Garden Village as it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of exiting Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Bassetlaw does not suffer from overcrowding and key centres such as Retford are suitable for urban expansion and would benefit from further growth to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability as well as the vitality of surrounding rural settlements. Agree with paragraph 5.3.1 in terms of promoting a step change in economic growth, the delivery of a Garden Village and associated transport hub is not necessary nor suitable to facilitate that step change. Have significant concerns in relation to feasibility and viability of those proposals. The 2019 Landscape Study Bassetlaw already comprises a largely rural borough (98%) with a significant number of villages, particularly to the east. Do not support the creation of a new Garden Village, particularly when the Council is already seeking to locate a large portion of its housing distribution to the rural settlements rather than supporting its Main Towns. To support the new Garden Village, the Local Plan proposes a new railway station, road links and public transport hub to enable access to the wider settlements. However, the Local Plan does not propose that infrastructure to be delivered within the plan period or demonstrate how that infrastructure will be delivered. Notwithstanding whether the above infrastructure is feasible, existing Main Towns already offer these facilities and services and would be better suited to deliver additional growth.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>In supporting the Garden Village, both families see an opportunity to create a legacy for the community that they can be proud of. The families are united by a common belief that any development on their land must embrace the principles set out in the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and, in particular, SDGs 3, 11 and 13. To fulfil those goals, the Garden Village must: (i) be constructed in an environmentally considerate manner; (ii) achieve an ambitious increase in biodiversity in its locality; (iii) support an increase of physical activity levels; and (iv) facilitate low carbon living in the community. involvement in the proposals is underpinned by, and conditional on, fulfilment of these principles and Bassetlaw's commitment to the opportunity to create a truly sustainable and green section of the community. The Local Plan consultation has coincided with the publication of 'Living with Beauty' by the Government's 'Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission' (January 2020). The Commission and the Report highlight the importance of safeguarding beauty, community, history, landscape in our places. The overall aspiration of the Report is supported and in particular, the following comments go to the heart of what is anticipated for the Garden Village: "Many of the things that make settlements beautiful also make them healthy, happy and sustainable. A beautiful place is a place in which people wish to walk, rather than a place that the car helps them to avoid. It is a place in which they enjoy spending time with one another."</p> <p>[P11] The Report identifies three key approaches to improving places, which are in line with the land owners aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village: "Ask for Beauty: We do not see beauty as a cost, to be negotiated away once planning permission has been obtained. It is the benchmark that all new developments should meet. It includes everything that promotes a healthy and happy life, everything that makes a collection of buildings into a place, everything that turns anywhere into somewhere, and nowhere into home. So understood beauty should be an essential condition for the grant of planning permission." Refuse Ugliness: People do not only want beauty in their surroundings. They are repelled by ugliness, which is a social cost that everyone is forced to bear. Ugliness means buildings that are unadaptable, unhealthy and unsightly, and which violate the context in which they are placed. Such buildings destroy the sense of place, undermine the spirit of community, and ensure that we are not at home in our world. Promote Stewardship: Our built environment and our natural environment belong together. Both should be protected and enhanced for the long-term benefit of the communities that depend on them..... New developments should be regenerative, enhancing their environment and adding to the health, sustainability and biodiversity of their context. For too long now we have been exploiting and spoiling our country. The time has come to enhance and care for it instead. Our recommendations are designed to ensure that we pass on to future generations an inheritance at least as good as the one we have received." It is very important to the landowners that the Garden Village creates a legacy to be proud of, which delivers growth and health and well-being benefits for its residents and the wider community, but not at the expense of the environment.</p>	Support for the Garden Village is noted and welcome. The Council will continue to work in partnership with both landowners to ensure that the proposal for the Garden Village meets their aspirations for the environment, health, biodiversity and community leaving a positive legacy for future generations.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF271	Savills (GV Rep)	<p>The opportunities presented by new settlements are addressed within paragraph 72 of the NPPF 2019. In general, support the aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village as set out in section 5.3 of the Draft Local Plan. In particular, paragraph 5.3.3 which states: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland, where residents and employees can easily move by sustainable transport to new community facilities, shops and services. A new railway station and public transport hub will provide sustainable access to the wider area." The Garden City Principles set out in 5.3.7 and 5.3.8 are welcomed and supported. These principles are echoed in those within Chapter 4 of 'Living with Beauty' which identifies the following factors in creating beautiful places: • Townscape • Mixed Use • Affordability • Respect for heritage • Respect for nature • Respect for communities aspirations • Stewardship • Democracy The comments in 5.3.10 and 5.3.11 go to the heart of the landowners aspirations for the site. With specific reference to policy ST3, the landowners support the overarching policy objectives in principle at this stage as set out in A-D. In particular, the references to an 'environmentally-led' development in D. It is suggested that that given the focus on creating an innovative, green community, in order to meet the criteria set out in D 5. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, an early assessment of the current green infrastructure and its spatial inter-relationships should be made. This will enable the optimum planning of corridors between existing and new green areas around which building for houses and employment, with, of course, their own new green areas, can take place. The family is fully supportive of green space. However, they are concerned that the half hectare community woodland (less than half a football pitch) proposed for this plan period is inadequate for the footfall of the residents of the 750 houses also suggested for this plan period. The family look forward to a more substantial and realistic allocation through detailed masterplanning. Wherever possible, additional areas of green space, community woodland and useable open space should be sought and integrated into the design of the Garden Village. As the timescale for the delivery of the Garden Village extends into the future, the policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow for changing technologies which could improve the sustainability of the site. The landowners consider that it is very important that the development facilitates an increase of physical activity and sport amongst its residents as a result of the economic, mental and physical health and well-being and environmental benefits that would be generated. The landowners consider that the World Health Organisation's Global Action Plan on Physical Activity together with the Sport England and local authority equivalent policy documents be consulted to guide development in this respect. Consideration should also be given to the creation of an overarching vision for the Garden Village which reflects the aspirations of the landowners and the Council for the site. The inclusion of land at Morton Hill Farm to create Bassetlaw Garden Village is supported in principle by our clients, The Mason Family, who are committed to working with The Girdham Family and the District Council to create a high quality, low carbon, landscape-led settlement for the future of Bassetlaw. There are likely to be many questions over the design, deliverability and developability of the site that need to be answered over 2020. The scheme is at the early stages but the family are committed to the principles and will contribute fully to further discussions about the delivery of this development.</p>	<p>Support for Policy ST3 is welcome. Further work on the existing green infrastructure network and its connectivity with other uses will need to be undertaken to ensure that the masterplan can be truly landscape led. Further work will be undertaken to determine the extent of appropriate tree coverage on the site, to ensure that provision is appropriate to mitigate the impacts of each phase of development. Flexibility will be built into the policy to ensure that as the development progresses the use of changing technologies can be incorporated into the design of development where appropriate. Healthy place-making is a key element of the Garden Village. The approach taken to creating an active place will be clarified in Policy ST3. Through collaborative working with the landowners and key stakeholders a vision and objectives for the Garden Village will be produced to reflect aspirations for the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF271	Savills (GV Rep)	Bassetlaw Garden Village in the area of Upper Morton indicates there will be further growth in this area beyond 2037 signalling further expansion which will have an impact on Retford and Villages Primary Care Network (PCN). Whilst service and infrastructure includes health facilities it is not specific what is meant by this. Community pharmacy provision is determined under pharmaceutical Regulations and would need an application to be successful. There will clearly be a need for this, so this expressed requirement will need to link into the Council's PNA. Dental facilities are commissioned by NHS England but it remains a dental business decision where to locate their premises. Similarly for optometry. Require ongoing consultation as this plan progresses so that we can support infrastructure development in line with expected need across the wide range of potential primary and community health and care services. Services and Infrastructure identifies: 'This significant new community will be large enough to sustain its own local shops and facilities. Policy ST3 requires a range of community facilities to help meet the day to day needs of its residents and which will have multiple benefits for the surrounding rural area. Sustainable access, including bus connectivity will ensure the existing and new communities are well-integrated, so all are able to benefit from a new Local Centre, health and education facilities and a community hub with associated sports facilities'.	The Council will continue to work with NHS Bassetlaw CCG to ensure the provision of primary and community health facilities meets the identified needs of the development.
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	Anglian Water is generally supportive of the principles for the proposed garden village. 'Landscape, biodiversity and Green Infrastructure': Anglian Water is keen to promote 'Water smart communities' as part of the garden village. They use a more holistic and integrated approach to water management with the aim to: • Enhance liveability by contributing to green streetspaces and high quality open space • Promote the sustainable use of water resources and infrastructure to enable growth • Build resilience against the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events • Contribute to natural capital and biodiversity through multi functional water features • Deliver water efficient homes to reduce household bills and support affordability. Policy ST45 of the Draft plan states that development should meet the optional higher water efficiency standard and water re-use measures should be included in development proposals wherever possible. There is no reference made to the garden village providing for water efficiency and re-use measures as part of the design principles. It is suggested that Policy ST3 be amended: '5. c) Housing standards to promote climate reliance in accordance with Policy ST45; c) d) An integrated approach to water management including water efficiency and re-use measures together with and surface water drainage and multifunctional greenspace which provides environmental and community benefits'	Support for the principle of the Garden Village is welcome. The principles of Water Smart Communities will be incorporated in Policy ST3 and the masterplan framework. The Local Plan should be read as a whole. So Policy ST45 applies to all new development including the garden village. However it is recognised that water re-use measures could be better referenced. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure an integrated approach to water management is required at th garden village.
REF273	Anglian Water	The concept of a garden village is not fully supported by the consultation.it is just a ' sound bite" to soften the terrible proposed over development in the area.	Comments noted.
1197023	Resident	The new Bassetlaw Garden Village is a poorly conceived idea and will be of great detriment not only to the local vicinity but also the wider region. The approach lacks any consideration regarding its feasibility and viability. Disagree with the policy ST3. This policy should be removed in its entirety. It is our position that the main towns in Bassetlaw are capable of supporting the required additional growth. The development of a Garden Village would only serve to detriment these towns, and the district as a whole. The proposal of the plan is to facilitate a new settlement such as the Garden Village with a new railway station, road links and public transport hubs, however, the feasibility, deliverability and cost analysis have not been considered fully. The plan states that public funding for the transport infrastructure is likely to be limited but will be developer funded. It is of our opinion that this is an extremely unrealistic expectation. The timeline for these links to be completed is also imperative, as currently, they may not come to fruition for 20 years. Have a similar view with regards to services for the housing development, all of which would need to be run a considerable distance to reach the site. An appropriately positioned urban extension with these services and transport links already in the local vicinity present a far better alternative. Alternative transport (pedestrian and cycle routes), as well as bus routes, have been considered as part of the Garden Village. However, the proposed location means that very extensive infrastructure work will be required for such routes, with unknown usage given its proposed location. Considering the sustainable position of our client's land this is another unnecessary expense.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF275	Resident	<p>A garden village built from scratch is going to be a hugely expensive enterprise. The new train station even with an infrastructure grant is unlikely to happen and the prospect of it being developer funded is pie in the sky. The only people who will benefit from this would be project are the landowners who stand to make a significant earner. A development of this scale would be better centred around the existing hubs of Retford or Worksop. Garden Villages on this scale are a gift to online traders, not sufficiently large enough to be self sustaining and will hence do nothing to arrest the continued decline of our towns that comes as a consequence of online shopping. Additional development around those towns is required to maintain, rejuvenate and grow the high streets and other associated facilities. There is already infrastructure around the two towns of Retford and Worksop, buses, trains and road network. A village of 700 lifting to 4,000 eventually, perhaps, is not of sufficient size to justify its own facilities, doctors, shops etc. Garden Village people will likely shop online and infrequently travel to Retford or Worksop by car. The regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives. Providing support to the comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield sites, particularly within town centres and at the former power station sites is a key Council Plan objective 14. The proposed site of the New Garden Village is alongside the A1 and will be subject to noise and pollution from that road. Whatever advances there are to be in battery technology and hydrogen fuelled cars it is unlikely that HGV vehicles will be cleaned up so as not to be a concern to Garden Villagers during the life of the project.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>
REF276	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Policy ST3 should be removed from the Local Plan. Disagree that there is the need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the Main Towns are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions, which is a more sustainable option for development. A new Garden Village, totalling some 4,000 homes, within Babworth Parish will immeasurably change the nature of the parish forever. It will become unrecognisable as the most rural and least densely-populated parish in the area, to the most urban parish with only Retford and Worksop having more Dwellings. Such a far-reaching, enormous, single concentration of development should not be "inflicted" on the Parish by building a "garden village" on 216 ha of the parish. It is more important than ever, that development in rural parishes is sustainable and maintains the character of that parish. Although we are supportive of the Local Plan's ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the Garden Village as it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of exiting Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Agree with paragraph 5.3.1 in terms of promoting a step change in economic growth, the delivery of a Garden Village and associated transport hub is not necessary nor suitable to facilitate that step change. Concern in relation to the amount of evidence there is to understand how the development would come forward and how it would be likely to impact the residents of the parish. There is an overwhelming lack of evidence to support the feasibility and viability of the proposed sustainability features required to deliver the Garden Village which will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the very serious risk of simply allocating a large proportion of isolated homes in the open countryside. To support the new Garden Village, the Local Plan proposes a new railway station, road links and public transport hub to enable access to the wider settlements. However, the Local Plan does not propose that infrastructure to be delivered within the plan period or demonstrate how that infrastructure will be delivered. The delivery of new homes through a Garden Village (with or without new transport links) is likely to generate additional car trips into the Main Towns such as Retford as residents will rely on its existing services and facilities. Paragraph 11.1.8 states that public funding for transport infrastructure is likely to be limited and will be largely developer funded. This is not a realistic expectation. The financial viability of creating a new transport hub and train station alongside the Garden Village has not been adequately considered and more sustainable development option is represented by development at</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		the main towns. While the development is taking place, in excess of 20 Years it is will cause massive congestion on the B6420 into Retford which is a very dangerous and congested road at peak times, with a level crossing, sharp corners, flooding areas and difficult junction at Babworth. Traffic noise and pollution will increase on the A1 and for the residents of Ranby Village. The Local Plan sets out that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2016 states the infrastructure requirements for the Garden Village can be “reasonably sought through on site provision and developer contributions” provided that the site is exempt from a CIL charge. A lack of comprehensive consideration for the creation of a new Garden Settlement and the cost of associated infrastructure. If the viability of the scheme changes part way through there may be a number of dwellings that are completely isolated and cut off from any other services adding to pollution and disruption. Not clear what the justification is for a substantial allocation of 216ha of greenfield land for the new Garden Village to support 4,000 new homes over its lifetime.	
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	The Garden Village is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan, the Council’s delivery assumptions for the site must be realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In progressing the Garden Village allocation, it is considered that a robust review of the sites deliverability, including start dates, build out rates and having regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades, should be undertaken to ensure a sound allocation and Plan.	Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.
REF278	Fisher German	There will be huge disruption to the area whilst such an isolated large-scale development is being built on the greenfield site. The traffic problems will be enormous, whilst being built, and afterwards. There are infrastructure problems in your plan. The A1 traffic will be congested and further increased. Ranby village will again be detrimentally affected by the traffic on the A1 in terms of congestion (being able to join the A1), and also the noise and pollution. The A1 is already extremely noisy and an increase in traffic will only increase noise levels. It may become unbearable for us, and other residents to go outside, open windows, or be in certain rooms. By building on such a huge amount of greenfield acreage, the agricultural land is lost, there is less land to absorb the rainfall we experience (which may lead to flooding in other areas), and the environmental impact on the biodiversity is also detrimental. Read the proposals to “offset” this, with some open spaces and trees, but this is not comparable to the established habitats and biodiversity that will be destroyed. It cannot be replaced. This whole area is being developed at a fast pace in terms of industrial developments, and if this carries on, our district will no longer be very rural. The proposed residential developments within our parish will define our rural parish then as urban.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. This will include more information on transport impacts and the mitigation required to address those impacts.
REF279	Resident	Welcome the inclusion of a new railway station at D.4.vii. It will however be important that this is developed as a priority and in advance of occupation of the new homes because it is much easier to motivate residents to use public transport when first moving to a new area than trying to change their travel behaviour from car to public transport when habits have already been established. Firm commitments and funding for the new station and new services will therefore have to be secured early on in the masterplanning process.	Further work will be undertaken in relation to the railway station delivery to inform future policy development.
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	By supporting the concept of this village, the Local Plan must recognise the significant impact it will have both directly and indirectly on small rural villages. It is inevitable and understandable that this village will attract young, working families offering affordable homes. Small rural areas attract developers for larger higher priced housing by their very nature as lack of amenities for families and travelling distance in rural areas are inevitable and go with the character of villages. Therefore a 20% increase in housing of this nature is unlikely to be required. This is not ‘NIMBYism’, it is social fact.	The Local Plan also supports appropriate rural growth. Neighbourhood Planning is an alternative but complementary way for the community to plan their areas and ensure the housing mix is appropriate to place.
1197063	Resident	Support in principle the concept of creating a Garden Village – ‘provided with a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland, where residents and employees can easily move by sustainable transport to new community facilities, jobs and services...’ although the subsequent policy may not do enough to support this aim. Support the principle of a comprehensive masterplan framework supported by a Consultative Group to guide future development.	The Garden Village was at an early stage in January 2020. As the Local Plan evolves the details will become clearer. The design will be landscape led with emphasis on healthy active places where people use public transport, walking and cycling to move around rather than the car for local journeys. Facilities will be located to enable this. A key theme of the Garden Village

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		While the location may be acceptable, the proposed scale and spatial configuration of the proposed allocation, particularly in combination with proposed Policy SEM1, threaten to close the gap between Worksop and Retford creating urban sprawl from Worksop to the A1 and onwards to within 2.5km of Retford. Concerned about the proposed scale of the development, 'at least 4000 new homes over its lifetime', for which there is no clear rationale. The scale of development ought to be influenced by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development while following the green principles espoused; the need to retain Green Gaps and a distinct identity between the Garden Village and the towns of Worksop and Retford; and the housing and economic needs and markets of the district and sub-region. The policy ought to incorporate the explicit requirement of creating a net zero carbon development. The policy ought to incorporate the explicit requirement of delivering a net gain to biodiversity within the development. Part 5(d) commits to provision of 'at least 0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5 thereafter'. This represents less than 1% of the 216ha being promoted for development. We suggest that a much more aspirational figure is required and that this ought to be landscape/masterplan led, linking green infrastructure networks throughout the scheme with larger woodland areas on its margins. Likewise the proposed green infrastructure network comprising 5ha in the plan period and 5ha thereafter ought to be more aspirational (as a minimum the words 'at least' could be included) and that this figure ought to be landscape/urban design led. The proposed site is close to Clumber Park, which is managed by the National Trust, and the Trust supports the aspiration to create/improve cycling and pedestrian links as well as, ideally, a public transport connection.	is delivering the green agenda. Support for energy efficiency, renewable and low carbon technologies is built in. Various other carbon offsetting measures including 30% tree canopy cover will help. 20% biodiversity net gain will be secured, higher than that in the emerging Environment Bill. 40% of the site will be set aside for green infrastructure a significant increase on that proposed originally.
REF282	National Trust	ST3.4 42 5.3.22 Agree with proposals to improve junctions at either end of B6420 Mansfield Road (Apleyhead and Babworth) but consider this road will also need elimination of the railway level crossing and the double bends near Morton to carry the increased traffic generated by the Garden Village and A57 capacity improvements: add to ST49.	Further work will be undertaken through the Transport Assessment for the site to determine the impacts on the level crossings. This would be required to be mitigated accordingly.
REF283	Resident	Makes no sense to be allocating a Garden Village in the rural area to deliver 750 homes in the Plan Period when the existing sustainable small rural villages are already showing a surplus over their projected requirement. New settlements are notoriously difficult to get started, infrastructure heavy and unreliable. They have only succeeded in areas of very high demand and have taken many years to deliver homes. A better strategy would be to increase the level of homes in the smaller settlements so that new permissions can be granted here, making best use of the existing social community and physical infrastructure in those settlements. There is no meaningful table in the Plan for each level of the settlement hierarchy showing the requirement, the commitments and what is left to be found. As the Plan stands it is a highly confusing document that does not convey to Plan users what is to be found where, which is the basic requirement of a Local Plan. Object to ST3 and the Garden Village and propose that the Plan be redrafted to • Omit the two new settlements Cottam and Garden Village • Redistribute the numbers anticipated in the Plan period to the existing settlement hierarchy especially to the smaller rural villages to allow them to grow organically and make the best use of the existing infrastructure and make allocations in the villages to achieve this strategy • Consider an alternative use of the Cottam Power Station Site. Identify new sites that are available in the villages of Rampton and Woodbeck to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF290	JVH Planning	Significant concerns regarding the deliverability of the Garden Village. The policy identifies that a 'Consultative Group' of stakeholders and landholders is to be formed, with a masterplan and SPD for the overall site to be prepared. Whilst not specified in any of the supporting evidence, it is understood that the site is in multiple private landownerships at this time and that the proposals are in their infancy. Supporting text details the extensive infrastructure requirements necessary to deliver the overall scheme, including a new railway station, new access roads and a new public transport hub (these are detailed further in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2020). Query whether these costs have been considered fully as part of the viability work supporting the draft Plan. The Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		<p>(August 2018) appears to take a general approach to development across the draft Plan, rather than looking at the very specific and significant costs and cash flow issues for a new settlement. It states that the approach to abnormal construction costs (including utilities diversions) is “based on generic tests ” and then assumes a generic cost of mitigation of £2,000 per dwelling that are “based on historic evidence of planning obligation contributions over the last five years (excluding Affordable Housing which is factored in separately) the following cost allowances have been adopted in the study ” (page 30). This is substantially short of the real costs of delivering a development of this scale in this location. The Aecom January 2018 publication ‘Garden towns and villages cost model’ suggests that a new garden village in 5,000 residential units on a 350 hectare greenfield site in the South East of England would have construction costs of £53,568 per unit. The very high cost of strategic infrastructure and the impacts on cash flow (which isn’t mentioned in the Council’s evidence), needs to be considered in detail to demonstrate deliverability. A new railway station is proposed, but this is only safeguarded and is not expected to come forward until after 2037. No costs are attributed to this as it outside of the Plan period. Query who will be paying for this and how will it be secured – is there any certainty of deliverability? The interim solution appears to be a bus subsidy, which as set out in the IDP, is estimated to cost around £590/dwelling (paragraph 3.2.12). This cost appears broadly reasonable, but further detail is required to understand what money needs to be paid upfront to secure the service, and the implications this would have on cashflow. There is no detail on what this bus service may look like – is it a conventional bus on non-segregated roads? How regular would it be? The attractiveness of this service is critical to encouraging modal shift for the occupants in this relatively isolated new settlement before 2037. This is fundamental to the success of the allocation. This is supported by the Inspector’s initial findings into the Uttlesford Local Plan (10th January 2020), where in relation to a proposed garden settlement it was concluded that: “44. Whilst appreciating the difficulties in providing a full RTS service from the outset and recognising the role of incremental improvements, in our view, the lack of a RTS until towards the end of the plan period would mean the modal shifts anticipated would not be realised. Moreover, the use of less sustainable modes of travel could have become engrained in the habits of residents living in the homes built within the early phases of the Garden Communities. According to the latest trajectory in ED51 this would be well in excess of 1000 homes.... 46. This being so, there is a danger that the Garden Communities would be served by little more than a conventional, regularly running bus service for a good number of years. This would use the existing road network, which is at times congested and there are concerns that such a bus service would be no quicker, and potentially slower, than travelling by car. It is also unclear to what degree the buses would run on existing roads as opposed to segregated bus lanes or busways and how the latter would be phased in. 47. Buses running on existing unsegregated carriageways, even based on a 10 or 15 minute service, is unlikely to encourage the residents to use their cars less for local journeys, despite this being better than the services that operate in Uttlesford at present. Consider this would be directly at odds with Garden Community Principle 7 which requires integrated and accessible transport systems, with walking, cycling and public transport designed to be the most attractive forms of local transport.” These initial findings are appended to this letter as they are highly relevant for the preparation and soundness of a Local Plan that proposes a new settlement. The ongoing Examination into the North Essex Garden Communities is also relevant, particularly in relation to a deliverable sustainable transport approach. In determining the trajectory for the site, it is considered to be inappropriate to draw direct comparisons between the Garden Village proposal and other large schemes in the District (namely the Harworth Colliery site) which appear to be very different in both scale and site-specific circumstances. The latter site is in single ownership (Harworth Estates) and provides 1,000 dwellings overall (which may increase to 1,300 dwellings) with lesser infrastructure requirements. The Garden Village represents a significantly larger scale scheme with multiple landowners, and it is not clear what formal partnership or agreements are in place. There are also significant infrastructure requirements for the site overall, and there do not appear to be any phasing plans to indicate at what point different items of infrastructure will be required to enable the envisaged</p>	<p>Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District’s housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		development trajectory. There is limited evidence related to deliverability which justifies the trajectory for the Garden Village. This means that this element of the anticipated supply for within the plan period should also be treated with caution. Suggested change: 1. Address the significant concerns in relation to the proposed Garden Village. Further detail is required to demonstrate that it is deliverable and that it can contribute 750 dwellings within the Plan period in a sustainable manner in line with the Garden Community Principles.	
REF291 -	Resident	Makes no sense to be allocating a Garden Village in the rural area to deliver 750 homes in the Plan Period when the existing sustainable small rural villages are already showing a surplus over their projected requirement. New settlements are notoriously difficult to get started, infrastructure heavy and unreliable. They have only succeeded in areas of very high demand and have taken many years to deliver homes. A better strategy would be to increase the level of homes in the smaller settlements so that new permissions can be granted here, making best use of the existing social community and physical infrastructure in those settlements. There is no meaningful table in the Plan for each level of the settlement hierarchy showing the requirement, the commitments and what is left to be found. As the Plan stands it is a highly confusing document that does not convey to Plan users what is to be found where, which is the basic requirement of a Local Plan. It is proposed that the Plan be redrafted to • Omit the two new settlements Cottam and Garden Village • Redistribute the numbers anticipated in the Plan period to the existing settlement hierarchy especially to the smaller rural villages to allow them to grow organically and make the best use of the existing infrastructure and make allocations in the villages to achieve this strategy • Consider an alternative use of the Cottam Power Station Site. Identify new sites that are available in the village of Sutton cum Lound to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF292	JVH Planning	The role that new settlements can provide is acknowledged in the NPPF (paragraph 72). The delivery of new settlements can be challenging and reliance on this site to deliver 750 dwellings from 2027 onwards may be optimistic. Evidence regarding the deliverability of the site is also unclear and the proposal is therefore not justified nor potentially effective and in breach of the tests of soundness. While the New Settlements Addendum demonstrates the suitability of the site in terms of the SA, it does not demonstrate the deliverability of the site during the plan period with a reliance on evidence from Harworth Colliery (a site adjacent to an existing settlement); evidence on land ownership, developer interest, the involvement of Nottinghamshire County Council from a transport perspective (especially important given the new railway station and park & ride) does not appear to be available at present. To prevent an over reliance on delivery from the site and be consistent with national policy (specifically paragraphs 59 of the NPPF regarding the need to significantly (our emphasis) boost the supply of housing and 73 on developability) additional housing allocations should be made to provide a sufficient buffer and ensure that the housing requirement is met.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
1197091	William Davis	<p>To ensure this vision is realised the Garden Village should be developed to the following nationally identified Garden City principles: “generous, accessible, and good quality green and blue infrastructure that promotes health, wellbeing, and quality of life, and promotes opportunities to deliver environmental and biodiversity net gain and enhancements to natural capital.” and ‘Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland’. Given that BDC have to meet significant housing targets, then a BDC led, sustainable development with ambitious habitat creation targets is a bold vision that we are supportive of in principle. Fully understand the need for sustainable development to support economic growth and jobs. It is essential that wildlife is safeguarded during this process if we do not wish to see an impoverished environment. The aim should be to achieve a win-win situation for wildlife and the economy. Not against all development. Work with developers within the county to ensure opportunities are taken to benefit wildlife and create truly sustainable development. Planning must focus on adaptation to protect, restore and create a robust and resilient natural environment which can stand up to the challenges of climate change. The uncertainties of a changing climate are just as relevant for people as they are for wildlife. Well connected, landscape-scale areas for wildlife are good for our mental and physical well-being and the economy. The added benefits of creating, or restoring, wildlife habitats include flood control, pollution control to food production and long-term solutions to climate change impacts. NWT are strong advocates of the need for access to high-quality wildlife-rich open space for the residents of the Garden Village. Note that the proposal includes the retention, enhancement and integration of important hedgerows, woodland and trees on site, an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional greenspace and the provision of at least 0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5ha thereafter. In addition, a multifunctional green infrastructure network comprising 5ha in this plan period, and 5ha thereafter, that connects to the existing, to incorporate publicly accessible open space to meet the standards set out in Policy ST41 is also proposed. Welcome the intention to protect existing habitats and create new woodland and multifunctional greenspace. Proposals should provide targeted and significant Green Infrastructure that maximises biodiversity opportunities and protects and enhances existing ecological features such as wildlife corridors that link to the countryside beyond the site. The creation and enhancement of GI through development must contribute to Biodiversity Action Plans to halt and reverse the decline in priority habitats and species. No Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) or water courses are within the proposed location of the Garden Village which consists largely of intensively managed arable fields. There are boundary hedgerows, which will have some wildlife value. Arable field margins are Habitats of 'principal importance' in England and so every effort should be made to retain and enhance them through the new development. The UK BAP lists of priority species and habitats remain, however, important and valuable reference sources. Notably, they have been used to help draw up statutory lists of priority species and habitats in England, (see NI species and NI habitats lists), as required under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (England). Further information provided about UK BAP priority species and habitats. Local authorities in England and Wales have a key role to play in the conservation of biodiversity and this is now recognised and formalised within Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, where: “Every public body must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity” The location of the Garden Village is likely to be a less damaging option to wildlife when compared, for example, with development of the former Bevercotes Colliery Local Wildlife Site which had been considered previously. Note that the development will be guided by the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan framework facilitated by a Consultative Group. Facilitated by the Council this key delivery mechanism will ensure stakeholder and community buy-in from the outset. Keen to be involved in a project group in order to help shape the plan for the site. The masterplan should be supported by a full Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) so that protected species are properly considered in the planning process and to allow the local planning authority to be in possession of all relevant ecological information when developing the masterplan. The EclA will need to be periodically</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. This includes for green infrastructure both the amount and mix of uses within the network.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		<p>updated due to the phasing of the scheme. Refer to Practical Guides for Creating Successful New Communities Guide 7: Planning for Green and Prosperous Places, TCPA. Living Draft, January 2018. It is stated that Bassetlaw Garden Village will promote a step-change towards active and public transport through a highly legible, attractive and accessible movement network, including a new railway station and integrated public transport hub and will seek to improve opportunities for cycling and pedestrian links between the Garden Village, the surrounding communities, in particular Retford, and over the A1 to natural and heritage assets such as Clumber Park. Hope that our Idle Valley Nature Reserve will become a key destination through the cycle network.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF293 -	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Policy ST3 details the Council will support the delivery of a new Garden Village on 216ha of land adjacent to the A1/A57 Apleyhead Junction. The Framework is clear that local plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change⁹. In this regard it is essential therefore that the expected supply from the Garden Village over the plan period is based on realistic assumptions on lead-in times and delivery rates. It is important that clear evidence is provided to demonstrate that any assumptions that are made within the housing trajectory are demonstrably realistic at this stage, accurately reflecting the challenges associated with the delivery of such sites and their current planning status. This evidence should include Statements of Common Ground between interested parties and appropriate sense checking should also be undertaken against local, regional and national evidence (for example, the information on lead in times and delivery rates from sites contained within Reports such as Lichfields 'Start to Finish' Report; and, Savills Spotlight: Planning and Housing Delivery Report, May 2019). The potential for further slippage from such a scheme will necessitate a flexible approach within the Local Plan's policies to ensure that they are responsive to rapid change and that development needs can be met in full over the plan period. Given the strategic scale and specific nature of the proposal it will be vitally important for the Local Plan to provide a clear contingency against its overall requirement to take into account the fact that such proposals will invariably deliver at a slower rate than originally envisaged when a Local Plan is examined. This can be achieved by including policies that take a responsive and flexible approach to sustainable development at the edge of suitable settlements to ensure that a positive response can be taken where monitoring indicates that the expected delivery from the proposed Garden Village has slipped (see comments on Policy ST2 above). Paragraphs 5.1.34 to 5.1.36 of the Plan summarise the process undertaken through the preparation of the Local Plan to date which has led to the identification of land adjacent to Apleyhead Junction as the preferred location for a Garden Village. As the Council are aware, land at Bevercotes Colliery was previously considered alongside Gamston Airfield as the location for the Garden Village for Bassetlaw. Gladman maintain that Bevercotes Colliery is fully capable of being delivered through the plan as a standalone Priority Regeneration Area. The identification of Bevercotes Colliery as a Priority Regeneration Area will provide further assurance that the long-term housing and employment needs will be delivered during and after the plan period. As outlined in section 6, Bevercotes Colliery can be bought forwards in a manner that positively responds to the local landscape and biodiversity, whilst respecting the existing communities and contributing to the local economy.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Natural England recognises the intention of the proposed garden village to follow the nationally identified garden city principles. Welcome the laudable aims to create a sustainable community with green infrastructure at the heart of the project and the creation of wildlife friendly space between Worksop and Retford. Strong reservations with the location of the village in such close proximity to Clumber Park, part of which is nationally designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The impact of locating a new settlement of up to 4,000 new homes does not appear to have been satisfactorily considered within the local plan documents. Clumber Park covers an area of 1,531ha with the SSSI covering 526ha. The park comprises one of the largest expanses of semi-natural vegetation in Nottinghamshire. It is made up of relict ancient woodland, historic parkland and extensive grass heath with rich invertebrate, bird and bat communities. The origins of the site can be traced back to the Royal Forest of Sherwood. Additional interest is provided by conifer woodland and open water. The SSSI was re-notified and extended in May 1999. Clumber Park SSSI is located 950 metres from the proposed garden village and our main concerns are that the close proximity of an additional large population will increase visitor pressure and reduce air quality on this site which will potentially damage the fragile habitats and species that the SSSI designation protects. Visitor Pressure - Whilst the plan admirably promotes (5.3.2) the use of new cycling and pedestrian links from the garden village to Clumber Park, this facilitation of visitors to the site will increase the pressures detailed below. The intended hope that residents will use the links which will reduce reliance on car transport to the site cannot be relied upon and an increase in vehicle traffic is probable. The SSSI is notified for a number of sensitive habitats and species and a substantial increase in visitor numbers is likely to result in a detrimental effect on these features;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Increase in compaction to soils and vegetation particularly of the lowland heathland, acid grassland and woodlands. · Increase in disturbance to ground flora vegetation · Increase in disturbance to breeding bird assemblages of the woodlands and open water · Increase in disturbance to ground nesting birds (woodlark and nightjar) considered to be of European importance identified within the boundary of the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA). <p>Air Quality - Air quality impacts from car use as well as from the residential and employment /industrial development opportunities will see a change to the current situation, and possibly have a detrimental effect on the sensitive habitats of the SSSI, particularly lowland heathland and acid grassland. Air quality impacts on invertebrates, which Clumber Park is also notified for are not yet fully understood. In addition Apleyhead Junction Site SEM1 is immediately adjacent to Clumber Park. It will have pedestrian and cycle routes linked to the Garden Village to provide employment via sustainable transport. However, due to the proximity and the unpredictable behaviour of the residents who may work here or others commuting in, an increase in traffic to this location will likely result in reductions in air quality and associated impacts on the SSSI notified features. Welcome the provision within the Garden Village of green corridors linked to community woodland which would contribute towards the Sherwood Re-forestation project, however there is no detail about this Project or links to references. At point 5d of the policy wording we note the provision of at least "0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5ha thereafter", whilst this is welcome we are concerned that this may be inadequate given the pressure from users. We would wish to ensure that tree planting creates a biodiverse area of woodland and not a token area of trees.</p>	<p>The potential impact of the Garden Village upon Clumber Park SSSI and the Birklands and Bilhaugh SPA will be assessed through a Recreational impact Assessment. This will be undertaken in partnership with Natural England.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF300 -	Natural England	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 52) acknowledges that; ...the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. Working with the support of their communities local planning authorities should consider whether such opportunities provide the best way achieving sustainable development". The Local Plan seeks to allocate the Bassetlaw Garden Village a site of 216ha as an area of long-term sustainable growth. It is suggested that this Garden Village could deliver up to 4,000 dwellings over its lifetime with a target delivery of 750 dwellings over the plan period. The recent Uttlesford Local Plan Stage 1 Inspectors Report highlights the problems which can be associated with a reliance upon such sites without clear and robust delivery evidence. In the case of Uttlesford three Garden Communities were proposed. The Inspector acknowledged that the Garden Communities would be responsible for the delivery of a large amount of the housing requirement. In considering the Garden Communities the Inspector identified they would not deliver the quantum of housing in the plan period that the Council's trajectory was showing. The Inspector was concerned about the lack of evidence to enable a conclusion to be made that the proposed allocations were sound and that they would deliver sufficient levels of housing over the plan period. In relation to the Bassetlaw Garden Village it is identified by the Local Planning Authority that: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland ...". It is acknowledged that several alternatives were reviewed. Whilst it is concluded that this location has been identified as being more suitable, it is not without its constraints. Furthermore, it appears that the Council has been 'wedded' to the delivery of a Garden Village or Garden Villages without consideration of suitable alternatives, including additional sites within the Main Towns, including Retford. 3.7 In addition, notwithstanding our concerns regarding the assessment of alternatives to a Garden Village, there is significant scope for a slippage in the timetable. Prior to development commencing, post BLP adoption, a significant amount of work is required to overcome the identified constraints, develop the identified required masterplan and appropriate infrastructure. It is, therefore, probable that the timescale identified for delivery could slip leading to an under-delivery in the plan period for this site. Any slippage in the delivery of this key site will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer (see section 4 below). If appropriate the Bassetlaw Garden Village proposal must be founded upon clear and robust evidence together with a realistic delivery timetable. It is on these grounds that our client has significant concerns with the Garden Village.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF304	Pegasus	<p>In supporting the Garden Village, both families see an opportunity to create a legacy for the community that they can be proud of. The families are united by a common belief that any development on their land must embrace the principles set out in the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and, in particular, SDGs 3, 11 and 13. To fulfil those goals, the Garden Village must: (i) be constructed in an environmentally considerate manner; (ii) achieve an ambitious increase in biodiversity in its locality; (iii) support an increase of physical activity levels; and (iv) facilitate low carbon living in the community. involvement in the proposals is underpinned by, and conditional on, fulfilment of these principles and Bassetlaw's commitment to the opportunity to create a truly sustainable and green section of the community. The Local Plan consultation has coincided with the publication of 'Living with Beauty' by the Government's 'Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission' (January 2020). The Commission and the Report highlight the importance of safeguarding beauty, community, history, landscape in our places. The overall aspiration of the Report is supported and in particular, the following comments go to the heart of what is anticipated for the Garden Village: "Many of the things that make settlements beautiful also make them healthy, happy and sustainable. A beautiful place is a place in which people wish to walk, rather than a place that the car helps them to avoid. It is a place in which they enjoy spending time with one another."</p> <p>[P11] The Report identifies three key approaches to improving places, which are in line with the land owners aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village: "Ask for Beauty: We do not see beauty as a cost, to be negotiated away once planning permission has been obtained. It is the benchmark that all new developments should meet. It includes everything that promotes a healthy and happy life, everything that makes a collection of buildings into a place, everything that turns anywhere into somewhere, and nowhere into home. So understood beauty should be an essential condition for the grant of planning permission." Refuse Ugliness: People do not only want beauty in their surroundings. They are repelled by ugliness, which is a social cost that everyone is forced to bear. Ugliness means buildings that are unadaptable, unhealthy and unsightly, and which violate the context in which they are placed. Such buildings destroy the sense of place, undermine the spirit of community, and ensure that we are not at home in our world. Promote Stewardship: Our built environment and our natural environment belong together. Both should be protected and enhanced for the long-term benefit of the communities that depend on them..... New developments should be regenerative, enhancing their environment and adding to the health, sustainability and biodiversity of their context. For too long now we have been exploiting and spoiling our country. The time has come to enhance and care for it instead. Our recommendations are designed to ensure that we pass on to future generations an inheritance at least as good as the one we have received." It is very important to the landowners that the Garden Village creates a legacy to be proud of, which delivers growth and health and well-being benefits for its residents and the wider community, but not at the expense of the environment.</p>	Support for the Garden Village is noted and welcome. The Council will continue to work in partnership with both landowners to ensure that the proposal for the Garden Village meets their aspirations for the environment, health, biodiversity and community leaving a positive legacy for future generations.

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
1197234	Resident	The Proposed railway station will encourage additional parking by the commuters from out of town who have traditionally travelled to Retford or Worksop to catch their trains. How many of the affordable homes proposed will be allocated Housing association / council house dwellings? How many of the sheltered accommodation units for older people proposed will be allocated to Basset Law Housing association / council house dwellings? What does the appropriate contributions towards primary and secondary schools entail, will these schools be definitely be built. The build up of traffic to the schools in Retford will bottleneck at the junction of the B6420 and the A620 road junction. Will the appropriate contributions towards health care facilities guarantee that there will be sufficient medical facilities on the Garden Village site? Can Bassetlaw / Worksop hospital cope with the additional volume of patients? The build up of traffic at the A620 & B6420 junction due to the local school start and end times is horrendous. What does the proposed contribution improvement plans entail to ensure that the traffic there flows smoothly going forward?	At least 20% of homes will be affordable. 10% will be for rent. 20% of the homes will be for older people. In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability.
1197243	Resident	Do not support the concept of a Garden Village. Again, services including healthcare, social care and education should be in place before building. Bassetlaw Hospital will be inadequate to cover the needs of the proposed developments	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan.
1197261	Resident	The development of the Garden Village states that it will introduce 4000 new properties, this is a huge number of houses, and will mean a huge number of residents. If the Garden Village is introduced, this is more countryside and green space which will be lost. The plan also talks about the introduction of a railway station. I assume this will be on the existing Leeds-Lincoln line? I use this line every day to commute between Retford and Sheffield. My journey already takes 45 minutes. The introduction of another station on this line will significantly add to my journey time.	The rail feasibility study shows that an additional station can be accommodated in service delivery on the Lincoln-Sheffield line.
1197263	Resident	Object to the proposed Garden Village. The council has included us (our home and plot of land) in the proposed Garden Village without obtaining our permission to do so. This came to light late yesterday evening at the very last minute consultation held at Ranby Village Hall. Have not offered our land to the Council for the proposed Garden Village. This is privately owned land that is, I repeat, NOT for the council's disposal. We will be located in the middle of the proposed Garden Village. Our water supply comes through the farm where this proposal is. How is the council going to guarantee our water supply? You cannot deprive a family of their basic drinking water and kill us by dehydration. This will have a direct impact on our amenities and the council needs to think carefully before proceeding with this plan. How is the council going to protect our privacy? Currently live in the country, and are not overlooked. Our amenities will again be affected by surrounding us with 4000 houses. The traffic created by 4000 houses will create excessive noise pollution for us. What steps are the council going to take to protect us from this? The neighbourhood's character will be altered, currently being countryside and view from the B6420 will be altered. This will have an impact on the neighbourhood's amenities once again.	The site is in the ownership of two landowners and excudes the land referred to. Existing services that cross the site will be amintained and secured through a legal agreement. Careful design will ensure that amenity is maintained. A Transport Assessment will identify impacts from the development on the road network and identify measures to address those impacts.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF320	A&D Architecture	<p>I am a child living where you are planning to put 4000 houses I do not like this for multiple reasons. My first point that by building more houses here you are destroying the green fields. I do hope you are aware about global warming. But by doing this (building 4000 houses) you are just simply increasing a few problems. 1. you are shorting earth's life, 2. less lives will be able to live - this one I am not too sure on but I am pretty certain that this could happen if you kill out living things. Now I know you are probably thinking that people in the future could do this too and I won't be there to stop this so why am I trying to stop you now. I am doing this for certain reasons: 1. to help the future 2. YOU ARE DESTROYING THE BEAUTIFUL EARTH AND CREATION. The earth isn't here for us to build on and kill nature. No! we came in the process of it's making so if you ask me, we are simply destroying what made us. I don't know about you but that sounds crazy. You are doing it, not me. You are an adult you should know better than me a child. But because you are destroying the countryside with putting 4000 houses here I will have to live in this destroyed world. Please think about where you put houses and stop picking on countryside just because it is easy for you and you don't need to think too hard. My next point sort of carries on from the last. It is about wildlife. Wildlife the creatures, the animals, the cute, the ugly, the young, the old it comes in all sorts of shapes and sizes. Many people don't like animals or creatures (can't blame the ones scared of them I can't say much to that. I am scared of spiders myself. I don't kill them if it is not necessary I release them back into the wildlife. Back to the point). But we can't and shouldn't really kill them, they were here first, we evolved from them. We can ignore them but if you go building 4000 houses around here, you are not going to knock the farmer out of his home, you are going to knock tonnes of wildlife out of homes - they come in all different shapes and sizes from huge birds of prey and foxes to the tiny mice and rats. We have also had grass snake which are protected in our garden who rely on the mice population in the fields to survive and so do the buzzard. We have swallows which are protected and heron and stoat all sorts. Now here's a different view of the problem let's put it this way. Think of baby bunnies being born. 7 years time you have decided to build those amount of number of houses in the countryside. You get to the bit where those little bunnies were born now living. Now imagine that you had lived in one house for most of your life you will have started to have grown to loving this house then without no warning a load of builders come and you have to leave the house you now love - gone and destroyed. You narrowly missing death too, nowhere to live and bring your babies up. You get the image let's move on. Now another reason I don't like this is I love playing in the fields and the byway when it has been raining. This is another point if you build 4000 houses here you will have to make sure that we are not flooded – how will you guarantee to keep me and my family safe from being flooded by building 4000 houses here? My dog also won't be pleased for she loves walking down the byway and getting mucky so do I. You are destroying green fields and happy lives homes (not the homes you are making, the animals homes). Also by doing this you are kinda going against the world of your own. A lot of us are trying to stop polluting the world but by doing all this building in the clean countryside you are polluting the world and no doubt about this. If you build the houses the people living in them will possibly litter and we don't want litter in the country, we are trying to prevent it. Let's move on.</p> <p>I will have to live the rest of my life in this destructed world that you are making in my countryside. Then my children will have to live in it too. It is not pleasant unless you are used to it but I am now a country child. Living in the country is better than living in a town. Never have I got ill since I came to live here, I have been here since I turned 3. I love this place and plead that you stop building on this beautiful open green countryside where I am growing up in. When I got told I was horrified, it is terrible if you knew what it was like you would definitely feel the same way.</p>	The Local Plan uses brownfield land where possible but unfortunately there is not enough to meet housing growth. The environment will be protected and enhanced through development. This will be through ecological assessments for the site.
REF326	Resident	Vehemently do NOT support this policy as it will create many problems of traffic own the B6420 and other issues in a rural area. The Consultation Period should be extended. We lived at Barn Cottage for 24 years and this Policy is totally unwelcome.	A Transport Assessment will identify impacts from the development on the road network and identify measures to address those impacts.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF330	Resident	<p>Despite the requirement to scrub 2 x proposed Garden Villages following the previous consultation, the LPA clings on to the vanity-project-ideal, with an entirely new location. Representing wasted work/local authority resource, considering that the LAA has already identified sufficient land for all housing needs in the district. The retention of the Garden Village ideal is all the more confusing when according to 5.1.8 of the subject consultation:yet the “Functional Cluster Model” is dead. The 2020 Draft Bassetlaw LP has returned to a settlement hierarchy model. Whom will the Apleyhead Garden Village be serving? Ranby?? Another example of how the total reliance on N2D2, has led to this intervention/location. Settlements for whom N2D2 is not relevant (as identified by GL Hearn), are being sacrificed. All previous comments made in connection with the Garden Village proposal apply. That the LPA is upping housing targets intended as regeneration assistance, to prop up a Garden Village, is entirely counter intuitive and fails to deliver Sustainable Development. This submission OBJECTS to Garden Village delivery and to POLICY ST49 (2,3,4). Alongside acknowledgement that electric cars will be instrumental in delivering sustainable transport solutions both during but especially after, the lifetime of the proposed LP, monies allocated to public transport for the Garden Village, should be used to enhance services in existing villages.</p>	<p>The housing targets in the Local Plan are necessary to be consistent with national policy. Unfortunately there is not enough land available to meet housing needs. The Garden Village helps meet those targets. The Local plan and Neighbourhood Planning support appropriate growth in rural villages proportionate to its place.</p>
1197282	Resident	<p>Do not agree with building on the colossal 533 acres of green fields for a “garden village”. I think to call it that is a misnomer. It would not be a village, and by the nature of where it was built, it would not be a “garden”. It will destroy more precious greenfields and countryside, not to mention all the flora and fauna that will be lost. The roads into and around Retford will be clogged up with traffic, as all those residents have to commute everywhere. It will be the same situation with congestion while it is being built, and the A1 will be affected terribly. Don't believe the “train station” plan will come off, and there are 2 stations within close proximity already. I also think that building a separate new town, like to garden village will actually destroy Retford and Worksop, as people will not necessarily visit those town centres. Houses should be built closer to the towns, to support them. The garden village is not sustainable.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF333 -	Resident	<p>The location of this proposal is absolutely unacceptable as it is going to destroy 216 hectares of Greenfield site still being actively farmed. As a result of this proposal farmers will loose their livelihood and home. The local green landscape will be completely destroyed and replaced with housing and industrial estate. This will affect the local's amenities to enjoy the pleasure of countryside living. It is unbelievable that green agricultural land that is currently being actively farmed is going to be converted into a housing estate and industrial estate depriving the future generation of nature and natural wildlife. Preserving a few trees as per Bassetlaw Council's plan is in no way comparison to the wildlife that live here. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Bassetlaw that can be utilised for this purpose. There are protected species like swallows and grass snake that live here and depend on other species such as rabbit and field mice to survive! When we challenged the council at a local consultation meeting on why Greenfield was being used rather than Brownfield, the reply was that it is easier and quicker to put houses up in Greenfield as compared to Brownfield which requires cleaning up. We find this reason completely unacceptable. You are appointed as planner so plan properly and dont find an easy way out, for goodness sake. Currently there is no mains sewage or gas supply in the proposed area. Therefore, more destruction of nature will be required in order to set this up. Chose to live in the country, to be in harmony with nature, for the future generation to understand the balance of this. The council are robbing us of this right and choice we made and are forcing us to live amongst 4000 other homes (and as we understand it industrial area) in a polluted environment with no care for nature or the future generation by bringing destruction to Greenfield and the wildlife that live here. This is not the life future generation want and it is time for planners to understand this. Remember we have not inherited the Earth from our ancestors but have borrowed it from our children. Let us please not destroy the earth we life in for our future generation. As planners we put our hopes and future in your hands. Please don't let us down by destroying the world we live in. Dont destroy the countryside. There are other alternatives to building on non-agricultural land, as planners please engage your brains and dont just look for easy route out. Think about the future, think about your children's future and the future of many generations to come. They will NOT thank you for destroying their countryside and putting up thousands of houses. Don't leave the Earth in a destroyed state for the younger generation. Don't deprive them of greenfield and nature and the right to grown up and enjoy the countryside. Don't be one of the planners that the future generation will be disappointed in!</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates brownfield sites for development but there is not enough brownfield sites available to meet housing needs. Some greenfield land is required. This includes the Garden Village. Impacts on the environment will be identified and mitigated through technical assessments such as ecological assessments to identify impacts on wildlife.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF335 -	Resident	<p>The location of this proposal is absolutely unacceptable as it is going to destroy 216 hectares of Greenfield site still being actively farmed. As a result of this proposal farmers will lose their livelihood and home. The local green landscape will be completely destroyed and replaced with housing and industrial estate. This will affect the local's amenities to enjoy the pleasure of countryside living. It is unbelievable that green agricultural land that is currently being actively farmed is going to be converted into a housing estate and industrial estate depriving the future generation of nature and natural wildlife. Preserving a few trees as per Bassetlaw Council's plan is in no way comparison to the wildlife that live here. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Bassetlaw that can be utilised for this purpose. There are protected species like swallows and grass snake that live here and depend on other species such as rabbit and field mice to survive! When we challenged the council at a local consultation meeting on why Greenfield was being used rather than Brownfield, the reply was that it is easier and quicker to put houses up in Greenfield as compared to Brownfield which requires cleaning up. We find this reason completely unacceptable. You are appointed as planner so plan properly and don't find an easy way out, for goodness sake. Currently there is no mains sewage or gas supply in the proposed area. Therefore, more destruction of nature will be required in order to set this up. We chose to live in the country, to be in harmony with nature, for the future generation to understand the balance of this. The council are robbing us of this right and choice we made and are forcing us to live amongst 4000 other homes (and as we understand it industrial area) in a polluted environment with no care for nature or the future generation by bringing destruction to Greenfield and the wildlife that live here. This is not the life future generation want and it is time for planners to understand this. Remember we have not inherited the Earth from our ancestors but have borrowed it from our children. Let us please not destroy the earth we live in for our future generation. As planners we put our hopes and future in your hands. Please don't let us down by destroying the world we live in. Don't destroy the countryside. There are other alternatives to building on non-agricultural land, as planners please engage your brains and don't just look for easy route out. Think about the future, think about your children's future and the future of many generations to come. They will NOT thank you for destroying their countryside and putting up thousands of houses. Don't leave the Earth in a destroyed state for the younger generation. Don't deprive them of greenfield and nature and the right to grown up and enjoy the countryside. Don't be one of the planners that the future generation will be disappointed in!</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates brownfield sites for development but there is not enough brownfield sites available to meet housing needs. Some greenfield land is required. This includes the Garden Village. Impacts on the environment will be identified and mitigated through technical assessments such as ecological assessments to identify impacts on wildlife.</p>
REF336	Resident	<p>Strongly oppose Policy ST3 setting out the Council's vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. I think that the Garden Village will harm the vitality and viability of Retford town centre and will cause harm to the community of Babworth. The Council's priority should be to enhance existing settlements such as Retford where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which I do not think is viable. In reality, the Garden Village will simply add traffic to Retford's town centre. The allocation of dwellings within Ranby village should be vastly reduced and the Garden Village idea scrapped.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>
REF337	Resident	<p>The infrastructure of the Five Lane Ends junction will see slow traffic for a number of years sitting outside their village on the A1 this is noisy and creates pollution some kind of acoustic barrier would go some way to alleviate this on the North Bound A1 by Elkesley approval and development of this prior to the works on 5 lane ends would go some way to get residents on side.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF338 -	Resident	The objective of a Garden Village is broadly supported, particularly where it can (alongside other strategic objectives) deliver a step change in the regeneration and growth prospects of Bassetlaw. It is important that the Garden Village policies do not inadvertently link the delivery of the new settlement to the adjacent Apleyhead Junction allocation (Policy 9; SEM1). Although the wording of Policy ST3 does not link the two sites, later draft Plan references to Policy SEM1 (see paragraph 6.4.2 of the plan) do infer a degree of interdependency in terms of economic and housing growth. Policy ST3 should not inadvertently place any infrastructure or delivery requirements on the Apleyhead Junction site or create any other interdependency between it and the garden village. Any such requirements could adversely impact on the ability to deliver significant employment development in the short to medium term.	The two sites are separate. But infrastructure work identifies that both will generate impacts on local infrastructure so it is important the impacts are understood cumulatively.
REF345	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>NEW TOWN PROPOSAL It is 8 miles between the centre of Retford and the centre of Worksop. Babworth crossing is 1 mile from Retford. The proposal is to build a residential new Town from Babworth Crossing to 5 lane ends 'Apley Head Junction' The SEM1 proposal is to extend the industrial commercial area at Manton in a continuous area out to Apley Head Junction on the West of the A1, the west side of the A1 access junction from the proposed residential New Town. The proposal would create a residential New Town urban extension. to the East of Apley Head junction with the industrial commercial area attached but running West to Worksop, to create a continuous residential and industrial commercial area stretching from Worksop Manor, Rhodesia and Shireoaks to Babworth crossing. A continuous built up area of over 8 miles. All this on the edge of Clumber Park and the Dukeries. The existing area designated is an attractive wooded agricultural area, more agricultural East of Apley Head junction, but the whole area thinly populated by the odd farm and cottage. Tourism and leisure which tend to be focused on Clumber Park and the Dukeries is likely to be discouraged by the Apley Head proposals. This will be damaging for Bassetlaw as leisure and tourism growth is desirable, and is likely to be achievable. Tourism and leisure has the ability to replace the industrial and commercial jobs where A1 and automation are going to reduce the traditional jobs in that sector that Bassetlaw has attempted to attract. There is a logic in extending the industrial commercial area from Manton, as there are no residents to consider between there and the Apley Head Junction. There is an abundance of industrial and commercial land in Bassetlaw in any case. A lower population below retirement age is envisaged. So there is likely to be lower demand for industrial commercial jobs. More jobs in the tourism and leisure sectors will mean Bassetlaw will not be short of employment opportunities. There is a surplus of proposed employment sites in the Bassetlaw Draft Plan. A lower working age population with growth in the retired non working older population. A large proportion of the employment land is likely not to be required for Bassetlaw jobs, but may provide employment for commuter's traveling into Bassetlaw. There is mention of a railway station, however officers at Nottinghamshire County Council have not been approached. Transport for the North has not been approached, I am a board member there. The support of these public bodies would be needed to take this forward, but British rail would need to agree as they are the body who would have to find the investment needed. I am not aware that they are even aware that a station is to be included in the Bassetlaw draft plan. Even the size envisaged for the projected New Town housing development is unlikely to justify a railway Station at Apley Head, as the road connections are likely to satisfy transport requirements. The demand, in even the large size envisaged will not be sufficient to justify the investment with the demanding infrastructure and improvement programmes in the North, from this government and future governments, in the coming decades. There will be much better investment opportunities and more demanding projects, benefitting larger numbers of people between the existing Towns and cities of the North and upgrading existing stations. It is usually considered acceptable to walk for 20 minutes or more to a train station for commuting purposes and regular use. Accepting this would make a lot more land along the Western side of Worksop available and useful, around the Western Side of Worksop, and Rhodesia, and there is already a Western by pass relief road in existence there providing adequate vehicular capacity and access. Access to Nottingham and the Derbyshire small towns can be obtained by rail from Worksop and the Shireoaks station. Development and improvement of the existing rail station at Shireoaks has the greatest probability of success, simply because it already exists. If there was a</p>	The evidence shows that a high number of jobs is expected over the plan period and this needs to be balanced with the number of dwellings delivered. This is a requirement of national policy. A governance structure is in place with in principle support of key stakeholders.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
		will to locate more people in the future to the West of Worksop , the apley Head New Town would be unlikely to be needed in the timescale envisaged and linked to the draft plan. The West of Worksop has the advantages of easy access to health facilities at Bassetlaw hospital and easy access to Doncaster and Sheffield hospitals. The station provides easy access to Sheffield and the cities of the North by rail for communities and business travellers. The Apley Head New Town is proposed in any case as overspill for Sheffield City Region. There was an understanding that Bassetlaw would take the influx. If this Sheffield based influx were to be removed from the building demand it would be seen that there would be no requirement for the Apley Head New Town. The projected building requirements are projected to provide a wide margin of additional homes, above the projected population generated requirements. An element of environmental luxury is proposed for the Apley Head Newtown, and this is usual with Bassetlaw planners to provide such envious conditions for people moving into Bassetlaw and yet leave the local residents in Bassetlaw permanently deprived. This can be seen in the way planning permissions are being granted in East Markham for instance where the 20% increase in planning permissions has been granted, the cap exceeded, in developments out of character with that previous garden village, on Beckland hill and Mark Lane for instance. This is an urban extension in practice. The proposal will fragment country areas	
REF347	NJL Consulting	Map of National Grid assets at the Garden Village provided.	Noted.
REF361 -	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	For forty years I have lived on the 's' bend on the B6420 and it has always been an extremely dangerous bend with a great many cars ending up in my garden/ditch every year. Another issue is with reagrds to my nursery entrance which is situated 250 metres on from the railway crossing. A suggestion has been made that there may be a flyover over the railway crossing and my concern would be how this would impact my business.	A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.
REF368 -	National Grid	Support for the efforts of Bassetlaw DC to produce a Local Plan and SA. Believe that the Garden Village (ST3) are excellent ideas.	Support noted and welcome.
REF372	Morton Nurseries	In recent years, upwards of a dozen significant schemes have been granted planning permission on sites in and around Retford. The inevitable result has been to put pressure on the infrastructure to the point that services and facilities such as schools, medical services, traffic, parking, drainage etc....have been stretched to the limit. Further development on a large scale in Retford would aggravate the situation referenced to above, therefore we support the proposal to develop Morton.	Support noted and welcome.
REF377 -	Resident	While receiving the need for homes – particularly affordable homes and social housing, concerned about the scale of the Garden Village proposal. A potential increase of around 4000 homes without supporting infrastructure will have a huge impact within the immediate locality. What is a green and pleasant rural environment will have gone forever. I am not sure that it is a good idea. Quality of life is a crude expression but it means a great deal. The countryside is a strategic reality in that ideal.	The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF383	Resident	Yet more housing built near to very busy motorway causing health risks from traffic fumes. The new development opposite Westmoor added to the village will actually join the outskirts of Worksop together making a large town. The junction of Mansfield Road and the A620 at Babworth is too small for the increasing traffic and needs a roundabout. Housing density too high.	A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF402	Resident	Against this proposal. Too big. Simply way too big. Too many houses in a rural area in one place The disruption will cast an incredibly long period. The traffic is lowering the quality of life already before and to 4000 extra homes and industrial area is included! Talk of a new train station is folly. It can only detract from Worksop and Retfords existing stations over a short way either side. Why not put money into those two stations. Also many would drive to Retford station for more choice of destination from there. Also no one would take a train to Retford itself because of the distance into town so the very concept would fail. More car journeys into Retford would be taken. The road network and particularly junctions (already highly congested) would set a huge unsustainable increase in traffic. Why not put money into smaller more acceptable developments and more environment. Why not develop the centre of Retford Town to help the struggling high street. There are many ageing sites where homes can be built – even above the areas etc...Get people back into towns, not outside. The A1 is an immensely busy road when it gets blocked and congested which it regularly does. The traffic pull of around this junction (5 lane ends) and Blyth, and Elkesley and block all the surrounding roads with this site of proposed development there would be a dreadful standstill and road blocks and ques. It would inherently change the fabric of the surrounding countryside. With Blyth and Babworth and Morton industrial areas and including Retford and Worksop industrial developments not at capacity, is another large industrial area really needed or desired. Years of disturbance with development etc... would seem never ending for a wide community.	The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. Brownfield sites are identified in the Plan but there are not enough available to meet needs. Some greenfield sites are required.
REF403	Resident	Oppose the building of the garden village. As the owner of Babworth rescue kennels the village will be on our doorstep. Anyone living near will be subject to our dogs barking constantly day and night. This will lead to complaints to the Council who will no doubt put a noise abatement order on us or close us down. Been here for 18 years and moved to this location so the dogs would not be a problem to any near neighbours so putting an entire village next door is beyond comprehension. The loss of farming land that has been farmed for generations. Loss of habitat for the birds and wild animals. Mansfield Road is already a very heavy traffic road with a village of this size the increase in traffic would be unbearable. The entire road has no footpaths for pedestrians to walk so this in itself is a danger to anyone living in the village. Since moving here we have already seen our property decrease in value due to now being surrounded by solar farms and our view from every window is panels and now you want to put an entire village on our doorstep.	Appropriate measures such as use of green infrastructure, and the location of dwellings will be built into the design to ensure that the existing business is not affected.
REF406	Resident	Loss of arable land therefore drainage and food production. Roads wholly unsuitable not maintained or wide enough Threat to BARK dog rescue from new residents complaints Drainage/sewer waste from where to where? Public Transport – railway? But what about buses? How will you staff a public health centre and at what stage. Retford GPs are at limit. What facilities are planned for adolescents? What proportion of the housing are meant for first time buyers and +55s What services will be available e.g. gas, water. What are quality employment surely not more sandwich factories? Why will electric cars minimise flood risk?	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. Brownfield sites are identified in the Plan but there are not enough available to meet needs. Some greenfield sites are required.
REF408	Resident	1. All residents will be complaining about dogs barking and noise from the rescue. 2. We moved here so dogs wouldn't bother people with noise. 3. Fireworks come November/New Year will scare already scared animals. 4. Road is not suitable for an increase of traffic 5. Kids will try to upset dogs from the other side of the tracks when bored. 6. You've already wrecked the area with thousands of solar panels. 7. Destroying good farm land 8. We have been here 18 years and employ 4 staff on full time wages caring for abused animals. You have wrecked our view from our house don't allow this on good farm land like you did the solar farms for a back pocket donation which never reached anyone who was affected by your decision to allow these solar farms.	Appropriate measures such as use of green infrastructure, and the location of dwellings will be built into the design to ensure that the existing business is not affected.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village		
REF409	Resident	Cannot see it being beneficial to Retford area as there are no industries left "no jobs" not enough medical positions to support such an expanse of housing. Traffic will be a problem roads at present are not sufficient for the amount of vehicles. All the industries that were in the Retford area have gone and housing estates built on there.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. The Local Plan is providing for 11.11ha of employment land in Retford to local jobs needs.
REF418	Resident	A great idea but why so near the A1, properties were compulsory purchased approximately 23 years ago as the A1 was to be widened. The A1 must be widened at some point so plans should reflect this.	Further discussions with Highways England will determine the extent of any land required.
REF425	Resident	Do not support. The requirement for housing is understood, this however appears very poorly considered with no understanding of the costs involved in this proposal. It comes across as easy solutions to the problem on paper. To be so close to Retford (and to some degree Worksop) but too far to easily access them seems a problem waiting to happen. The proposed train station will cost millions and is restricted in times. It is also an inconvenient line. This will result in people choosing to drive which will strain roads/traffic/parking. Shops etc will bring people away from the town centre. This area of land is also very good for growing crops despite its current classification. Better locations are available.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period.
REF480 -	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	4) The site at Morton seems to have a credible transport plan and will be able to sustain a community (train station, and close to major road network which limits the impact although doesn't negate it). Have concerns that there appears to be no firm commitment to when these crucial infrastructure projects would take place (accept BDC has Ltd scope)	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. In terms of infrastructure provision that will be dealt with through the master plan and subsequent planning applications and negotiations.
REF484 -	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	It is assumed that the transport hub will be on the site of the former Chequerhouse station, which should become the site for a garden village station.	It will be within the vicinity of the previous station. The transport hub will be located at an appropriate position on the railway line following consultation with Network Rail.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST04 -Worksop	Central Area		
1189777	Resident	Delighted with, and fully support A6. Full support B and would want to be consulted and contribute to the preparation of the Worksop Central Area Development Plan Document.	Support noted and welcome.
1192494	Resident	Policy ST4 is welcomed. Would be interested to see the Worksop Central Area Development Plan when produced. The plan, once approved should drive activity and regular updates provided to confirm progress against plan. No new retail development should be permitted outside zone 3 unless it is specifically designed to serve the identified needs of the very local communities.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST04 -Worksop	Central Area		
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>Chesterfield Canal flows through the centre of Worksop, and provides good access for residents and visitors to the wider Green Infrastructure network through the use of our towpaths. The canal environment also offers opportunities to encourage tourism, through the focus on heritage assets associated with the canal corridor and from the use of leisure resources connected with the use of the canal. For example, the canal is used by leisure craft. Such use contributes to the local leisure and visitor economy of the area. It can also assist in animating waterside spaces, and providing a more attractive setting for existing and proposed development. To ensure that the Plan is effective in maximising the benefits of the canal, it is essential that policy is provided to provide guidance and certainty to developers and decision makers over how waterfront spaces should be incorporated into new development. Policy ST4 (part A) should be expanded to include to include relevant points as to how development could maximise benefits alongside the waterway. Measures include ensuring development integrates with the waterway; ensuring development is designed to improve access to, along and from the waterway; improvements to wayfinding to the canal from the wider town centre and ensuring development optimises natural surveillance of the waterway. Do not believe that policy ST4 is suitably precise to fully cover the matters needed to ensure effective waterside development, which are very important to ensuring that future development along the Chesterfield Canal, and other waterspaces, maximises the potential regeneration benefits that could be brought by waterfront development. Reference is given towards the development of a Central Worksop Development Plan Document (DPD). A DPD could provide greater certainty for developers and decision makers in supporting the regeneration of the Town Centre. This provides a unique opportunity to help guide the redevelopment of key sites in proximity to the canal, which could help to ensure that the potential benefits of the canal to the town are maximised. Welcome the opportunity to comment upon the DPD as and when it is developed. Paragraph 5.4.9 makes referent to ourselves as “the Rivers and Canal Trust”. For clarity, we advise that this should be amended to read “The Canal and River Trust”.</p>	<p>Policy ST4 provides the strategic framework to facilitate the regeneration of the Central Area. The policy is clear that the detail will be set out in a separate DPD, which is the more appropriate document to address the detail identified. However, to ensure Policy ST4 provides an appropriate framework for the DPD reference will be made in Policy ST4 to access to the Canal and wayfinding throughout the area.</p>
REF140	Resident	<p>The thing I think needs improving in this plan, is bringing our town centres back to life. But the only way this will happen is if you provide ample free parking in town centres. Its now £1 per hour to park while you shop in Retford how do you expect shops to survive when Amazon is cheaper and will deliver free to my door next day, 7 days a week. Do not suggest using public transport to get into town there are 3 buses a week all on Thursday in our area.</p>	<p>This is not a planning matter.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent is supportive of the general principles of the policy would note that for bullet point 4 – 6: Identify the need to consider high quality design, but does not provide any clarify about what is defined as high quality. It is recommended that key design considerations such as Water Efficiency, Drainage Hierarchy, SuDS and Blue Green infrastructure area specifically mentioned to improve clarity and ensure delivery of the plan’s objectives (see comments to Policy ST3). Worksop is situated within a groundwater Source Protection Zone, including some areas of the settlement being defined as Zones 1, 2 and 3. For any development in an area covered by Zone 3 recommend that the comments provided in the Protection of Groundwater sources are followed, where a site is identified as falling in a SPZ 1 or 2, recommend that further consultation with STW is undertaken to understand the development proposed and how best to protect the Groundwater Source.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.2.4 states that several policies may be relevant to any proposed development - therefore the document should be read as a whole rather than considering policies in isolation. Policy ST45: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation refers to water efficiency standards and Policy ST32 Design Quality covers design considerations for blue/green infrastructure. However, for clarity and to provide a comprehensive framework for the DPD Policy ST4 will be amended to include a criteria relating to climate change mitigation/adaptation and another requiring that all new development should make provision for appropriate infrastructure. The DPD will ensure that the guidance for Groundwater Source Protection Zones are reflected appropriately.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Policy ST4, A, Part 7 should include reference to public transport and public transport facilities.</p>	<p>Improved access and connectivity of public transport in the Central Area is essential to the development of a framework for the area. Policy ST4 will be changed accordingly.</p>
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	<p>It seems that the Local Plan has not fully investigated the sorely needed development of our local towns (Retford and Worksop) with a view to driving business and finance to our High Streets and to support local businesses. Whilst the Local Plan talks about promoting healthy living and reducing carbon emissions, struggle to comprehend cycling into Retford or Worksop on the A620. With the increased proposed</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Transport Study Part 2 considers the transport impacts of the development proposed by the Local Plan on the existing transport infrastructure, and identifies mitigation where appropriate. Policy ST50 recognises the importance of protecting existing cycling routes/facilities</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST04 -Worksop	Central Area		
		dwelling in the Garden Village and Ranby alone, there is absolutely no consideration of the increased number of cars which will pack the surrounding roads and cause significant risk to anyone who wishes to embark on a 'cleaner' lifestyle. Ask whether the development of our beautiful market towns has had serious consideration, thought and planning.	and connection to and extension of these where appropriate. Policy ST4 requires that cycle connectivity through the area to be improved.
1197262	Resident	Worksop needs regeneration - in it's present state nobody would want to live here anyway - every entrance into town has rundown, empty properties and the town looks so shabby and tired, an absolute disgrace. Much within a few yards of BDC's own building, and owned by BDC	Support noted and welcome.
REF350	Indigo Planning	Policy ST4 goes on to state that the Council will support development proposals in the WCA where they meet a number of criteria including amongst others where they "introduce a range of complementary and compatible land uses, such as high quality residential, recreational, commercial, leisure, cultural, retail and temporary uses to support the diversification and regeneration of the Area". Whilst support the regeneration of the WCA including the town centre, concerned that Policy ST4 appears to support retail uses across the whole of the WCA including in areas outside the town centre. For example, in Delivery Zone 1, Delivery Zone 2, Delivery Zone 4 and Delivery Zone 5 which are either all located or partly located outside the town centre boundary. Consider that the currently worded Policy ST4 is contrary to NPPF paragraphs 86 and 87 which require retail uses to be located in town centres unless it can be demonstrated that there are no suitable or available sites either within or on the edge of the town centre. There is a strong risk that allowing retail proposals (especially larger scale ones) outside Worksop town centre will undermine the Council's strategy to regenerate and enhance the town centre. Request that Policy ST4 is amended in accordance with the NPPF as follows: "3. introduce a range of complementary and compatible land uses, such as high quality residential, recreational, commercial, leisure, cultural, retail and temporary uses to support the diversification and regeneration of the Area subject to the sequential and impact assessment as set out in Policy ST13 if proposing a main town centre use outside of the designated town centre."	Paragraph 1.2.4 states that several policies may be relevant to any proposed development - therefore the document should be read as a whole rather than considering policies in isolation. On that basis Policy ST13 provides the policy framework for the assessment of retail applications in the District. In addition the DPD would provide further detail about the mix of land uses in each zone. However, for clarity Policy ST4 3 will be amended slightly to ensure retail development is appropriate to its location.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST04 -Workshop	Central Area		
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	<p>Section 5.4.1 states: 'The regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives. Providing support to the comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield sites, particularly within town centres and at the former power station sites is a key Council Plan objective14.' Note in the Appendix that the following definition is provided for Brownfield Land. It appears to have been taken from the NPPF. "Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including land within the structures curtilage. This excludes land occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal; land in built up areas, such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape." Support proposals for re-use of previously developed land outside development boundaries where it will result in the restoration or natural regeneration of the site e.g. sustainable wetlands. Feel there should be a presumption against development of brown field land for other types of development, where it has already developed significant nature conservation interest. Often previously developed land that has been left for some years will have developed significant biodiversity value. Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land (formally called post- industrial sites) Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 Section 41: Habitats of Principal Importance in England. In all likelihood responders to the Draft Plan will indicate a strong preference for the redevelopment of brownfield sites rather than greenfield. This is understandable, because impacts on previously undeveloped land will always appear greater. Brownfield habitats however, (particularly early successional sites), can be important biodiversity resources. There is increasing development pressure on brownfield sites and to ensure sustainability every effort should be made to retain and/or recreate this habitat within a site. Acknowledge that the re-use of previously developed land for new development makes a major contribution to sustainable development by reducing the amount of undeveloped land that needs to be used. Where such sites have significant biodiversity interest of recognised local importance, local planning authorities, together with developers, should aim to retain this interest or incorporate it into any development of the site. There needs to be a criterion based policy to assess the suitability of previously developed land as appropriate and sustainable. Assess the biodiversity of the site through a desktop study of wildlife sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation/Local Wildlife Sites) and protected species, followed by a rigorous ecological assessment of the site.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.2.4 states that several policies may be relevant to any proposed development - therefore the document should be read as a whole rather than considering policies in isolation. On that basis Policy ST1: Spatial Strategy addresses the issue of re-use of previously developed land across the District. Policy ST1 and paragraph 5.1.4 of the supporting text will be amended to better align with the principle of the NPPF that requires land to be allocated with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework and other relevant legislation.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
1175882	Resident	<p>Raise concern over the ability of the rural infrastructure to handle a "large rural development" - This description is also used to describe Tuxford and Blyth. Treswell and Leverton would struggle to accommodate the traffic without a new route to Retford, which would be the nearest town. Suggest some though required around roads. New garden village next to A1 makes complete sense, but Cottam will need some planning - The trunk road avoids the villages which is fine for wagon traffic off the A1 but people living there once all complete will be travelling to Retford and the roads aren't geared up to this in my opinion.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
			plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1176658	Resident	Badly polluted site , polluted soil , asbestos & waste, also close to Live gas Power station, & a large Gas supply pipe,Electrical switch gear,not really the place to bring up children.also its an area of low or no development being outside any village	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1177309	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Support the redevelopment of the Cottam Power Station site but am concerned that the infrastructure requirements don't go far enough. Most of the villages in the east of the district are accessed through other villages. This means traffic volumes are increasing year on year, without appropriate investment. To make this part of the district "developable", there needs to be major upgrades to Laneham Road and/or the creation of a new road that serves Treswell, Rampton, Cottam, the Levertons, Woodbeck and Laneham. Infrastructure planning also needs to consider the likely redevelopment of West Burton during the plan period. Coupled with Cottam /High Marnham redevelopment, this is likely to lead to more north-south traffic in the eastern part of the district, and we need to prepare for this. It will ultimately help to rebalance the district away from the Worksop / Retford /Harworth & Bircotes monopoly on resources which is to be encouraged – but it must be done in the right way and with a strong commitment to enhancing access beyond the current road network which already has limitations.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site including from traffic can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1183729	Resident	The development of this site, initially 450 dwellings and thereafter 1150, will completely destroy this rural aspect of the River Trent. Object to this development based on the following: Light pollution and noise from this new village which would be set in the countryside. How do you envisage Torksey Street within this plan - currently used by dog walkers, horse riders and walkers. Building on flood zones - don't Councils ever learn! Adjacent to LNR - the impact from dogs walking on this valuable site has not been assessed. 450 dwellings equates to minimum of 100 dogs (based on UK figures). Add to this cat population and the effect on the bird population. Where are these people going to work? Lincoln, Doncaster, Newark. Villages like Rampton and Tresswell would be used as shortcuts to main roads. Farm traffic is a local part of this road system, not ideal from a traffic perspective. I moved here with cattle in the meadow behind my home and limited light, noise, traffic etc. If I wanted to live in sight of a housing estate I would have moved near Retford. Councils should develop redundant areas of towns for homes, close to where people can work.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1184447	Resident	in regard to cottam power station,i think it ill conceived ill thought out and will create a total nightmare for the surrounding villages. The roads now are not fit for purpose,i shudder to think what it will be like if it comes to pass. How are you going to police it by the way you can't do that now. whoever dreamed this up is certainly not living in this area	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
			detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
REF009	Resident	Really hope this will happen it will make such a difference to our villages especially Cottam it's such a scruffy village now, be so lovely to have lovely houses and not cottam chimneys.	Support noted and welcome.
REF013	Resident	<p>5:4:13 “-providing the services and facilities which - are lacking in this part of the District for many years. This is a massive insult to the local communities, the Council have deliberately refused development in the local area saying “it is unsustainable”. The local area has become stagnating dormitory villages, why the sudden change? Disappointed with the way this proposed development has been dropped on the local area. No objection to building new houses but why does it have to be so concentrated in one place. This development is about as far away from Retford as you can possibly get. Over the years landowners and local residents have made countless requests for sympathetic infill and generic growth in the area. Only a few have passed with the majority being turned down. It may be hindsight but had all or most of those requests been approved there may not have been this rush to meet government housing quotas now. A few years ago applied for a planning pre-application on the field adjacent to our house, it cost us in the region of £500.00 to be told “the development was unsustainable”. I asked the planning officer “did he visit our site?” He wouldn’t answer the question, it led me to believe he never visited our site and we paid £500.00 for the privilege, how can a desk driven decision be acceptable? In another case a planning application was made by the resident living next door to Sundown Adventureland. The resident appealed the planning refusal, at appeal he was refused saying “there were no footpaths from his house to Rampton village, and as a result he would need a car to go to the local shop. How galling is that when there are thousands of car journeys made to Sundown Adventureland every year, is one car more or less going to make so much of a difference? 3b) makes reference to a convenience store of up to 500²m, (Aldi store in Retford is in the region of 1,500²m). Traditionally convenience stores usually charge RRP which can be 25% or more above “high street” prices. There is no real incentive for residents to shop local. “The Plan” doesn’t mention any more shops in the later phase(s)? How will residents get their weekly/monthly “big shop”? If only one resident does their “big shop” by car it makes a mockery of the decision metered out to the resident next to Sundown. In light of this that decision should be overturned. If this involves additional cost to the applicant it should be waived as a gesture of good will.</p>	National planning policy sets the approach to housing delivery and this continues to change so that each area contributes to the Government's national housebuilding targets. The Local Plan must respond positively to national policy. The proposed shop was intended to be used for local everyday needs and not to cater for a large shopping trip.
REF013	Resident	<p>As a member of the Treswell with Cottam community concerned about the ramifications for our Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The Government says “Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided, and grant planning permission for the new buildings they want to see go ahead. Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to plan for the types of development to meet their community’s needs and where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area”. Our NDP encompasses Treswell Village, Cottam Village, the immediate area in-between and the former Cottam Power Station Site. The former Cottam Power Station Site has been of concern since its closure. Now it appears there is no shared vision. Have usurped our NDP for us to determine our neighbourhood and the shape and development of growth in our local area. No mention of the River Trent being used for tourism and/or leisure in a possible “Burton Waters type development”?</p> <p>5:4:17 “Use of green infrastructure will ensure the continued separation of the site from the villages of Rampton and Cottam ensuring their individual character distinctiveness and identities are protected” When looking at the area outlined in red it is clear that the western boundary of the development abuts All Saints Church Rampton, Torksey Road. What is the proposed area and composition of this green infrastructure, what is the timescale for it to become mature? Also applies to the north/north western aspects facing</p>	All of the neighbourhood plans in Bassetlaw need to be in general alignment with the planning strategies that sit above them, those being the Core Strategy / Bassetlaw Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst the Cottam Power Station site is a significant feature in Treswell and Cottam Parish it is appropriate that its future is being managed in the first instance through the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The site is ‘strategic’ - it has significance beyond the local area and the size of the site is significant, exceeding other potential development sites in Bassetlaw. The site straddles two parishes, and abuts others, many of which are also producing neighbourhood plans. This means that the Local Plan is the most effective vehicle to manage the potential future uses of this site, it having the potential to address these various complexities in a comprehensive manner. Neighbourhood plans provide an invaluable means to address the fine details of the local area, they are unable to influence issues beyond their boundaries. This does not mean that neighbourhood plans will not have a role to play. The made Treswell with Cottam Neighbourhood Plan 2019, did not address Cottam Power Station directly in its policies, as the site was still active as a power station at the time. The current work to review the Neighbourhood Plan provides a useful opportunity to update

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>Welcome consideration given to this site, which should help to provide certainty to future developers and decision makers with regards to how this large brownfield site will be brought back into use following its use as a power station. Due to the former use of the site and its proximity to the River Trent and Local Wildlife Sites, it is important that any redevelopment of the site seeks to fully remediate the site and prevent any contamination towards the nearby watercourse. Welcome reference towards the need for remediation and protection of the watercourse to ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 170. Recommend that consideration is given towards the incorporation of waterborne freight to deliver construction materials and aggregates to site. The redevelopment of the site would require the importation of a significant amount of construction material and aggregates to site. The River Trent forms a direct route to the Humber Ports (and marine sourced aggregate) which could be provided to the location without the need for HGV traffic. The use of the waterway for the transportation of waterborne freight, especially bulk materials and 0 of sustainable transport which can help in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion on the local highway network. The Trent is identified by the Trust as a Freight waterway, capable of handling waterborne freight. Efforts to mitigate against the adverse impacts of traffic are promoted by NPPF paragraph 102 and in the case of larger loads, is the governments water preferred policy for the movement of abnormal loads. Correspondence from the Department for Transport to PINS highlights the policy position for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads by water, and the advisory role of Highways England. https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/wpp_letter.pdf NPPF Paragraph 148 highlights that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. Waterborne freight can help accord with this aim, as carbon emissions by water are demonstrably lower when compared to other forms of transit, such as road transport. Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA), using a case study of the transport of steel by water, highlights that carbon emissions of transport by water can be 45% lower than that of comparative transport by road. http://www.cboa.org.uk/downloads/environmental_impact_report.pdf Request that the policy wording and/or explanatory text is expanded to ensure that future consideration is given to the use of the River Trent to transport construction materials to the site (and to export any waste materials from the site). This could be undertaken through the expansion of part 4 (Transport and Movement) of the policy with the following suggested text: "b) Consideration should be given towards opportunities to utilise the River Trent for the transportation of construction and waste materials to and from the site during redevelopment.</p>	Consideration of the use of the River Trent for transportation, for freight and construction materials will be added to the supporting text.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF117	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>Like to know more about the proposed housing and whether it will fit within Rampton & Woodbeck Neighborhood Plan, and what infrastructure is planned to support such a large development. The parish boundary between Rampton and Cottam, half of the power station itself is within Rampton Parish and with the bottom three and a half cooling towers with our parish, therefore any homes built on our side of the boundary line, regardless of the name of the new settlement or where the access is from, is within our parish and the precept, any cil money, s106 money from will be to Rampton & Woodbeck parish council for those homes and not to Treswell Parish Council, only those homes built north of the boundary line will be to Treswell with Cottam Parish, how many of the initial 450 homes and how many of the total 1650 homes will be within our parish and how many will be within Treswell With Cottam parish? Why has there been no detail around the sort of houses that would be built, detached, bungalows, semi's, social and numbers of those proposed. Why is there no clear definition to where the houses will be, are they only on the former cottam site itself rather than the surrounding farmland owned by edf. Would the train line be used and a station opened so people can travel by rail from there. How many drs spaces will be created in local surgeries or will a new drs be built. Will a community centre be built. Will there be shops and a village green? Would the local communities of Treswell/Rampton etc be allowed to say the design and layout of the community as it is split into both parishes? Why is this allowed in addition to the housing allocated in the Treswell and Rampton neighbourhood plans. What flood protection is there will there be? How will access to the Seymour drain be garrenteed for the local drainage board. Wont the houses be surrounded by pylons, a grid connection and the Uniper Gas Power Station in the middle of the development, or is the Gas station closing in the next 15 year too? Are you aware of badgers and gt chrested newts in the pond areas around the former site and will they be protected. Why does it say 1200 more homes thereafter with no defined timescale for the build. How much S106 money will it generate for Treswell and Rampton Parishes. How much CIL money will it generate for Treswell & Rampton Parishes and is it expected that the parish councils provide playparks, a community centre and other parish facilities or will Bassetlaw provide these?</p>	<p>The regeneration of the Cottam Power Station site is recognised as an important but longer-term proposal for the District. Details about what will be delivered on the site are not yet fully developed, and the role of the Bassetlaw Local Plan is to provide a broad framework to guide this going forward. Key to this will be a masterplan for the site, to be produced by the developers and agreed by the Council, which will provide greater detail about what is proposed, and supported by relevant evidence. This is a sizeable, strategic site that will likely have impacts beyond the immediate local area. As such, the evidence to support any proposals will draw upon a similar geography but also to acknowledge the immediate context of the site, including the surrounding parishes and their settlements, and how any proposals seek to respond to this. The contents of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, alongside the neighbourhood plans of other neighbouring parishes, should provide invaluable points of reference to this effect, alongside broader evidence base studies.</p>
REF117	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>Have you consulted with both Anglian Water and with Severn Trent as a place bigger than Tuxford is now, will need its own sewage works and may need a small water works or an upgrade with a booster station from the nearby works. Where will all the people work? as no extra jobs are being created. The plan is so vague and lacking in detail, several people find it hard to know what to object to and what to support. Will the design, and style of homes be consistent with the types of homes that are wanted and dictated within our Neighbourhood Plan. Will any of the homes be built on farmland currently owned by EDF or will it all be just on the existing power station site. What is the lifespan of the Uniper Gas Power Station at Cottam? Are the homes to be built around this or is the gas station going to Before it entered decommissioning, the Cottam Power Station Manager stated that the future of the site was to include the largest batter storage device in the UK to deal with peaks and troughs on the national grid, is this still taking place and having homes built around it? Do you have any plans to force the Highways Authority to adopt Torksey Ferry Road out of Rampton and pave the road as a southern access to the site? Is there any contamination on the site from the former coal, slag and any asbestos or chemicals that need thoroughly cleaning away before it can be built on? • Elderly people in the village who helped build the power station in the 1960's state that all sorts of rubbish, including the diggers and building equipment and vehicles were buried underneath the base of the power station, because in those days Health & Safety was not a thing it is today and they just chucked all this waste and things there, this would need dealing with before homes built on top. • Lack of details plans re infrastructure, Dunham and Leverton Schools are full to capacity, Rampton has some spare capacity, but not the facilities to take in a large influx of pupils and there is a lack of child minding and preschools/nurseries in the area. Plus the Drs at Leverton would struggle and it is hard to recruit medical personnel to rural areas anyway. • The roads situation is far from ideal heading north towards the Gainsborough/Doncaster area. • There was surprise by several councillors at this proposal from bassetlaw because, given that EDF talked about solar farming, and the use of the area for energy generation, and</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It wil also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input. That will show the proposed layout and where different types of development will go and the detailed infrastructure requirements. The Uniper plant is expected to remain on site. Appropriate mitigation will be required to ensure there are no adverse impacts on future residents or the ongoing operation of the business.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		storage via new battery technology, in the past 2 years at the EDF open forum meetings • What about the Impact of traffic on all surrounding villages? • What is the impact on wild fowl, swans and geese and bird life on Trentside areas, This was one of the reasons permission was refused for wind farms some years ago. What gaurentees will there be to protect the Gt Chrested Newts at Cottam, the badgers and bats Lack of any specific detail re buses, a sore point given the withdrawal of frequent bus services to Treswell and Rampton villages.	
1194590	Resident	In my view the former Cottam site is not safe for housing due to ground contamination , it should be developed as a green energy site using small oscillating wind Turbines in line with Bassetlaws green credentials also all large loads from the demolition should be transported by barges utilising the loading dock already constructed this is a green and cost effective mode of transport widely used all over europe ,this should be a condition of law for the demolition company.	Comments noted.
1194599	Resident	Regrowth for rural area is to high and not what was agreed and approved by the NDP steering group. As a resident I do not wish to see anymore new builds in our rural community. Bassetlaw have met their quota on new builds already. I move to this area to get away from the hussle and bussle of town life not to be crammed back into another. Insufficient draining and flooding. Increased traffic. Lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. Rural environment will be lost. Insufficient drainage and flooding already. The adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs. Protected species already on the site. Subsidence already occurring in Cottam and surrounding. Noise & traffic pollution and increased crime rates. Would like to see something greener and environmentally friendly. The connection to the national grid is already in place so we are 50% there.	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1194662	Resident	Do not support the redevelopment of the Cottam power station site for residential use,the site is remote from suitable transport links and would impose vastly increased traffic volumes on the rural road network of east Bassetlaw. The rail link is not viable to re connect to lincoln as the old bridge is an ancient monument and preserved in some way and has been converted to pedestrian use as part of the footpath network.The plan goes against the wider concept that east bassetlaw mainly comprises of SMALL villages and hamlets, the scale of the development proposed is parachuting a small town into an area un-fit to accept it. Bassetlaw's housing requirements have already been met by the other allocations proposed under this plan.I propose a more suitable idea for regenerating the Power station site would be to allocate for a Green Energy site with its grid connection and already has permission for a battery storage project.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk can be suitably mitigated and that residents can easily move around by sustainable and public transport. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
1195107	Resident	Do not support the plan housing on the site of Cottam power station. The would cause disruption to all the surrounding villages, in particular Cottam. The roads are not of a sufficient standard including a lot of single track roads. Cottam already has to endure HGVs which are travelling to Coates and are not only damaging roads and verges, but are damaging houses due to the vibration caused by these vehicles. The village would potentially add another 2000 vehicles to the routes through all the villages. Develop the existing areas of nature and conservation which already has protected wildlife in existence there; and build a renewable energy site which would have immediate access to the national grid. Bassetlaw has already met its 20% target for housing without building on the Cottam power station site	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1195111	Resident	The use of the land for housing development is inappropriate in the current and predicted climate of ecological and sociological needs of the area . The infrastructure development required to enable free movement of existing and intended residents during the development and as a functioning new and permanent village will be considerable and in complete opposition to a carbon zero future. Surely development of current amenities could take preference and therefore being of benefit to the wider communities of Bassetlaw The location of the site is removed from existing urbanisation and would impact on rural living. The usual issues of increased demand on water, sewerage, energy and the current concerns of flood risk in an area of a tidal river are also real considerations. However we could take a positive view on this location for low risk leisure and green energy power generation, e.g. Solar power or hydro/water turbine power production. Clean energy production to benefit Bassetlaw residents and meeting carbon zero living. Cottam is in a location supporting wildlife, a natural tidal river and the greater ecological systems which should be maintained for future generations. I and many other local residents have chosen to live in rural Bassetlaw. Let's maintain this choice of living and remind ourselves that Bassetlaw is to be congratulated on meeting current housing requirements and future projected needs without this development through the Green Village Scheme. To summarise I object to non-essential residential development of the former Cottam Power Station site.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1195155	Resident	Live directly opposite the power station. The plan to build yet more houses there will be incredibly detrimental to wildlife, grass verges and the amount of pollution. It is a rural area and does not have viable infrastructure such as gps, schools, and hardly any public transport. Have a large amount of industrial traffic passing through and this will add to the noise and disruption that residents have to face on a daily basis. Moved here after being diagnosed with cancer. I wanted to live in peace and quiet. The thought of a massive housing estate and everything that goes with that, just fills me with dread.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF140	Resident	Subject to flood assessment. First it would give motivation to clear the site or it will stay a blot on the landscape for years as EDF would have no motivation to clear it. The site already has both road and rail connections to it. Although you do not mention a railway station the addition of one at this site would have the same benefits as the Bassetlaw Garden Village linking it to Retford and the East Coast mainline.	A requirement of development is that the site submits a Flood Risk Assessment to be agreed with the Environment Agency. Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
			explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
1195216	Resident	The railway line into Cottam should be upgraded for passenger traffic to link the new settlement	Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
1195859	Resident	Cottam redevelopment plan. Insufficient draining and flooding. Increased traffic. Lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. Insufficient draining and flooding. The adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs. Pollution. Protected species already on the site. Bassetlaw Council does not need any further new builds.	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc.
1195911	Aspbury Planning Limited	Support the allocation of the former Cottam Power Station site for a mixed-use regeneration led new settlement. This is a 'new' addition to the housing supply in the 2020 Draft Plan and there is little information in the public domain to substantiate delivery which is pretty much all that is presented in this Draft Plan. There appear to be many areas of uncertainty with regard to site reclamation, flood risk, nature conservation and heritage constraints that it is unsafe to rely on the circa 450 dwellings coming forward in the plan period in this secondary location and counting toward the housing requirement. In this regard it is essential that ST2 is robust in delivering the the housing requirement for Rural Bassetlaw from its large and small rural settlements without relying upon 450 dwellings from Cottam. Not convinced that the delivery policy for the smaller rural settlements will secure delivery of these homes.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1196000	Resident	In principle, a good idea, and it makes perfect sense to use the existing land productively. Would like to see more detail about the changes to the roads that would be required. It's clear that, for this to work in line with the environmental objectives, there would need to be better transport links and the provision of services (healthcare, shops, etc). It would also make sense to provide support to public transport to ensure that the impact of car use is minimised.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF201	Severn Trent	Note that the local Plan identifies a number of areas as prime locations for redevelopment, whilst we are in general supportive of the re-development of brownfield sites, and understand that there are often additional considerations including contamination that may need to be addressed before development can be carried out. Recommend that that Planning policy looks to ensure that development is carried out in way that will result in wider benefits, including but not limited to separation of surface water connections to foul sewers where possible, and the attenuation of surface water flows as close as reasonably practically to greenfield, this especially where connecting to the sewers. Severn Trent support the inclusion of "the green and blue infrastructure and its amenity value will ensure the area becomes a more attractive place to live," within paragraph 5.4.6. Care will need to be taken to protect water sources and ensure that redevelopment of sites does not mobilise pollutants due to the underlying aquifer.	Development of brownfield sites will be carried out sensitively to ensure there are wider benefits including through the appropriate provision of water infrastructure and water management. In line with other policies in this Plan care will be taken to ensure future development does not adversely affect the underlying aquifer.
REF201	Severn Trent	Whilst Severn Trent is supportive of the general principles and the inclusion of bullet point 5.d) "An integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional green spaces," the plan does not provide any mention of the drainage hierarchy. The site is situated adjacent to the River Trent therefore the need to connect surface water to the foul sewers should not be required, this is a key element of ensuring that the development is sustainable and resilient to the future impacts from things like climate change etc. It may also be useful to specifically mention the need to incorporate true SuDS principles that look all 4 pillar of SuDS, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity as well as Quantity. Recommended wording for the considerations are covered under our response to the Bassetlaw Garden Village.	The drainage hierarchy applies to all new development so is better covered by a strategic policies for water management and flood risk and drainage.
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	Enclose a Vision Document (VD) which aims to corroborate the Site's constraints and opportunities whilst indicating how the legacy of the power station could be delivered through strategic and comprehensive redevelopment. The thrust and overall objective of the policy working towards the delivery of a new large rural settlement is fully supported by EDF. The strategy is considered to be appropriate not only as a long-term sustainable future for the Site but also one that would directly support and enhance the existing communities of Cottam, Treswell, Rampton and beyond. The approach taken is considered to be consistent with the aims of plan making as set out within Chapter 11 of the NPPF, which focusses on making effective use of land. The re-use of this large-scale brownfield site would result in delivery of a substantial number of new homes and environmental improvements that would otherwise be a missed opportunity, instead placing pressure on greenfield sites across other parts of the district. The draft policy in this respect is considered to be prepared on a sound basis. The approach to bringing forward development in accordance with a framework masterplan to be prepared by a developer is welcomed (ST5 B-C). This is considered to be a standard approach to bringing forward large-scale regeneration proposals, ensuring all stakeholders have an opportunity to be consulted on the masterplan's evolution. Later parts of the policy indicate specific stakeholders such as the Environment Agency and Highways Authority that would need to be involved throughout the planning process, and it is expected that this would include the early stages of masterplanning the Site. Draft Policy ST5 B specifically refers to the importance of phasing arrangements being agreed, and EDF notes that this is likely to be critical to the Site's successful regeneration. It is predicted that a phasing strategy would focus on those parts of the Site that would 'unlock' the wider development site, bringing housebuilders forward on plots of circa 100-150 units to start with, increasing to plots of 200-250 units as development and market interest gather momentum. For a site of this scale it would be normal to expect at least two housebuilders on site at any one time. Good Quality Design and Local Character, sets out criteria to be adhered to within the design and masterplanning process, as well as relating to detailed matters that may come forward during the reserved matters application process. The following points are noteworthy in respect of the corresponding criteria: a) EDF has already taken steps to Screen the demolition process in line with the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations (2017), for which BDC confirmed within its Screening Opinion that an Environmental Statement would not be required. b) Major development of this scale will always be subject to Flood Risk Assessment, but the Site's context is particularly sensitive in this riverside location. The existing Site has flood defences in place that have not	Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>previously been breached and it is expected that an adequate developable area can be achieved without placing additional risk on new homes or other locations up or down stream. c) The Site's rural location requires a sensitive landscape-led approach and this is welcomed by EDF.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>The VD provides an early indication of how the Site could sensitively fit within the landscape, given the comparative visual impact will be significantly reduced following demolition. d) EDF supports the need for sustainable and innovative design, particularly given the Site's unique context. The approach is wholly consistent with the objectives of NPPF e) Whilst it is EDF's strategy to find a developer to purchase the Site to bring forward regeneration proposals, it fully supports the principle of incorporating localised green energy production, including enhanced transport connections such as exploring rail connection opportunities. f) EDF would expect a future developer of the Site to engage with Nottinghamshire County Council as minerals authority to ensure that no conflicts existed between regenerating the Site and realising any extraction opportunities. Moreover, the challenges of extracting minerals in this flood-sensitive location are likely to be significant. ST5 2: Development Mix The scale of development both in terms of housing and employment land is considered to be realistic. Where demand exists as development starts to come forward, and subject to overcoming the relevant constraints, opportunities may exist beyond the plan period to consider increasing the scale slightly or adjusting the ratio of uses, for example, if employment land take-up is low. Further, it may be possible to include a new primary school on-site subject to the Local Education Authority's requirements and the details of such issues as land-take and funding. a) The split between the number of homes to be delivered within the plan period and those beyond is considered to be realistic. This is based on the broad timescales for decommissioning, demolition, remediation and bringing forward the requisite planning applications prior to commencing infrastructure works and only then commencing onstruction of homes. b) The approach to promoting a mix of housing types is consistent with national policy and could result in a widely beneficial mix of housing to benefit the existing communities, both in terms of bringing affordable homes to the market for those wishing to purchas their first homes through to specialist and care accommodation catering for older people or the infirm. c) The principles of Policy ST45 are broadly supported and EDF advocates a climate resilient to regenerating the Site.d) EDF welcomes an open range of housing densities appropriate to the rural setting. The lack of prescription in this criterion is considered essential so as not to minimise opportunities for delivering a full variety of densities. For example, this could include higher density apartment and care home living through to lower density detached and bungalow accommodation. e) The scale and split of employment land both within and beyond the plan period is considered to be reasonable and would likely be mutually beneficial to establishing market demand for the Site.</p>	<p>Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>Social and Community Facilities EDF comments: a) subject to engagement with the Local Education Authority in terms of assessing demand for school places, an opportunity may exist for a primary school to be provided on site. Regardless, the need for financial contributions to support provision of school places in the surrounding community (assuming a new school on site is not required) is a standard requirement for major residential proposal and is therefore fully supported. b) The Local Centre will provide an important focal point for the community. It is suggested that the policy makes clear the exclusion of any requirement for the sequential test or retail impact assessment to be required during the planning application process, as the quantum and mix of Local Centre uses will most likely be market-driven. The restriction on convenience floorspace of up to 500 sq m should be clarified as gross sales floorspace in order to allow sufficient flexibility in delivery (i.e. for food and/or non-food retailers). c) EDF supports the need for appropriate financial contributions to be made towards health care facilities d) Similarly, the principle of a community hub and sports pitches is fully supported. Other leisure opportunities such as walking and cycling networks are also likely to play an important place-making role in regenerating the Site. Transport and Movement, is noted as an important aspect of the policy to ensure the delivery and also the long-term sustainability of the Site. EDF recognises that the Site is remote from major settlements, with the nearest main town of Retford located approximately 9 miles to the west. The integration of a mix of public transport opportunities, cycle routes and exploration of opportunities to utilise rail and river connections could set the new settlement apart from other rural locations. The need for a detailed and comprehensive transport assessment is</p>	<p>Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>supported. It is recognised that the existing road network will need some improvements and EDF supports the need for further investigation into the capacity of key junctions and an assessment of potential traffic flows to consider the specific works needed to support the Site's delivery. Ensuring adequate parking and servicing provision, are considered to be standard criteria for a development site of this scale. Landscape Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, highlights the key environmental objectives for the Site. Again, EDF considers that these broad objectives are consistent with both the scale of the Site and the corresponding objectives of the NPPF, including Chapters 15 and 16. a) EDF supports the need for an archaeological assessment for the site as well as a wider built heritage assessment that would consider the impacts of regenerating the Site on nearby heritage assets such as the numerous listed buildings within a short distance of the Site boundaries. However, given the existing heavy industrial nature of the Site, it is considered likely that a residential-led regeneration scheme would be sensitive to the b) The Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site is noted as a key environmental asset and should be protected accordingly. EDF support the retention, protection and enhancement of the wetlands through the masterplanning and development process. c) EDF prides itself on ensuring that its impact on the local environment results in no risks to human health or biodiversity. Taking the Site forward, EDF's expectations are to find a responsible developer who would utilise access to the river as an asset to the Site's regeneration, maintaining the highest standards of protection of the river throughout the development process and also via the long-term management of the settlement through a management company. d) A multi-functional drainage strategy and utilisation of sustainable drainage principles is expected as a standard approach for a site of this scale and is therefore supported. Details of drainage would be developed in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency. e) EDF fully supports the need to focus on green infrastructure in the masterplanning of this new rural settlement. Details of the management of these networks would be determined during the planning application process and could involve a mix of private and public management depending on the status of certain routes and facilities. The use of a Planning Performance Agreement to aid the planning application process is welcomed and broadly agreeable subject to detailed matters regarding cost and resource allocation – this would be discussed at the planning application stage. For completeness, it is noteworthy that the policy reference 'ST5 F' should be amended to 'ST5 D'. Minor suggestions are noted above and are consolidated below for ease of reference: 1. Clarifying that the Local Centre would not be subject to sequential test or retail impact assessment 2. Clarifying the convenience retail provision of 500 sq m as gross sales floorspace 3.</p>	
1196375	Resident	<p>Do not support the housing development in the Cottam Power Station site There is insufficient draining on site and risk of flooding. The villages cannot cope with the increased traffic. There is a total lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. There will be an adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs protected species already on the site. IT WAS STATED AT THE RECENT MEETING BY A COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE THAT THIS DEVELOPMENT IS NOR REQUIRED TO MEET HOUSING NEEDS IN THE PLAN A RENEWABLE ENERGY SITE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ABOVE HOUSING</p>	<p>The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. There are currently no plans for energy generation on the site.</p>
REF218	Central Lincolnshire	<p>Note and support the policy for the former Cottam Power Station, reserve the right to comment further once the full details of the proposal and any potential impacts are understood.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Part C, 4, a) The Transport Assessment would need to identify the need for and propose improvements on strategic routes from the site and explore the opportunities to transport goods and people by river and rail.</p> <p>Part C, 4, a) (i) The site already has two large accesses onto Outgang Lane. It is not clear why only one is included within the application area. The main site would benefit from two accesses, the second potentially closer to Cottam village such that the main development area is not served from one large cul-de-sac. Presumably a further access would be required to serve the land to the north of Outgang Lane. Part C, 4, a) (ii) Outgang Lane/Cottam Road is of a reasonably high standard. However, pedestrian and cycle routes are likely to require improvement between the site, the village, and Rampton through the site. These should be secured as part of the development rather than by way of a contribution. Part C, 4, a) (v) Should include a contribution towards public transport</p>	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework and inform infrastructure planning.
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Minerals and Waste As outlined in the Waste Core Strategy (2013) Cottam was one of three power stations in Nottinghamshire and as part of the energy operation, two types of ash are produced: Pulverised Fuel Ash (PFA) and Furnace Bottom Ash (FBA). Whilst most, if not all, PFA is sold and re-used as secondary aggregate in the construction industry, the production of PFA often outstrips market demand for the material and so the remaining PFA material which is not re-used or recycled is disposed as either part of land raising schemes or to reclaim and fill derelict voids. Policy WCS6: Power Station Ash in the Waste Core Strategy outlines how the County Council favours the recycling or re-use of material but where this cannot occur, priority will be given to proposals that use ash to fill or reclaim mineral workings or derelict voids, with land-raising of ash for disposal only acceptable when no other reasonable options exist. At Cottam, permission was granted to dispose any remaining PFA into two lagoons; the North Lagoon and South Lagoon. Disposal in the north lagoon ceased in 2016, as per condition 5 attached to planning permission 1/12/12/00001, and disposal in the South Lagoon is permitted until 2023 under permission 1/38/12/00001. As the power station has now ceased operation, the ash disposal site is to be restored to the satisfaction of Nottinghamshire County Council and will then enter a 5-year aftercare period. As disposal has ceased in the North Lagoon, this area entered into aftercare in 2016. During the aftercare period, the site will be monitored and assessed by Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure the full and proper restoration of the site to the requirement of the planning permission and so will remain of interest to the County Council from a waste perspective. In terms of this allocation and any potential future application, it will need to consider the restoration plans and aftercare process that have been agreed for the site by the County Council as the Waste Planning Authority. It should also be considered that where PFA has been deposited, these areas are unlikely to be suitable or stable for development and that there is potential that these disposal sites may be re-worked in the future to recover PFA. Such consideration could be included within Policy ST5 and its supporting text. The former Cottam Power Station also lies within the MSA/MCA for sand gravel, which the draft plan recognises in paragraph 5.4.19 and outlines that the County Council will be consulted to ensure it does not lead to the sterilisation of mineral. As Policy SP7 outlines, where a need for non-mineral development can be demonstrated, prior extraction will be sought where practical. This prevents not only the sterilisation of mineral but also can reduce the waste produced from the construction of the site.</p>	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework.
REF222	Notts CC	<p>This regeneration area falls within the Rampton Primary Planning Area, incorporating Woodbeck and Treswell with Cottam. NCC anticipate that contributions would be required to create 3 additional classrooms within the span of the local plan. Rampton Primary is on a restricted site and would be difficult to expand, so feasibility would be required. The development at Cottam Power Station is anticipated to add a further 1,150 houses after 2037, which would necessitate a new primary school and potentially land on which to build it.</p>	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework and inform infrastructure planning.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
1196559	Resident	<p>The Head of the environment Agency is now stating that "homes should not be built on flood plains", and that "there is a clue in the name". Well, that is certainly not Rocket Science, and whilst the Policy states that there are Flood Defences the addition of the huge development proposed with again "concrete over" huge areas of land that currently is ably to absorb rainfall. It is presumed that Drains would discharge to the River Trent, thus increasing the risk of overtopping of the River Banks. Again, a proper plan for Traffic to and from this proposed development is woefully missing. How are the new occupants and workers/materials suppliers intended to access the 'out-of-the-way' location ?? It always seems to be the 'Chicken and The Egg' scenario. Roads will follow, we are told and are expected to believe ! If the proposal is allowed traffic needs to be kept away from the villages between this site and Retford, bearing in mind that there are only three ways to go from Cottam. The River is in the way to the East.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
1196560	Resident	<p>There is a disconnect between the aims and the proposed development at Cottam which will have a massive impact on local communities and cause environmental damage. The plans for this in relating to Cottam development are unrealistic and will cause harm to local communities. The regeneration proposed at Cottam power station will have a negative impact on the existing communities and the infrastructure is not available to sustain such a development.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		from Cottam power station site as illustrative of our concerns. Travelling to Lincoln, Tuxford, A1 South – Dunham, East Drayton Travelling to Retford, Gainsborough, M180 – Treswell, South Leverton, North Leverton, Sturton le Steeple. Consider the above communities as one cluster as BDC did in their previous draft plan.	this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF263	Resident	If half the traffic from the proposed housing development (450 now, with a further 1150 houses later) travels either south or east (and I would expect more than half because your planning Officer told us that Cottam residents gravitate towards Lincoln), the number of additional cars at the Ragnall Crossroads will be at least approx 450 cars: each house will have two cars because of the lack of public transport. This is set to rise to an additional 1150 in later years making a total of 1600 more cars using this poorly sighted crossroads. Traffic going south to the crossroads would pass our small village school which already struggles with speeding traffic and passing high heavy goods vehicles. Traffic wanting to travel in an easterly direction would use the small Dunham Bridge which would mean travelling through the village of Dunham with it's dangerous bend, already the site of numerous accidents due to traffic speed. Last month (January), an attending ambulance was hit by a car travelling too fast and unable to stop, one of many accidents in Dunham. Traffic travelling in a westerly direction would go through Darlton, one of two communities on the entire length of the A57 where the road actually divides the villages (Dunham being the other one), necessitating residents crossing the busy road on a regular basis, including school children catching the school bus and children crossing the A57 to access the play areas. This whole eastern side development of Bassetlaw impacts on our four parishes because of the increased traffic. As we live in a rural area we already have a high spring/summer/autumn high heavy goods traffic related to agriculture.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1196914	Resident	cottam power station site would be better used for industrial use with traffic out via A57 dunham crossroads With West Burton also shortly stopping coal generating electricity, this would be a better site for housing as it is nearer better roads to major areas of employment.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is also acknowledged that the draft Local Plan promotes the reclamation and regeneration of the former Cottam Power Station for the delivery of a new Large Rural Settlement (Policy ST5). The Council does note that this site currently is in a remote location and there is no access across the Trent to Lincolnshire from here.	Thank you for your comments
REF278	Fisher German	Note that to ensure that this is a sound allocation, a robust review of the sites deliverability should be undertaken, including start dates, build out rates which has regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades.	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for similar projects in other areas of the country.

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF300 -	Natural England	Welcome the policy aims of a landscape-led approach to design and the delivery of green and low carbon energy for this proposal. Welcome section 5 of the policy wording which offers protection to the Cottam Wetlands LWS and other ecological interest plus the provision of a multifunctional green infrastructure network. Suggest that reference should also be made to the wider River Trent improvement projects (Trent Vision and Wild Trent) which are currently being developed.	Reference to the improvement project has been made in the supporting text.
1197187	KSR Accountants	Renewable Energy Park alongside Wildlife area would be far more beneficial to the environment and the community	There are currently no proposals for energy generation for this site.
1197238	Resident	There is a variance between the policy, and the impact of certain developments especially that at Cottam. The overall strategy is fine, but the council does not seem to have consider the impact of the proposed development at Leafield and at Cottam with the broad thrust of its other environmental policies. Proposing to build a mega village on and very near a flood plain, in an area with poor or no public transport, and poor road access. This will lead to pollution over and above that already experienced by residents in Cottam, Treswell and nearby villages.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	<p>Been justified by planners and the Cottam Station owners who have a financial interest in obtaining residential planning permission. It is obvious that a residential development is not appropriate and a village centre is a planners fantasy not a practical suggestion. The boundary of the brownfield site has been extended beyond the existing brownfield land but a large area of agricultural land west of Cottam and another larger area directly East of Rampton village, leading East, and adjoining to the existing power station site. The agricultural land here is of high quality and should remain as is. It may be sensible on the existing brown land to allow light industry and commercial land for local businesses and to supply local residents with jobs. The site is totally unsuitable for housing and the incoming population that would come with it. It is as far from a main road as can be in Bassetlaw. Putting a population in the middle of nowhere, rather than a community that has grown naturally is likely to lead to dependency and possible deprivation. Cottam is a hamlet lying to the North of this site. A single track road runs through Cottam, and the villages of Leverton can be accessed through Cottam village, but this is undesirable for the safety of those residents. The route West would go through the village of Treswell, alternatively traffic transferring North would go through the T junction at Treswell, often congested and not a good turn to continue North through the villages of South then North Leverton. Before negotiating the built up village of Sturton and to the Bole roundabout on an A road. A 7 1/2 mile journey to the main road at Bole corner. The route South can be accessed 2 miles from the Power station site at a T junction before entering the village of Treswell. The road was altered and improved to take heavy traffic during building and maintenance of the station. Any industrial and commercial traffic would need to be restricted to this access route which intersects the A57 Markham Moor to Lincoln main road. The distance is 6 3/4 miles to the A57 junction at Dunham Crossroads. Dunham on Trent primary school lies on this road just 200 yards from the A57 junction. Residential traffic from any development on the station site cannot be. Along this designated route lies the Woodbeck Rampton crossroads. This is a death trap because many people have died over the years. The communities have asked for improvements, but NCC not willing to spend any money. A roundabout may be the solution. The dangerous crossroads is another reason why Cottam and an increase in residential traffic should be avoided. The route North travels through North Leverton. There is a dangerous crossroads in the centre of the village. There is much concern with the crossroads as the increases in housing imposed are already envisaged to increase the congestion and the danger there. There is a campaign by the community to improve the crossroads, but officers are advising solutions will not alleviate the dangers, and money cannot be spent without improving safety. Less traffic would be welcome.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	<p>No residential at Cottam would be safer. It would be unsustainable, environmentally unfriendly, and dangerous for the residents of the roads leading from the station and in the villages through which the unrestricted residential traffic would have to pass. Most of the routes connecting Cottam are country roads grown and tarmacked. They do not lend themselves to improvement even if the finance was possible. It is ludicrous to suggest a wasteful expense of creating a village centre for surrounding villages in what is the edge of nowhere with a river which floods to the East. Many of the residents own their own cars along the Trentside already. The bus service already travels along the Dunham North Leverton route without entering many of the villages. Passengers must contact the bus company in an on demand request service. Not many passengers use it but it is valued by those who do, and is an economical way of continuing to provide public transport. It will be salutary to learn that the Council's suggested transport hub will be a bus stop sign with a shelter on a dead end. Bassetlaw do not provide the bus services and the planners have clearly not researched this. The existing garden villages along the Trent side have to be self-reliant. There is deprivation of facilities along the Trentside, as the Council splash the cash in the West and North, the villages throughout Bassetlaw have long been neglected. Cottam is as far from major medical facilities as can be in Bassetlaw. There is a small surgery in North Leverton but it would be at least 35 minutes to Bassetlaw hospital. Medical facilities in Lincolnshire would take even longer. There is adequate brown field land at Cottam, and it does not make sense to use valuable agricultural land where there is little demand for</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are no proposals for development at West Burton in this Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		housing and industrial demand, because of the poor transport and road links. West Burton Power site be substituted for Cottam. Closing shortly It is only one mile North to an A class road at Bole corner, and this short distance does not intrude in any villages. Access is safe and efficient with good roads to Gainsborough, Retford, Doncaster , Sheffield and the North.	
REF362	Treswell and Cottam Parish Council	<p>The Treswell with Cottam Parish Council, and the NDP Steering Group, are disappointed that EDF have said no form of renewable energy is viable for the site. Perhaps without the possibility of the housing development, there may be a viable way to introduce a form of renewable energy production on this site; a solution, as you will see from the responses, is overwhelmingly favoured by this community. This community does not consider that the development of a Cottam Garden Community represents best use, although they do understand that it represents highest value for both the current site owners and the District Council. This community fear that many questions remain unanswered, and that the housing development proposed is unnecessary, unsustainable, and unaffordable, and that the proposed Cottam Garden Community should not be included within the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our medical facilities for doctors and schools are at capacity. Ensuring that these facilities are in place for first phase occupation is critical. Bassetlaw state that these facilities are not available for first phase developments, and for communities less than 500 units. 2. Conservation of existing wildlife facilities currently occupying the whole of Cottam Power Station site is critical 3. Confirmation as to who is responsible for the maintenance of flood defence system around the development site, and wider reach to protect existing communities and residents, is required 4. A full, and thorough, traffic study to be carried out on the country roads to identify, and to develop further, one-way systems through neighbouring villages to safeguard existing residents and road users and support new, improved highway infrastructure is vital 5. New road infrastructure will be essential to join up the new Garden Community to the A57 running alongside the River Trent to alleviate heavy road use on the country roads/lanes around the site. This new infrastructure would need to be complete before any work starts on the site development 6. Re-consideration to be given to assist Cottam parishioners who wish to develop their sites, who have been refused due to potential flooding issues to be included in a future Draft Local Plan-inconsistencies 7. Improved routes for walking/biking to join up new Garden Community to nearby local communities should be part of the planned, infrastructure provided by the developer to encourage/secure, social integration, community cohesion and retain/increase revenue with existing shops/pubs etc 8. Development on other decommissioned coal fired power stations may have been successful but these have been developed adjacent to existing facilities such as major roads, employment, schools, doctors etc. To be successful, and sustainable, these facilities need to be installed, on site, prior to the occupation of a housing development 9. The District Council have a responsibility to ensure the health and wellbeing of all residents. The fear is, that this unsustainable, unnecessary development, may become forgotten and a blight, rather than something to be championed. Careful thought and consideration need to be given to the regeneration of the site, and preferably, NOT the option that gives the best return. 	<p>The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are currently no plans for energy production on this site.</p>

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>opportunity for a combination of different types of Leisure Activity Reason:1. There is enough leisure/camping in this area. We need to promote nature, walking and cycling.2. It would be nice to have leisure amenities for the benefit of local villages3. Infrastructure- road for access unsuitable for additional visiting traffic- no.4. Create an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the countryside and nation; the natural wildlife area should be extended to eventually provide a forest, with walks. Cycle tracks should extend over the recently built bridge to Torksey and then beyond along the Fosse to Saxilby and Lincoln and beyond- it goes as far as Woodhall Spa and beyond.5. No camping - Perhaps include the Forestry Commission, National Trust or other association in the development of this brownfield site.6. This site has a prime riverside location and is suitable for a number of healthy leisure activities; water sports, moorings, marina, riverside walks, joining up to national cycle tracks- but no camping please7. Site turned into a Learning Centre for future generations eg MAGNA – it is a shame that the Control Centre is to be on display elsewhere – future development and Sundown represents joined up thinking1.DEFINITELY NOT This area is rural and does not have the capacity/facilities for this. Additional traffic associated with such a development would be detrimental to all existing residents, traffic management and necessary road repair/infrastructure. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town2. Our concern is that up to 1600 homes would relate to infrastructure challenges; roads, flooding, and where would all these residents work? There is little opportunity for employment.3. Concerns over this proposal. There are few opportunities for employment- where would the occupiers work? The local infrastructure would be unable to cope with large scale demands. A significantly smaller development may be more appropriate for this rural area and only if it was in combination with a wildlife protected area (Support?)4. A maximum of 450 dwellings with all the appropriate amenities- school, medical services, community hall, church, public house, store- as described in the Draft Local Plan, would be acceptable (Support?)5. We are really opposed to more houses. They are not needed or suitable for land that floods. An extra 2 cars per household would add pressure to the already busy roads. Carbon footprint, climate change?6. We feel that housing in this area is needed and if that brings more amenities to the area then it would be an advantage. Also, it would bring the housing to an existing brownfield area and take proposed housing pressure off the villages in this area. (Support?)7. Too much development would ruin the rural nature of this area. To create a balanced addition to Cottam and to other nuclear villages any development should be no bigger than 50 dwellings. (Support?)8. Existing communities could not cope with all the additional traffic; medical services etc are already stretched to limit.9. There is no infrastructure for the housing that is not needed (Retford housing stock is adequate?)10. Lack of infrastructure does not support building of 1600 houses and related construction, nor is this necessary- housing stock for Retford is at least adequate.11. The area floods and is not suitable for housing and there is insufficient infrastructure to support.12. Site not suitable for housing. Flood plain and contaminated ground, asbestos, oil etc. Already enough daily traffic through the village due to Rampton staff. Roads in a terrible state and enough housing in Retford already.13. Housing would produce too much traffic, would need new roads in and out of new community and a regular public transport service reintroduced14. 1600 homes vastly increase carbon footprint; 2 vehicles per home, inadequate local transport- where is this new community to work? Few opportunities for employment locally.15. This would lead to traffic disruption, location - distant from supporting services and road infrastructure totally inadequate- totally the wrong place for housing development. Where are occupants going to work?16. I would support a selection of retirement bungalows and council dwellings that would help Cottam and the surrounding villages in many ways to develop a supportive community.17. The building of homes for me is preferable but I would need to know that the amenities- school, medical facilities, shops etc were to be planned to serve the early inhabitants of such a development.18. I would support some development in Cottam- but not in front of Floss Lane. The village needs more recognition to bring the community and its people together.19. Lack of infrastructure does not support the building of 1600 houses and related construction- nor is it necessary in Retford according to the numbers in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.20. Infrastructure not suitable for</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>this.21. Community medical facilities and schools are at capacity- additional facilities would not be made available to early occupants of this development22. Extensive, possibly unaffordable improvements to road infrastructure required to safely join up to local communities- before any development begins- to keep the communities and current highway users safe.23. BDC have a responsibility to ensure health and wellbeing of all residents and if this goes ahead, I fear that this development's unsustainability will render the proposed Cottam Garden Community a blight, rather than something to be championed.5. A combination of the non-negotiable Wildlife Area, renewable energy installation, leisure and housing development 1.This combination is preferable. But- we have ample Leisure facilities for our community. We wish to remain rural and not be a part of a large town.2. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town. No leisure facilities eg camping – just walking, cycling tracks etc. Get the nation active.3. This option would fit into the existing local environment and benefit the local community rather than having a huge impact on it. It would make the area more attractive to families who wished to relocate into the existing Trent Villages.4. This is possibly the best solution for all in the surrounding area, but the number of homes should be kept to a minimum and should complement the character of the existing dwellings in Cottam and the surrounding villages5. Infrastructure inadequate to serve such development6. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station - don't want any more.7. Additional, improved walking/cycle routes to join up nearby communities- community cohesion8. Developer to provide new playpark facilities and easy access foot/cycler paths from nearby communities.2. The development of a Renewable Energy Park alongside the non-negotiable Wildlife Area Reason:1.Site has been producing energy for the nation for many years, still connected to national grid. This would also provide some employment opportunities for families in the community.2. Renewable Energy Park, Solar or low height turbines, would give benefit to local community and environment, whilst maintaining and developing the non-negotiable wildlife area. Although the renewable energy park may not be viable for EDF, it may be for other developers/energy producers.3.It has all the infrastructure for electrical generation and if we are changing from fossil fuels for road vehicles then there will be a much greater demand for electricity. Solar Panels and wind turbines are the obvious choice, but I believe that there should be energy storage systems for periods when there is no wind and no sunshine. This will also create jobs for local people.4.The development of a Renewable Energy Park is more in keeping with the original site usage, keeping local road usage to existing levels.5. With a history of generating electricity, I believe this should be a solar farm supplying green energy to the local community.6. This toxic site is not suitable for domestic use. Wind turbines, Solar Power, or a gas station preferred.Demolition rubble should be taken by barge and used for coastal defence.7.Renewable Energy Park preferred. No noise from Solar Panels, minimal noise from wind driven generators. Minimal traffic increase.8. The infrastructure is in place to divert Renewable Energy into the grid. The existing gas station is remaining and will be ideal for that purpose. This would also help to look after the large variety of wildlife in the area instead of destroying it by building on the land.9. A renewable Energy Park would assist in reducing the carbon footprint for the area. It would also not result in any increase in traffic through the surrounding villages in particular, Cottam, which already has to endure HGVs travelling through to Coates damaging property due to vibration and damage to roads/verges would be kept to a minimum.10. Generating energy from a renewable source reduces air pollution- good for the environment. Diversifying energy supply reduces our dependence on imported fuels. The manufacture and installation of renewable energy equipment and installation would create jobs for the local community11. In the present crisis of climate change, I feel this is the best way forward.12. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity to develop it locally. 13. The infrastructure is already in place, residents in the area are well used to a large Power Station so it would be a natural progression moving forward to creating a clean energy producing site.14. Grid already for joining to Solar Panels and Wind Turbines. 15. The site is ideal for Renewable Energy Park. We need to protect wildlife areas. 16. I would prefer that the land is returned to agriculture but a renewable energy park</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>would benefit and protect the wildlife.17. Green energy production-Infrastructure already in place- grid. Clean, no additional traffic/population good for carbon footprint. 18. After 50 years of being a part of the landscape to provide energy it is the natural progression to carry on with a renewable energy source within the area.19. Low maintenance REF preferred; less traffic, already on the national grid. Greener future protects and saves the wildlife and does not impact on current infrastructure as the building of many unnecessary homes.20. Site is already on the national grid. Low maintenance, low traffic, protects established wildlife.21. We need to provide for and protect our wildlife. A Renewable Energy Park and Wildlife Area could work very well together.22.We currently need more Green Energy and this site is perfect for this; there would be no increase in traffic on our narrow, single, track roads.23. A Renewable Energy Park is preferable; to reduce carbon footprint, and contribute to reaching green carbon targets and address climate change, natural link at Cottam to National Grid.24. Hundreds of turbines not acceptable25. No to Renewable Energy Park- yes to extending the Wildlife area to whole brown field site26. Giving some of the site to Renewable Energy Generation is the only alternative and it would create job opportunities.27. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity and location in which to develop it locally.28. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station- don't want any more.29. With more information we would probably prefer an extended wildlife area with riverside walks or a renewable energy park.30. Retention and continued support of wildlife, currently occupying this site, is critical for this location3. An area providing the opportunity for a combination of different types of Leisure Activity Reason:1.There is enough leisure/camping in this area. We need to promote nature, walking and cycling.2. It would be nice to have leisure amenities for the benefit of local villages3. Infrastructure- road for access unsuitable for additional visiting traffic- no.4. Create an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the countryside and nation; the natural wildlife area should be extended to eventually provide a forest, with walks. Cycle tracks should extend over the recently built bridge to Torksey and then beyond along the Fosse to Saxilby and Lincoln and beyond- it goes as far as Woodhall Spa and beyond.5. No camping - Perhaps include the Forestry Commission, National Trust or other association in the development of this brownfield site.6. This site has a prime riverside location and is suitable for a number of healthy leisure activities; water sports, moorings, marina, riverside walks, joining up to national cycle tracks- but no camping please7. Site turned into a Learning Centre for future generations eg MAGNA – it is a shame that the Control Centre is to be on display elsewhere – future development and Sundown represents joined up thinking1.DEFINITELY NOT This area is rural and does not have the capacity/facilities for this. Additional traffic associated with such a development would be detrimental to all existing residents, traffic management and necessary road repair/infrastructure. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town2. Our concern is that up to 1600 homes would relate to infrastructure challenges; roads, flooding, and where would all these residents work? There is little opportunity for employment.3. Concerns over this proposal. There is few opportunities for employment- where would the occupiers work? The local infrastructure would be unable to cope with large scale demands. A significantly smaller development may be more appropriate for this rural area and only if it was in combination with a wildlife protected area (Support?)4. A maximum of 450 dwellings with all the appropriate amenities- school, medical services, community hall, church, public house, store- as described in the Draft Local Plan, would be acceptable (Support?)5. We are really opposed to more houses. They are not needed or suitable for land that floods. An extra 2 cars per household would add pressure to the already busy roads. Carbon footprint, climate change?6.We feel that housing in this area is needed and if that brings more amenities to the area then it would be an advantage. Also, it would bring the housing to an existing brownfield area and take proposed housing pressure off the villages in this area. (Support?)7.Too much development would ruin the rural nature of this area. To create a balanced addition to Cottam and to other nuclear villages any development should be no bigger than 50 dwellings. (Support?)8. Existing communities could not cope with all the additional traffic; medical services etc are already stretched to limit.9. There is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
		<p>no infrastructure for the housing that is not needed (Retford housing stock is adequate?)10. Lack of infrastructure does not support building of 1600 houses and related construction, nor is this necessary- housing stock for Retford is at least adequate.11. The area floods and is not suitable for housing and there is insufficient infrastructure to support.12. Site not suitable for housing. Flood plain and contaminated ground, asbestos, oil etc. Already enough daily traffic through the village due to Rampton staff. Roads in a terrible state and enough housing in Retford already.13. Housing would produce too much traffic, would need new roads in and out of new community and a regular public transport service reintroduced14. 1600 homes vastly increase carbon footprint; 2 vehicles per home, inadequate local transport- where is this new community to work? Few opportunities for employment locally.15. This would lead to traffic disruption, location - distant from supporting services and road infrastructure totally inadequate- totally the wrong place for housing development. Where are occupants going to work?16. I would support a selection of retirement bungalows and council dwellings that would help Cottam and the surrounding villages in many ways to develop a supportive community.17. The building of homes for me is preferable but I would need to know that the amenities- school, medical facilities, shops etc were to be planned to serve the early inhabitants of such a development.18. I would support some development in Cottam- but not in front of Floss Lane. The village needs more recognition to bring the community and its people together.19. Lack of infrastructure does not support the building of 1600 houses and related construction- nor is it necessary in Retford according to the numbers in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.20. Infrastructure not suitable for this.21. Community medical facilities and schools are at capacity- additional facilities would not be made available to early occupants of this development22. Extensive, possibly unaffordable improvements to road infrastructure required to safely join up to local communities- before any development begins- to keep the communities and current highway users safe.23. BDC have a responsibility to ensure health and wellbeing of all residents and if this goes ahead, I fear that this development's unsustainability will render the proposed Cottam Garden Community a blight, rather than something to be championed.5. A combination of the non-negotiable Wildlife Area, renewable energy installation, leisure and housing development 1.This combination is preferable. But- we have ample Leisure facilities for our community. We wish to remain rural and not be a part of a large town.2. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town. No leisure facilities eg camping – just walking, cycling tracks etc. Get the nation active.3. This option would fit into the existing local environment and benefit the local community rather than having a huge impact on it. It would make the area more attractive to families who wished to relocate into the existing Trent Villages.4. This is possibly the best solution for all in the surrounding area, but the number of homes should be kept to a minimum and should complement the character of the existing dwellings in Cottam and the surrounding villages5. Infrastructure inadequate to serve such development6. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station - don't want any more.7, Additional, improved walking/cycle routes to join up nearby communities- community cohesion8. Developer to provide new playpark facilities and easy access foot/cycler paths from nearby communities.</p>	
REF363	Resident	<p>The plan to develop 450 houses on the Cottam Power Station in this plan period whilst maybe admirable it is in my submission not feasible. Cannot see any developer wishing to fund the infrastructure improvements required. The building of a school, community facility, shop and road improvement would make it unprofitable. If all these improvements were not provided in the early stages the impact on the surrounding roads would be intolerable.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
			plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF368	National Grid	Asset map provided	Assets noted.
REF386	Resident	Endorse developing brown rather than green field sites Cottam is for too isolated a rural area which is hemmed into the east by the River Trent – a river very prone to flooding. The transport links are virtually non-existent and the current roads are narrow. To cater for 400-500 new homes would be bad enough. The planned large increase later on would be unjust unless all roads are widened and unsustainable and the road bridge created over into Lincolnshire. Fear for wildlife in the wetland areas. No amount of improvement to allow greater public access could enhance this wildlife habitat. The thought of hundreds of people gaining access and thus improving their health does not add up. Wildlife is not improved by mass human intervention for the purposes of leisure. Support therefore a small scale regeneration project with 400 a maximum figure and it would be excellent if the old railway line could become a passenger line to link to west and east. Support any schemes that are sustainable and which address climate change but implore the Council to do more pro-active work in addressing the big roadside litter problems currently faced in the countryside. An extra few hundred people seems to equal more anti-social behaviour/ littering. Has any thought been given to this very real problem and how it can be solved?	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Wildlife Site and habitats and species on site will be appropriately protected through any future proposals. Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	Cottam regeneration scheme represents a disproportionate spend on the site for little in the way of benefit. It is difficult to see this representing an attractive site for either developers or residents. Also difficult to see either Cottam or High Marnham being attractive to business. Each site is remote and has poor transport links. The funds proposed for each of these two sites would be better-used improving infrastructure elsewhere within the district.	Future development at Cottam would be developer led. Therefore any infrastructure provided or improved would be as a result of development at Cottam. The Council is not committing any funds to the regeneration of Cottam.
REF475	Resident	ST5 – very costly conversion of site, lots of local improvements required.	Thank you for your comments
REF480	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Taken at face value BDCs statement that the site at Cottam is viable for housing. Been contacted by several local residents who state (after working at the location) otherwise. Due to the current information provided cannot support the proposal at Cottam. When completed the town will be larger than Bawtry and have no additional guaranteed Transport Infrastructure. The impact on local communities will be immense. Question how environmentally sound the proposal is in relation to other areas. Can only see the main employment hubs being in Sheffield, Worksop and Lincoln which all would involve residents using personal cars to commute. Concerned that the plan can not clarify at this stage where additional school places and medical support services would be located. Concerned with the impact on already overstrained local amenities. The community suggestion of a renewable energy park needs to be explored at depth. With the governments (and as far as I am aware all major parties) commitment to a carbon neutral economy by 2050 it seems short sighted to lose such a strategic site that could benefit all the residents of Bassetlaw and the UK.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The proposal included employment land on site. Infrastructure provision for any site develops alongside the production of the Plan through negotiations with infrastructure partners so that it can be tailored to meet the developments needs.
REF484	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	It is noted that the existing railway to the site is protected. Provision for suitable mode of transport across the Trent using the Sustains route to Torksey (for bus connections to Lincoln and Gainsborough) should be considered for those unable or unwilling to walk or cycle. It is a distance of 1.5 miles.	Options to improving the Trent crossing should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam	Priority Regeneration	Area	
REF491	Stone Planning Services	<p>This is a relatively isolated site served off a series of minor roads which is allocated to serve 1,600 dwellings and 14.4 ha of B1, B2 and B8 employment. Do not consider this to be a commercially attractive site to employment investors or a sustainable location. The site as originally developed as a power station because of the proximity of the River Trent and rail infrastructure and its relative isolation from residential areas; these are bespoke locational criteria and not sustainable criteria for a mixed use residential and employment allocation. Notwithstanding the existing river defences the site is partially in Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, a Flood Risk Assessment has not been undertaken to determine if the site is suitable for housing, a particularly vulnerable use, and employment. Resolving flood issues is a prerequisite to allocating the site. There is a significant amount of demolition to be undertaken and inevitably contamination to remediate. Delivery of any employment at this site to be hugely optimistic. The Viability Appraisal shows a net Viability Margin of -£16.35m when assessed against CIL. The Council should not rely on employment delivery from Cottam Power Station.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
1180212	Resident	One reservation is to ask if the figures are over-optimistic. It is notoriously difficult to predict labour market figures and a cautious approach is surely preferred.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and approach taken to policy development.
1189264	Resident	It really depends on what type of employment Bassetlaw want to encourage. If you simply want to expand on the number of large warehouse developments, employing large numbers of unskilled or low paid workers then no, that is a bad idea. If Bassetlaw want to encourage towns and villages to prosper and flourish through better investment, increased interest in grass roots businesses, innovations and entrepreneurship then yes thats what this area needs.	The Local Plan aims to support a step change in the local economy by diversifying the economic base and providing the right type of land at the right time to meet business needs and to provide more better paid, higher skilled jobs. This includes support for local business growth and Policies ST11-ST13 supports economic growth in the rural area.
1189633	Resident	The economic assessment analysis is very likely to be over-optimistic and undue weight has been placed on it when housing numbers have been calculated. Never seen an accurate assessment of economic growth and great caution should surely be exercised with the findings of Bassetlaw's commissioned report. If the number of houses is too large and not delivered, likely to face national government penalties.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and the housing and jobs balance. This informs the approach to policy development. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed to reflect the current position in the District.
1193061	Resident	This again is aspirational. Though we may have sites in the district that once housed major employers, would need more evidence to support the fact that these would do the same again. The possibility for employment in construction is likely but is this sustainable beyond 2037?	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and approach taken to policy development. Seven of the general employment sites have planning permission and two sites are under construction. DHL have recently completed at Manton Wood.
REF089	NEDDC	Bassetlaw's spatial strategy is focussed 'on delivering sustainable development and growth' that amongst other things 'meets the evidenced need for new homes and jobs...' The Draft Plan states that 'the spatial strategy promotes a 'step change' in the District's economy to reflect the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan and Bassetlaw's Industrial Strategy to; reduce levels of out-commuting; retain employment and skills locally; increase productivity; address affordability issues and improve infrastructure capacity,...'. On the issue of employment needs it is stated that 'future employment needs consider completions trends as well as economic forecasts from Oxford Economics, Cambridge Econometrics and Experian'. It then says that 'the evidence identifies job growth of 3,400 to the year 2035, which when projected forward to 2037, to balance with the housing requirement, totals 5,500 jobs in B1, B2 and B8 use and for other employment uses.' The Draft Plan acknowledges that 'the District has a high level of employment permissions and available employment land (at least 108 ha) – it is generally accepted that 75% will come forward in the plan period (81 ha)...' and 'on that basis, Policy ST1 identifies sufficient land to balance with Bassetlaw's housing requirement'. Policy ST1 of the Draft Plan proposes an employment land target of 108 ha for the period 2018 to 2037, which provides for an average 5.7 ha of 'general' employment land over the 19 year plan period. The Draft Plan also makes provision for a further 199.6 ha of 'strategic' employment land. This strategic employment land recognises the need to support strategic distribution which capitalises on the district's locational advantage in proximity to the A1, A57 and M1. It is being made available only to meet footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of local business subject to certain policy criteria. The employment evidence that underpins the Draft Plan considers a number of economic scenarios and produces a large range in potential future employment need of between 52.4ha and 187.8ha in the period up to 2035. It is not clear from the evidence presented how the Council has arrived at the employment land requirement figure of 108 ha; or how the figure has been extrapolated to cover the period to 2037. Do not object in principle, to the scale of development proposed. However, these questions need addressing if are to understand the potential implications for this district and wider HMA; and indeed support the proposals through an updated Statement of Common Ground.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and the housing and jobs balance. This informs the approach to policy development and will provide the basis for duty to cooperate discussions.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
REF122	Resident	These representations are in relation to the land at Shireoaks due to be approved for employment purposes under application reference 18/00413/OUT. Policy ST6 sets out proposals to provide employment land to ensure an attractive and flexible supply of employment land to deliver the Council's employment strategy. The policy lists sites under construction, sites with planning permission and proposed Local Plan Allocations. Land at Shireoaks Common is identified as EM002 to provide some 15.4 ha for B1, B2, B8 uses. The recent outline application includes provision for B1/B2/B8 employment uses and also ancillary uses to provide a pub/restaurant, drive-thru restaurant and petrol filling station with an ancillary convenience store. The policy does not refer to the ancillary uses approved on the site and merely refers to B1/B2/B8 uses. For the avoidance of any future confusion, the policy should be amended to make appropriate reference to the provision of a pub/restaurant, drive-thru restaurant and petrol filling station with ancillary convenience store within the policy.	Comments noted. Policy ST8 will be amended to ensure supporting ancillary uses are appropriately referenced.
1194992	Resident	Support employment but it should be high quality employment not just distribution centres with low quality, low paid jobs as this will just lead to more people commuting for work not less. Lack of affordable housing for workers in low paid jobs also an issue. ST7 green energy should not just be in these areas but district wider with an initiative to make use of poor quality agricultural land for use as solar farms or for drainage eg using natural reed beds and wind turbines.	The Local Plan aims to support a step change in the local economy by diversifying the economic base and providing the right type of land at the right time to meet business needs and to provide more better paid, higher skilled jobs. Other policies support renewable energy generation including solar energy in the appropriate circumstances subject to policy criteria.
1195111	Resident	Object to employment at the Cottam site on the basis this is connected to the proposed residential development	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1195356	Resident	EM005 Proposed Carlton Forest would add danger and overcrowding to an already busy and dangerous road which has had no upgrade to its infrastructure even with the uppage of Peppers Warehousing the amount of HGVs that use that road is dangerous and even queue up at times to access Peppers . This cannot be allowed to be expanded any further	The Carlton Forest employment site has planning permission. Therefore the Local Highways Authority are satisfied that the vehicle movements associated with the development can be safely accommodated on the road network.
1195356	Resident	Facts should be corrected as Bassetlaw is not part of the Sheffield City Region Trade and Investment Plan, Sheffield City Region, 2019 Sheffield City Region Statement of Common Ground, Sheffield City Region Combined Authority, 2019	The Sheffield City Region Trade and Investment Plan identifies Harworth as being within the Doncaster Sheffield Airport Corridor. The Council are a signatory to the Sheffield City Region Statement of Common Ground and the Council is a non-constituent member of the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority.
1195356	Resident	While i agree the links to roads are ideal the A1 is ill equipped to cope at the moment and the slip roads are a continual accident hotspots as they cant cope with the amount of traffic so adding even more HGVs will only add to this issue	Highways England are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan and have been involved in the production of the Bassetlaw Transport Study Part 2 which informs the development of the Local Plan. This assesses the impact of development identified in the Local Plan on the strategic road network, including the A1 and identifies mitigation. For this plan period no mitigation has been identified for the A1.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
REF182	DHA Planning	As set out in our previous representations, consider that the site should be formally allocated for B1, B2 and B8 employment development under Policy ST6. Such an approach would then be consistent with that taken by Bolsover for the remainder of the site which, as set out above, has been formally allocated for these uses. See no good reason for excluding Explore Industrial Park from a formal allocation under this policy. Whilst it is recognised that the site is already in use for employment purposes, it currently benefits from planning permissions for more intensive employment uses – both in the form of the 2010 masterplan permission, and also the detailed planning permission for the AMF building. It should be formally allocated under policy ST6, an approach which would be consistent with the allocation of sites EM001 to EM005 in particular.	Explore Steetley will be identified as a general employment site by this policy. The policy will be amended to ensure supporting ancillary uses are appropriately referenced.
REF198	Consultant	This is generally to be supported but there should be other identifiable sites. The A1 is identified as being very important to the district yet one of its existing hubs, Markham Moor, is not considered for growth. Why ever not? It currently has more service facilities than the Apleyhead junction which, unless put them there, is devoid of service. There is plenty of land and sites available at Markham Moor, some of which your Council is aware of but once again it has been overlooked. NTransport related opportunities should be taken at this location.	The sites submitted to the Council have been assessed by the LAA and EDNA. The reports conclude that the sites are some distance from labour supply, others have heritage constraints and others do not form a critical mass of B class employment. The EDNA/LAA consider that these sites are not as attractive to the market as others in the District identified as potential allocations.
REF199	Cushwake	Further commercial development is also planned for Shireoaks, which will further extend the settlement development limits in a northerly direction linking up with the A57. An application by Hallam Land Management, a developer with a good delivery track record, for an employment led development of B1, B2 and B8 uses with a pub-restaurant, Drive-Thru restaurant and petrol filling station with ancillary convenience store has obtained Member support at committee. This development will further expand the facilities available in Shireoaks.	Comments noted.
REF222	Notts CC	It is recommended that, as part of the policies linked to Delivering Economic Prosperity, prioritising the creation of supported employment opportunities for people with mental illness and/or learning disabilities, and that priority be given to care leavers as part of Nottinghamshire's role as a corporate parent for this group.	Use of an Employment and Skills Plan will ensure that appropriate training and job opportunities are made available to local residents. This could include the people identified.
REF222	Notts CC	The plan also allocates the former High Marnham Power Station and Trinity Farm sites (EM006 and EM007) for employment use. Both of these sites fall within the MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. As per Policy SP7, any applications will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development and where this is shown, the applicant should consider the feasibility of prior extraction and so prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource. This is of importance at Trinity Farm, including the housing allocation under Policy 22, as mineral operators have indicated interest in extracting sand and gravel 240m to the west of the allocated mixed-use site. The Draft Minerals Local Plan (July 2018) did include this site (Botany Bay), as an allocation to help meet the required demand under Policy MP2r. This site has now been removed from the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and is no longer allocated. This is due to changes to the mix of site specific allocations identified across the County and not due to the site being withdrawn by the operator. Would recommend that Policy 22 highlight the presence of the MSA/MCA and that any future application will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development in this area and if this can be demonstrated, consider prior extraction so to prevent the sterilisation of the resource. Policy ST6 also identifies EM002, Shireoaks Common as employment land. As noted in the planning application response (15/00971/OUT), the Northern part of the sites lies adjacent to Serlby Quarry. Whilst mineral extraction has ceased, the site is still to be restored and remains of interest to the County Council. Application 1/17/01035/CDM under consideration by NCC sought to extend the timescale of importation of waste until 2027, it has recently been withdrawn, a further application is expected to detail the proposed restoration of Serlby quarry. Whilst the quarry is well screened, NCC would wish to ensure any development on the proposed employment allocation site does not prejudice the restoration of Serlby quarry. To the West of the proposed site boundary, there is a current application at the former Harworth Colliery site to import 6.2 million cubic metres of restoration material to restore the former colliery. This application is yet to be	Policy ST7 and Policy 22 will make reference to meeting the need for non minerals development. EM002 has outline planning permission for employment use - NCC would be consulted upon any reserved matters applications to ensure the development does not adversely impact upon the restoration of Serlby Quarry. The Council consults Environmental Health on all relevant applications to ensure that implications for dust, noise are addressed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
		determined by NCC. Considering the volume of inert waste that is anticipated to be required to restore the colliery, it is likely the potential employment allocation may be able to detect some environmental impacts from the waste management site, if the application was to be permitted. Bassetlaw may wish to seek advice from their Environmental Health Officer on any potential implications on this proposed site in terms of dust and noise and consider potential phasing of development so to reduce any potential land use conflict. Such comments are also applicable to EM003, Symmetry Park.	
REF253	Fisher German	8 ha of employment land at Trinity Farm is supported. The pragmatic approach taken by the Council seeking only 5 ha of the 8-ha total to be brought forward within the Plan period is also supported. As the Council is aware Trinity Farm is immediately adjacent to Trinity Park, Randall Way, Retford, a successful business park which has been built out over the previous decade. Trinity Hospital has been instrumental in bringing forward the Trinity Park site and are committed to the next phase. The site is sustainably located, being adjacent to the Retford urban area and is well located to deliver some additional employment land, alongside residential development over the next Plan period. The delivery of the 5 ha of employment land at Trinity Farm will be dependent upon demand and long-term financial commitment to the site. Speculative development is not always easy to progress, in locations away from major arterial routes (e.g. the A1). Occupiers are not prepared to wait and often want built units, whereas developers/investors often want pre-lets before investing in the site. Trinity Hospital has been a Retford based charity for circa 350 years and are committed to its investment in the town. If necessary, to support the development of the employment land, Trinity could create serviced plots or deliver a small commercial scheme. The ability to deliver this would depend on the overall site viability.	The policy takes a pragmatic approach identifying 5ha of the consented land for E and B uses. This should enable the employment uses, supported by employment generating uses on the remaining employment land to be delivered on site as part of a viable scheme.
REF256	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Additional text is requested to part of policy ST6 set out below: Section A point 2 A further 199.6ha of strategic employment land is identified as available only to meet the specific needs of footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of a local business, as set out in Policy ST8. This land would only be used for this purpose if there were no other allocated sites within the Sheffield City Region that could accommodate this requirement.	Following consideration of comments it is not considered that a sequential approach is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Additional text is requested to part of policy ST6 set out below: Section A Point 2 A further 199.6ha of strategic employment land is identified as available only to meet the specific needs of footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of a local business, as set out in Policy ST8. This land would only be used for this purpose if there were no other allocated sites within the Sheffield City Region that could accommodate this requirement.	Following consideration of comments it is not considered that a sequential approach is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust objects to the proposal at part A.2. of this policy to allocate 'a further 199.6ha of strategic employment land' over and above any identified need or demand. This figure is not supported by the proposed growth in housing in the local area. The inclusion of land at Apleyhead Junction would result in urban sprawl, bringing Workop all the way to the A1 junction and proposed Garden Village. It would result in the unjustified loss of good-moderate agricultural land. It would generate further traffic and pollution on the A57 corridor, while impacting on the character of the wider area. It would also present a risk to the remediation and development of brownfield sites in the district and farther afield.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the jobs growth figures and the housing and jobs balance. This informs the approach to policy development. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed to reflect the current position in the District.
REF298	Axis PED Ltd	Policy ST6 sets out that the Council will ensure that a flexible supply of employment land is available to deliver the Council's strategy for economic prosperity, job growth and inward investment. Presents sites in three categories, which are: those with sites under construction 2019-2020, sites with planning permission, and local plan allocations. Identifies 108.38ha of general employment land available during the Plan period. This includes a number of sites with planning permission totalling 36.25ha of employment land. Land at Carlton Forest is included within this total, however, this relates to the site to the south of FCC's site which is	Planning permission exists for part of the site and an occupier is in place to develop the remainder in 2022. On that basis, there is no need to allocate the site a tenant is lined up to occupy. Therefore there is no need to allocate this land. The planning permission and development management process is addressing the needs of the site

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
		shown on the Policies Map. 2.4 ha of FCC's site benefits from planning permission (ref: 18/01093/OUT) for employment uses. It is unclear why this is not included within Policy ST6 under 'sites with planning permission'. This omission is presumed to be an error which should be corrected. In addition to the 2.4ha of land to the east of the Site which currently benefits from planning permission, FCC contend that the remainder of the site is also suitable for employment uses and should be included as a Local Plan Allocation (within the third tranche of sites in Policy ST6). Part of the Site is previously developed land and the entire site is of low environmental value and currently underutilised. Despite being outside of the settlement boundary, the entire Site is well connected to the existing settlement and the adjacent allocation (HS1 and EM005).	
REF299	Gladmans	Policy ST6 seeks to ensure an attractive and flexible supply of employment land is available in the District to ensure the Council's strategy for economic prosperity, job growth and inward investment is achieved. The inclusion of Bevercotes Colliery as an additional Priority Regeneration Area aligns with the ambitions of Policy ST6 and the Plan overall. Bevercotes Colliery has the ability to form a comprehensive mixed-use Priority Regeneration Area that includes B1, B2 and B8 uses alongside residential development. The site is less than 1km from the strategic A1 corridor and therefore represents an excellent location for strategic employment development.	The former Bevercotes Colliery is covered by Local Wildlife Sites and is identified by the Bassetlaw HRA as having the potential to host breeding and foraging protected bird species associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Allocating the site is therefore contrary to legislation and national planning policy. However, the site has planning permission for employment development which is considered to be deliverable as a mitigation package has previously been agreed.
1197264	Resident	Do not need more distribution centres in the area. Mention an increase in jobs, but the majority of land is to be used for more distribution centres, which will mean the majority of new jobs created are for packer/distributor roles, the majority of which will most likely be filled by migrant labour. Would very much like to work locally, however the lack of higher level jobs in the area means we have to commute further afield to surrounding cities and towns.	The Local Plan aims to support a step change in the local economy by diversifying the economic base and providing the right type of land at the right time to meet business needs and to provide more better paid, higher skilled jobs.
REF323	Emery Planning	Welcome the recognition in the Plan of the importance of local businesses as an integral factor in creating and sustaining a diverse and strong local economy. Such businesses are essential to the continued prosperity of the District and a strong local economy is vital to improving living standards and quality of life for Bassetlaw's residents. J G Pears is one such business which is ideally placed to assist the Council in enhancing its economic prosperity. Note a typographical error with the referencing of the High Marnham Energy Hub allocation which is referred at paragraph 6.1.12 and within Policy ST6 as site reference 'EP006', however, in Section heading 6.2 and within Policy ST7 (which allocates the land at the Former High Marnham Power Station as an 'Energy Hub') the site reference is given at 'EM007'. This drafting error is also reflected in other evidence base documents such as the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. For clarity and consistency this matter needs to be addressed across the full suite of documents. Support the allocation of the land at the Former High Marnham Power Station as an employment allocation for B1, B2, B8 - Energy Hub energy and low carbon generation related business. The requirement for development proposals in employment allocations to enter into a site related Construction Job Employment Strategy in order to support local employment and skills in the construction industry is noted and J G Pears are committed to enhancing local employment opportunities and increasing skill levels across the workforce. Note the reference to the use of Planning Performance Agreements and whilst these can be a useful tool in some circumstances these should not be a mandatory requirement of development proposals.	Support for the policy approach is noted. High Marnham Energy Hub will be consistently referenced across all Local Plan documents.
REF325	Resident	Policy ST6A and B should be amended to include the site between the A57/A1 south.	The Economic Development Needs Assessment 2019 assessed a range of available sites and concluded that this site was not required to deliver the economic growth ambitions of the District in this plan period.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Additional text is requested to part of policy ST6 set out below: Section A point 2 A further 199.6ha of strategic employment land is identified as available only to meet the specific needs of footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of a local business, as set out in Policy ST8. This land would only be used for this purpose if there were no other allocated sites within the Sheffield City Region that could accommodate this requirement.	Following consideration of comments it is not considered that a sequential approach is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - Provision of	Land for Employment Development		
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Policy ST6 carries forward the key employment land policy thread from ST1. Although the strategic vision of securing growth across 308ha of employment land is fully supported, it is not necessary to specify the specific market sectors to deliver this quantum of employment. The draft Local Plan objective is to bring forward allocations that provide a balanced portfolio of employment land supply across Bassetlaw that is sufficiently flexible to attract and satisfy the needs of established businesses and investment at a subregional, regional and National level. The approach in ST6 (which then leads to ST8) unhelpfully creates two classes of employment land when in fact both types of land are essential to meet growth ambitions, sub-regional economic objectives and occupier demand. For the Local Plan's strategic vision of delivering step change growth to be realised, the total employment land being proposed must be met. If any part of this need is not delivered, then the overall vision and economic growth objectives for Bassetlaw would be unfulfilled. ST6 is also inconsistent with ST1 in some of the terminology and wording in respect of the ambitions for the site. For example, ST1 refers to 'sub-regional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business' whereas ST6 refers to footloose national and regional business investment. These inconsistencies are unhelpful to the implementation of the policy and will only serve to confuse and potentially deter market interest which in turn would compromise the Council's vision.</p> <p>Suggested policy changes: A. To ensure an attractive and flexible supply of employment land is available to deliver the Council's strategy for economic prosperity, job growth and inward investment 307.98ha 308ha of employment land is recognised of particular value to the economy and will be available for development. 1. to 2037:108.38ha of general employment land available for development during the plan period, an annual average of 5.7ha per year 2018 to 2037. 2. A further 199.6ha of strategic employment land is identified as available only to meet the specific needs of footloose national and regional business investment or the significant expansion of a local business, as set out in Policy ST8. B. All These key employment sites are identified on the Policies Map for development in the following classes and other identified employment sectors in accordance with site specific policies as identified in the plan. Add new site EM010 Apleyhead Junction to list of sites. (Parts C and D remain unaltered)</p>	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the approach taken to policy development. This site is identified as additional to local employment needs and is proposed for allocation on that basis. Terminology will be addressed to ensure consistency in approach.
REF387	Resident	Retford requires land allocation for more employment provision in and around Retford.	5ha of land is identified for employment use in Retford over the plan period. In addition five existing employment sites are protected to support ongoing employment use and the expansion of existing businesses. This approach reflects market demand for employment development in Retford over the last few years.
REF475	Resident	Support. Good locations suggested for big employment sites.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF043	Consultant	<p>To take advantage of the strong grid connection, potential transport via the railway and local manufacturing skills base I would suggest the following rezoning of the former High Marnham Power Station. Note that this rezoning would see a similar electricity generation from solar and also facilitate the creation of jobs in low carbon industry and attract businesses to develop our local energy economy.</p> <p>A – unchanged B- unchanged C: unchanged D: Open as a potential manufacturing zone for low carbon industries with local planning requirement for rooftop solar generation. Valid industry to include organisations in manufacturing of low carbon products in electricity, transport and heat. Could be used to attract battery manufacture, automotive, railway works or producers of solar/wind. Council to seek national grant funding to provide incentives to attract business. Possible reopening of line for freight to be discussed with Network Rail E- unchanged</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
1193338	Resident	<p>Questionable why this hasn't been considered earlier as High Marnham was decommissioned in 2003. Very much supportive of this development with electricity links already in place and the location ideal.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
REF111	Resident	<p>I am speaking for myself and my husband as residents of Ragnall we are concerned about what is being proposed for High Marnham and our local area, as our house is very close to the A57 & only a couple of miles from High Marnham site. The A57 needs more than just upgrading the junction it also needs the traffic slowing down IE; traffic lights or a roundabout because the traffic is horrendous it can take 5-10 minutes to cross the road at times. Also the volume and speed of traffic as increased significantly recently as Collingham as a 7am-7pm weight limit on it now so a lot of traffic from Girtton quarry takes a short cut through Ragnall to get to the A1 instead of going along the A57 to Tuxford to get on the A1. this road is an unclassified road, we have had some repairs in recent months but with recent weather it is breaking down again in places also its not wide enough for all these heavy goods vehicles. A very good friend and neighbour to us had her son killed on A57 3 Christmases ago how many more people have to die before something is done, also with the proposed building of houses on Cottam site it means there will be even more traffic using the A57 junction. Would the junction improvements also mean that the road through our village would be improved also because as it is now it is not of a quality for safe travel for all the extra traffic the proposal will generate. The traffic for J G Pears and the proposed site already runs 24/7 and causes sleep disturbance so if this was to be allowed we would get a significant increase in noise pollution, not to mention the increase in odour pollution that already causes distress to many.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF112	Resident	<p>In principle I fully support and endorse Green Energy production, (I work in the generation business) it's what the proposal really means in relation to the other developments on the site that are the key factor. I have experience of a battery storage project and fully understand the UK needs to secure electricity supply post 2025 though renewables along with other low carbon generation. I fully support the UK being self-sufficient and not reliant on interconnects from Europe. Just for information UK demand today is 36 Gig, Wind is producing 13 Gig, Gas 9.5 Gig, Coal 1 Gig, Nuclear 6 Gig, Biomass 2.5 Gig + other. Further to my emails last night I have a few initial questions and concerns regarding the draught proposal. I feel it would be beneficial if you came to the meeting prepared to answer these and address any concerns of other local Councillors. Are we correct in thinking that J G Pears will be the main promoter / developer for the "High Manrham Energy Hub" they currently lease the site with an option to buy? This fact is important to local residents due to the fact Pears operate their current business in a reactive manner and are not proactive. For many years residents have suffered awful odour from the rendering plant, only when Pears were faced with legal action did they invest in a thermal oxidiser to address odour issues. More recently the CHP plant is the main odour abatement technology, however its only when the EA issue corrective action plans that any improvements are carried out. Two families with children have been forced out of their homes in Low Manrham due to odour, how this can morally be right..... Can it? I have over 20 years' experience on the Parish Council, dealing with Pears constantly, the local residents' concerns are reinforced by historical factual data. Assurances need to be given, and enforced in the planning application to ensure compliance with any requirements. I have been asked by several residents for clarification of the different sections, especially "B" and "C", please could you expand on these? The closest residential property is only 300m from area B "Energy efficient business use" and 450m away from area A "Low carbon energy production". Noise from both of these areas is a major potential concern which local residents don't feel Bassetlaw fully appreciate due to the fact Bassetlaw have already issued Pears a 24/7 operating licence for the storage facility on this site. Along with this the current access to the site passes through residential areas, noise at night? Area's C, the site ceased electricity generation in 2003, the northern area of the site (Adjacent A & B) was the old coal plant so little demolition works were required. As a result with the site being secure it has become a haven for wild life protected from "people". Area C, which is adjacent area D is the old site access road, this as I have previously commented is planted with trees. This is already established woodland and should be protected, along with additional planting. This would have been planted when High Manrham opened in the late 1950's so 70 years of tree growth needs to be protected. The area East of B is a flood risk area. The old power station site has quite a substantial flood bank and in the worst floods of 2000 didn't encounter and flooding (I worked on the site at this time). In the proposal is quotes: "the site promoter, who has significant experience in using energy generation and low carbon uses to minimise the carbon emissions from their current business operations"</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny.</p>
REF112	Resident	<p>J G Pears have had major issues with their CHP plant, to such an extent that it was shut down for several months at the end of 2019. (it is less than 2 years old). It was reported that they had issues with tube leaks within the boiler. Working in the Power Industry this clearly demonstrates their lack of experience and knowledge in Power Generation and thus Pears ability to run and maintain a power generation source. These problems will (I am sure) have been caused by poor water chemistry, which is basic operational procedure of a power generation boiler, the comment "significant experience" is not justifiable. In the proposal is quotes: "Measures to ensure amenity of local communities from noise, light, glare, smell, dust, or emissions are in accordance with relevant environmental standards". From their existing site JG Pears omit odour with continuous complaints, even to an extent of forcing people from their homes. Light pollution is extensive but complaints over ruled by the needs of Health and Safety. In the proposal is quotes: "Transport and Movement a) A scheme of an appropriate scale, layout and form supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan". Rather than duplicate this issue I will leave Ragnal and Dunham councillors to expand on this. I do feel that the bridge at Grassporpe is also of major concern I have copied this to other councillors along with a few local people who care about our</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
		<p>local community. I am sure others will comment in a constructive manner. One final note, employment? How many local people are employed at the existing Pears site? None / (very few to my knowledge). Manual type labour is provided by Eastern European workers. More specialised tasks are not carried out by local personnel. Solar farms, battery storage and other low carbon generation plant require very limited staff. JG Pears already demonstrate that low grade employment needs are met by foreign workers. These are facts that cannot be disputed Pears have already set a precedent. Therefore the application can not, and should not quote employment for local people.</p>	<p>Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>We welcome the consideration given to this site within the Local Plan, which should help to provide certainty to future developers and decision makers with regards to how this large brownfield site will be brought back into use.</p> <p>The site lies to the immediate west of the River Trent, which the Trust manage as Navigation Authority. Whilst the Draft Plan makes reference to the need for a Transport Assessment, we are concerned that paragraph 6.2.8 focusses upon the likely demands upon the Highways Network, which has the implication that alternative transport to deliver materials to the site are not being considered. The River Trent is a navigable river, which is capable of handling vessels that could deliver materials to and from the site. It provides a direct link to the Humber Estuary and associated ports. Development will require the delivery of building materials and solar panels, which may include abnormal loads which could be accommodated via the River Trent, reducing the potential burden on the local highway network. The river also has the potential to transport fuel stock to the proposed energy hub by barge, which would help to reduce the long term importation of materials to site by road. As highlighted in our response to Policy ST5, efforts to mitigate against the adverse impacts of traffic are promoted by paragraph 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework and in, in the case of larger loads, in the government's water preferred policy for the movement of abnormal loads. Correspondence from the Department for Transport to PINS highlights the policy position for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads by water, and the advisory role of Highways England. https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/wpp_letter.pdf Paragraph 148 of the NPPF highlights that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. The use of waterborne freight can help accord with this aim, as carbon emissions by water are demonstrably lower when compared to other forms of transit, such as road transport. Research by the Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA), using a case study of the transport of steel by water, highlights that carbon emissions of transport by water can be 45% lower than that of comparative transport by road. http://www.cboa.org.uk/downloads/environmental_impact_report.pdf We therefore believe that the Local Plan should require the potential of waterborne freight to be considered in any future assessment of the transport plan concerning this site. This could be done through expansion of paragraph 6.2.8 to require an assessment to be undertaken with regards to the feasibility of waterborne freight to deliver materials and fuel stock to site. Failure to take account for this could result in the potential use of this water resource being ignored, which could reduce its effectiveness in mitigating against the adverse impacts of traffic generation. Policy ST7 We therefore respectfully request that the policy is expanded to ensure that future decision makers consider the use of the River Trent to transport construction materials to the site (and to export any waste materials from the site). This could be undertaken through the expansion of part 2 (Transport and Movement) of the policy with the following suggested text "b) Consideration should be given towards opportunities to utilise the River Trent for the transportation of construction and waste materials to and from the site during redevelopment.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF123	Resident	<p>1. Is there no possibility that the Robin Hood rail line will extend to Lincoln given current DOT 'noise'? This could affect the development. 2. If not, the west end of area C should incorporate a car park for users of the cycle / walking track. Currently there is no place to park and the ad-hoc grass verge parking is a bit risky from the Fledborough approach when coming over the bridge. Continuing on transport – both northern and southern HGV approaches are currently far from ideal for residents of Ragnall, Fledborough, Normanton and Sutton on Trent with existing HGV traffic. More would render it intolerable. 3. It would be a pity if the existing well established spinneys on the south and east boundaries of the switchyard and area B were not retained. They are substantial wild life refuges in an area not 'over-treed' (I ran the village shoot for nearly 20 years which extended over all of area D down to Sutton on Trent so know them well)</p> <p>4. Area A. Low carbon energy production. I can think of nuclear, hydro, wind, solar (area D already) none of which would seem to be an option for area A. However, there are fertile and technically ignorant minds out there so who knows? 5. Area B. Energy efficient business area. Gym? Treadmill for convicts? Perhaps not, but CO2 neutral offices or small industrial units would be welcome 6. Area C. Energy intensive land uses..... Aluminium smelter? Electric arc steelmaking? Cement works? Paper mill? Pottery factory? I don't think so. What we all fear is another stinking, noisy rendering plant as per existing..... Remember North/South Clifton school is downwind at about 1250m and the long-suffering (JGP blighted) residents of High Marnham even nearer when a north wind blows.</p> <p>7. Suggestion - why not some housing to provide 'walk-to-work' employment. Winners all round. May I ask who is the promotor? Strawsons – OK. JG Pears – we fear the worst!</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF139	Resident	<p>I have read the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. I am supportive of the council looking for opportunities for low-carbon and renewable energy development opportunities, however any development opportunities must not be taken at the cost of safety, health and well-being of local people and the preservation of the local environment. As a resident of Ragnall I am particularly concerned about the following sections relating to site EM007 and policy ST7 (pages 55-58): "The Bassetlaw Transport Study: Part 29 sets out recommendations for transport mitigation measures. These include capacity improvements to the A57 junction at Dunham on Trent/Ragnall crossroads. A Transport Assessment will provide a more detailed assessment of the impact of development on the highways network." "Transport and Movement a) A scheme of an appropriate scale, layout and form supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, and advice of the Local Highways Authority, which further details: i. Contributions towards improvements to the A57 junction at Dunham on Trent/Ragnall crossroads; ii. That vehicular traffic generated by the development, including lorry movements can be safely accommodated." These sections suggest that the council intends to allow the increase the volume of traffic, including more heavy vehicles using the road through Ragnall, with the development of a High Marnham energy hub. This raises serious concerns for the safety and health of residents due to road safety and air quality impacts. It also impacts upon amenity of residents due to noise and smell associated with increased industrial traffic. A further increase in industrial traffic is unacceptable in this situation. For these reason I object to these draft plans. I would expect the council to prioritise the safety and health of residents and the impact on residents daily lives in consideration of any plans, and to revise the local plan to prevent these serious negative impacts upon residents. I look forward to reviewing the revisions to this plan, and will be as actively involved as required in helping the council maintain focus on the safety, health and best interests of residents, so please keep me updated.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
1195350	Resident	<p>TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT</p> <p>Whilst it is mentioned in the Policy a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be conducted with improvements at the junction with the A57, it has be considered that this junction is the first access into Lincoln, after Newark & Gainsborough. With proposals of increased housing at Cottam, this will additionally impact also on the access across the River Trent, with potential traffic delays at Dunham Bridge also at this junction is an infant and junior school. This is a rural school and services the villages of Dunham, Ragnall and Fledborough. Most families have to drive their children to school because of the distance from their homes and there currently is no pedestrian crossings. During school start and finish times and times and when parents visit school for other events, a good stretch of this road is blocked on one side by parked vehicles. Currently there is no alternative for them. Warehousing usually employs high numbers of staff, adding this to all the additional traffic generated by suppliers and customers will certainly lead to an overall steady stream of vehicles accessing the B8 site. Without a doubt this will put further pressures on the existing road systems in this area and surrounding areas. It's also worth noting here that already the route from this site to the A57 has very regular traffic (HGV's and slow moving tractors) operating 24 hours from JG Pears at Marnham and used regularly by other HGV's wanting to take a short cut from the A1 to the A57, there are further burdens when the A1 is closed and alternative traffic routes are sought by road users. Along this route particularly in Fledborough there are tight corners and properties with accesses on blind corners .</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technonly which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council beleive that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
1195851	Resident	<p>I oppose the plan to develop High Marnham power station site. Road access is poor using narrow lanes. Any increase in traffic level is a backwards step. The proposed use seems to have appeared from thin air to benefit only one company. Little to no consideration seems to be paid to anyone who lives near any of the large housing developments or the Marnham "power hub"</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technonly which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council beleive that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF193	Residents	<p>employment land. This has been calculated as a future requirement of 63.0 ha with higher need under scenarios subject to strong performance in transport and distribution. 3. Whilst the Local Plan might want to pursue a growth strategy, policies ST6, ST7, ST8 and S98 collectively allocate some 302.98 ha of employment land which is some 4.8 times larger than the evidential requirement. The plan suggests that 199.60 ha of this is in strategic inward investment. 4. There is no evidence submitted to demonstrate that there is a need to allocate land that exceeds the need put forward in the Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment. In the absence of any cogent or substantive evidence underpinning the Local Plan for the period 2018 to 2037; this does not justify the allocation of inappropriate or unsuitable sites. As such there is no unmet strategic employment need requirement to justify the allocation of site EM007. 5. Even ignoring the two strategic sites in Policy ST8; policy ST6 allocates 103.38 ha which far exceeds the identified future requirement of 63.0 ha. Removal of the 38.4 ha site at HighMarnham would still leave 64.98 ha under Policy ST6 which meets the future need identified; with the 199.60 ha of land in Policy ST8 as additional buffer for strategic inward investment.6. The Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment identifies in Table 17 that the High Marnham site is "Not in a commercially attractive location." As such the evidence underpinning the draft Local Plan does not support the allocation of this site in terms of quantum or location. In fact the Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment concludes the policy recommendation as being: "Not included in supply." Despite this the Local Plan allocates the site.7. Paragraph 6.1.14 of the draft Local Plan states: "In addition, Policy ST6 makes a positive policy intervention to ensure the regeneration of two former coal fired power stations sites at High Marnham and Cottam. Their closure directly affects employment in the rural area, and indirectly affects local supply chains. New employment land is regarded as essential to support those local communities and make best use of these significant brownfield sites in the longer term." However this statement is misleading, High Marnham power station was decommissioned in 2003 some 17 years ago and the main demolition took place in 2004 and 2006; the cooling towers as the final structures were demolished in 2012 some 8 years ago. According to BBC News the power station only employed 109 people prior to closure and it has provided no employment now for 17 years. Accessibility8. High Marnham represents a poorly accessible location, the power station was sited there for operational reasons needing to be next to the river. Like most of the coal fired power stations it was connected to the rail network which was used for the delivery of coal. It had direct rail connection to most of the collieries in North Nottinghamshire. 9. The site no longer has a rail connection, although the High Marnham Test Track which houses Network Rail's 'Rail Innovation & Development Centre' (RIDC) runs to the western side of Ragnall Road. The Test Track doesn't connect to the national rail network, although through use of the mineral line for the former Thoresby and Bevercotes Collieries it can connect to the Robin Hood Line at Shirebrook. The former railway trackbed eastwards from the site across the Fledborough viaduct over the River Trent, through Clifton to Doddington & Harby forms an off-road part of National Cycle Route 647 which is part of the National Cycle Network. 10. The site entrance gate is 3.5km from the A57 along a 'C' classified road; this route takes vehicles through the villages of Fledborough and Ragnall. There is a 6.1km route westwards along a 'C' classified road to the A6075 past the Tuxford Academy but this has a low bridge height limit of 4m. The A1 is 7.9km south of the site entrance along a 'C' classified road; however this route takes vehicles through the villages of Grassthorpe, Sutton on Trent and Carlton on Trent; including a narrow bridge over Grassthorpe Beck which is susceptible to regular flooding. The only large settlement within 5 miles of the site is Tuxford, otherwise Retford is around 10 miles away, none of the villages within this part of Bassetlaw provide any sizeable populations; as such it is poorly related to locations where people will live.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF193	Resident	<p>11. The Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment discounts sites at Markham Moor which are significantly closer to Tuxford and Retford for being: "some distance from nearby labour supply." The proposed allocation is even more remote from the local labour force. 12. The site cannot be reached by public transport, the nearest bus stop is at Gracefield Lane in Normanton on Trent some 1.7km from the site access and some 2.5km from the centre of the site. This bus stop is only served by the 37A service which provides a school time service only to/from Newark; the 40 service which provides a school time service only to/from Tuxford; and the 339 infrequent daytime service which only links to Tuxford and South Muskham. This latter service does not run at peak hours so is unsuitable for most employment uses. 13. The site is not within walking and cycling distance of local settlements where any sizeable amount of housing exists. As such employment on this site would be entirely dependent upon the use of private vehicles for employees and the use of HGVS or vans for deliveries etc. 14. The proposed allocation therefore does not reflecting the spatial strategy, and undermines the attempts of the spatial strategy to achieve the most sustainable pattern of growth. The Local Plan claims that the focus will be on developing land for major new employment uses in sustainable locations. The proposed High Manrham allocation is in an unsustainable location. The Local Plan through Policy ST7 does not propose any measures to improve the accessibility of the site by sustainable modes of transport. 15. The site could be regenerated as a renewable energy generation hub without the need to locate B1, B2 or B8 businesses. It could also operate for rail related purposes with a short connection to the existing Rail Test Track. 16. Previously promoted large scale sites in similar remote locations such as the former Bevercotes Colliery (Vertical Park promoted by Gladman) have not attracted any interest and remain vacant. This site despite previously having planning permission appears not to have even been assessed in the Bassetlaw Economic Needs Assessment The site will offer employment but in a location the evidence says is remote from the labour supply as such the economy and skills criterion is over scored. We consider that the proposal has a 'mixture of positive and negative effects'. 19. In terms of accessibility to public transport the SA incorrectly says that part of the site is within 400m of a bus stop. As identified earlier the nearest bus stop is at Gracefield Lane in Normanton on Trent some 1.7km from the site access and some 2.5km from the centre of the site. This bus stop is only served by school and infrequent daytime services which are unsuited to employee use. As such transport will have a 'significant negative' effect. 20. In terms of climate change although the site is proposed to generate renewable energy, as an employment location the site is not accessible by public transport or other sustainable means of transport. It will be wholly reliant upon use of the private car and HGVs as such as a location it will result in transport movements that contributes to harm to climate change. Consequently we consider that the proposal has a 'mixture of positive and negative effects'. 21. In terms of landscape the site is prominent being in the Trent valley, it is particularly prominent from South and North Clifton to the east; as well as from High Manrham and Fledborough. The site is highly visible from the National Cycle Route 647 and the Fledborough viaduct over the River Trent. The policy sets out no specific mitigation measures for mitigation from all of these viewpoints as such the allocation would have a 'negative' effect on the landscape. Conclusion 22. Consequently the proposed allocation would fail the tests of soundness as explained earlier and it would not constitute sustainable development. Change Requested 23. Delete the proposed site EM007: High Manrham Energy Hub for employment.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF198	Consultant	Policy ST7 page 57 This is to be supported and encouraged with whatever means the LPA have at their disposal.	Thank you for your comment

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Whilst Severn Trent is supportive of the general principles and the inclusion bullet point 3.c) “the protection of water quality of the River Trent;” the plan does not provide any mention of the drainage hierarchy. The site is situated adjacent to the River Trent therefore the need to connect surface water to the foul sewers should not be required, this is a key element of ensuring that the development is sustainable and resilient to the future impacts of climate change etc. Recommended wording for the considerations are covered under our response to the Bassetlaw Garden Village.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF203	Residential	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this development. I would like to begin by endorsing all the comments made by the previous correspondents. It seems natural to exploit the assets which this site already has.1. Because of the electrical apparatus left behind by the Power Station, it would be easy to adapt the area for a Solar Farm and Large Scale Electrical Battery Storage when that Technology becomes available. 2. At the same time, the cycle way along the disused railway line and the adjacent woodland [Area C] could be enhanced as a local amenity in a manner like the Monsel Trail in the Derbyshire Peak District. At present, there is limited access with extremely poor signage and no publicity about this facility. There is no car park and a very hazardous road to cross. This could be combined with the Common Land [Area E] as a Park for walking, cycling and horse riding ; I am aware that the area along the River Trent is already in use as a Water Ski and boating area.3. Nevertheless, I feel that I should draw your attention to the potential Health Risk emanating from the site of the old Ash Plant Site and the disturbance of that site. There is a body of Medical Evidence about the Risks to Human Health from Coal Ash and the need for its safe disposal.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways Part C, 2, a), (i) The A57 junction improvement should be secured as part of the development rather than by way of a contribution. Part C,2. A fourth bullet point is needed to address pedestrians, cycling, and public transport.	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny
1196681	Resident	The proposals for developing this site at the former High Marnham Power Station are commendable with its aim of producing a low carbon economy. However the source of the energy that would be produced is not specified and the implication is that materials would be brought from elsewhere, therefore increasing the commercial traffic on routes that are unsuitable, being narrow and winding. This site would only be viable if there was a dedicated new access direct to the A1 which did not impact on small rural settlements, north and south, reducing the their quality of life. Improving the junction of the A57/ and Main St, Ragnall is not the answer.	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF237	Resident	<p>Why would you rob local residents of the chance to protect themselves? By enshrining into policy a plan for this site that includes so many elements. Solar Low Carbon Energy Production B1 B2 & B8 You give “the prompter” a free pass, to burn, build, transport, disturb, and disrupt the lives of local people. If the scheme is off such merit “the prompter” should be invited to submit an application for planning permission which can be scrutinised, discussed and debated by elected officials with the welfare of their electorate at heart. It should not be the role of the council to further the commercial interests of one company. Locally it is believed that the prompter is J G Pears – a company who are reviled for their lack of care and consideration for their neighbours. Pears applied in 2015 to build a CHP plant, burning chicken litter, at their exiting site at Low Marham. The application was denied permission by Bassetlaw; the subject of a planning appeal and eventually submitted to the Secretary of State for a decision. At the time local people were horrified and galvanized into campaigning against the plant. Subsequent planning applications, including a recent one at the High Marnham site, also attracted objections. This proposal makes reference to “Low Carbon Energy Generation” – yet the fuel isn’t stipulated. Whatever the fuel, it will be trucked to site – along road described in your own research as unsuitable in trucks burning diesel. We are not comforted by the promise of a Transport Assessment as statutory consultees only ever consider the application before them and not the cumulative impact caused by a now sprawling industrial plant in the heart of the countryside. 330 vehicles passed our home in a 24 hours period one day last week, 114 of these were HGVs. The site is lovely. It’s been allowed to re-wild since the demolition of the power station. The deciduous avenue of mature trees along the drive on the site is such a joy and rare in this intensively farmed area. Surely a range of housing would be a better use of this site. I urge you not to rob us of the ability to protect ourselves.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF254	Resident	<p>Generally supportive. We are in favour of environmentally friendly and sustainable development. If this site has to be developed at all, we applaud the Council for identifying these type of activities as suitable. Some specific comments: 1. Must avoid diluting the ambition by granting any type of heavy/polluting industrial usage on the site. The reference to the type of businesses using the green energy production should be clarified to make it clear what type of business is being referred to. 2. The plans must be sensitive to the limited local infrastructure, including narrow country roads. Local concern about increased traffic are valid. Can the site be encouraged to have some local amenities? 3. Council should consider independent advice and/or verification of the green credentials - eg from an appropriate NGO.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF258	Environment Agency	<p>We'd like to see a bullet point added under section 1 'Good Quality Design and Local Character' which clearly states the requirement for 'the comprehensive remediation of any contaminated land in accordance with relevant environmental standards'. We feel that this change is necessary given the current and historic use of the site.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF263	Resident	<p>My comments will focus on: the proposed Energy Hub at High Marnham; the impact of the Cottam housing development traffic; Energy Hub traffic within our parishes and I believe, a couple of errors in the plan. Energy Hub Recognise it is necessary to attach a planning framework to this site in order to control planning applications, but this site offers so much more. It is a terrific opportunity for BDC to do something really positive in an area that feels both forgotten and let down by Bassetlaw, particularly with the history of handling of JGPears. The east side of Bassetlaw has very little in the way of public amenities: following your green energy theme, you could make the site a wildlife sanctuary with a car park for those wishing to walk the area and for those wishing to walk/cycle the wildlife corridor which runs adjacent to the site. There could also be another car park at the river side to allow public access to the River Trent. The only other parking currently available is for fishermen at Dunham Bridge (approx. 5 cars) and 4/5 miles away. One suggestion could be to broaden your horizons and consider an Energy Village not just an Energy Hub. By doing this you could incorporate both housing, employment and leisure activities. Referring to the current plan for the site it strikes odd that you place an industrial site right next to the wildlife corridor identified in the plan. Surely there should be a green buffer belt running the length of the track to allow the wildlife to flourish? There would then be a green 'circle' around any 'hard' development in the centre of the site. Then the current industrial area identified on the map (blue) wouldn't be under water as it is now, plus it would 'hide' the uglier developments of industry. However the involvement of Pears with the site strikes a worrying and fearful note in the hearts of local residents. Sadly we have suffered for years with this company. The headings in your proposal of* Low carbon energy production and storage creating an energy hub plus*Energy efficient business uses plus*Energy intensive land uses harnessing power and heat from the energy hub Sounds like heaven for Pears - through their actions and their representatives have shown an arrogance borne from confidence that whatever they apply for will be granted, regardless of the cost to the local surrounding communities. What a stitch up! It is so vague as to allow any kind of development so long as it taps into the energy hub. This must be tightened up so as to stop a) anymore Pears/odorous businesses developing and b) more heavy traffic related to these businesses. The best energy hub for the local residents would be to have solar panels and battery storage. This would not add smell, dust, light, glare, noise or emissions pollution to the area nor significant traffic to an unclassified road. Marnham is a Key Council Plan priority however the Draft Local Plan doesn't even list Ragnall crossroads, a junction that will be significantly impacted by this development, as part of Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan ST49. There are 12 projects listed, yet not one of them supporting this Key priority and there have been two fatalities at these crossroads in the</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
		last 3 years. Bassetlaw DC appear to have looked at a site and only at the site. Marnham on the face of it, offers a brownfield development but that's as far as it goes. As you are aware, the land is contaminated and may have landfill, has sand/gravel/limestone on site, is within 100 metres of a wildlife site, some distance from local services, and has part of the site in Flood zone 3 and 2. It is in a rural setting, served by an unclassified road where traffic going north would travel through four small agricultural hamlets. Traffic going south would pass through Grassthorne and have to cross the completely unsuitable bridge. Not the best place for a significant Energy Hub without meaningful changes to the proposals outlined in the Draft Plan. West Burton power station site served by the close proximity of an A road offers a far safer, more acceptable and more economical solution to an Energy Hub centre. The site has direct connection to the national electricity grid from the high voltage electricity infrastructure on site.	
REF263	Resident	Traffic in Dunham, Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough will suffer badly with additional traffic based on the Large Rural Development at Cottam and the Energy Hub. The unclassified road running north/south at the crossroads is already used as a rat run to the A1. Large agricultural vehicles have to use this road to access farms and as already expressed, we have the added heavy goods vehicles associated with JG Pears. Over 110 lorries used the road in one day during the 'quiet' month of February. Parts of Dunham, Fledborough and particularly Ragnall villages already experience high heavy goods traffic 24/7. The B8 designation of the site encourages distribution so more traffic: this has got to be limited or better still eliminated. If the Energy Hub was to be developed then there should be a new road built avoiding Ragnall where a relatively recent death occurred on the bend. At the bend, most traffic crosses on to the wrong side of the road, especially lorries. What is needed is the creation of a safe junction whereby traffic can enter and exit the A57 and avoid this hamlet altogether. In other words a new road that would reflect the value of investment and high profile Bassetlaw are giving this Marnham site. And this new road would have to be built before the site was developed. The villages of both Darlton and Dunham would experience increased traffic from the site, and worryingly traffic going directly north would pass the already mentioned local village school. Traffic going due east and west has already been mentioned in relation to Cottam. Very worrying times for our communities.	The allocation of High Marnham for renewable energy and employment development makes a sensible use for a former power producing site. The development of the site will be controlled through the preparation of a Local Development Order. The impact of traffic from the site will be assessed through the preparation of the masterplan when the type, use and level of proposed development has been agreed. NCC Highways will also be a stakeholder in the preparation of the masterplan.
REF273	Anglian Water	Policy ST7: Site EM007: High Marnham Energy Hub Policy ST7 as drafted cross refers to employment proposals on the above site meeting the water efficiency standards specified in Policy ST45 of the Draft Plan. Policy ST45 of the Draft plan states that development proposals should meet the optional higher water efficiency standard and water re-use measures should be included in development proposals wherever possible. However the water efficiency standard relates to residential development proposals as such it is unclear what standard for water efficiency is being sought. Consideration should be given to setting out a specific standard e.g. BREEAM for employment proposals in Policy ST45. In addition reference could be made to an integrated approach to water management as suggested for the Bassetlaw Garden Village policy.	The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF282	National Trust	<p>National Trust supports in principal the concept of redeveloping the former High Marnham Power Station to create a green energy hub, bearing in mind its existing grid connections and contaminated status. However, this is subject to the development being of an appropriate scale in order to keep impacts on the neighbouring hamlet, road network, landscape, heritage and the River Trent within acceptable limits. Bearing in mind the relative isolation of the site, and depending on whether any green travel arrangements can be secured, it may be appropriate to restrict the size of the 'business area' as B1 type office use is typically high employment density and is generally more suited to urban areas. Part 1(b) of the policy states that the scheme should not result in an increase in flood risk to this site or land elsewhere. As parts of the site are within Flood Zone 3 it may be appropriate to go further and explore whether there is any opportunity to incorporate flood betterment, helping to alleviate flood risk elsewhere on the River Trent corridor. Part 3 of the policy refers to protection of a Local Wildlife Site and a landscaping scheme to avoid significant adverse effects. However, there is a clear opportunity for this to be an aspirational scheme and to deliver biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF283	Resident	<p>ST7 56 6.2.8 Although junction improvements on the A57 at Dunham crossroads are anticipated, no account is taken of the impact on the inadequate road through Ragnall village. An alternative would be to extend northwards the existing HGV route to the nearby JG Pears plant at Low Marnham, which would avoid disturbing any other communities.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	<p>It is stated that development of this site will 'be sensitive to the Fledborough to Harby Local Wildlife Site on the site which should remain outside the developable area, as well as the adjoining Old Trent Local Wildlife Site. Their nature conservation interests must be preserved during and post-construction.' Local Wildlife Sites are afforded protection due to their substantive nature conservation value. Their selection takes into consideration the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats within a national, regional and local context, making them some of our most valuable urban and rural wildlife areas. We are of the opinion that it is not sufficient to just protect the LWS. We advocate significant buffering to enhance its wildlife value. Planning application 19/00818/FUL was accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (BSG ecology 2019). Section 4.5 states 'the wider survey area (former power station site) has potential to meet the criteria for open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (OMH)'. This is a Habitat of Principal Importance under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Section 41 of The Act requires the Secretary of State to publish and maintain lists of species and types of habitats which are regarded by Natural England to be of "principal importance" for the purposes of conserving biodiversity in England. Section 4.6 states 'The site itself shows limited spatial variability, mainly supporting ephemeral short perennial vegetation / sparsely vegetated bare ground and hard standing. It is not assessed to form a particularly important area of habitat given the abundance of this type of habitat within the context of the former power station site; however, it does form part of the wider OMH habitat component'. It is recognised therefore, that development of this site will result in a net loss in the extent of this habitat. Any development of the site would need to consider and evaluate the OMH habitat.</p> <p>The associated landscaping schemes of the proposed development should use native species, preferably of local provenance, and create/restore habitats found within the Trent corridor, especially habitats that are a priority in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF300 -	Natural England	<p>We welcome section 3 of the policy wording which protects ecological interests and makes provision of a multi-functional green infrastructure network.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF322	Resident	<p>1. As a member of the local community, I feel that that any buildings / development in the proposed Energy Hub are not merely hidden behind a green area, but utilise the latest environmentally and eco friendly building design and material availability to ensure once completed the Energy Hub does not detract from the visual appeal of the rural area in which the communities are situated and which for many community members is the reason for living in the area. Any buildings should not breach the height of the proposed Zone E area as per point 4 below and should be kept to a minimum of 4 storeys tall, for all planned or future buildings. 2. Any proposed business operation should not be granted permission to neither draw water from or discharge effluent into the adjacent River Trent. 3. The area designated as Zone C in figure 12 below is designated for use by Energy Intensive Land Uses harnessing power and heat from the energy hub, Zone C however; 3.1. Includes the Local Wildlife site (ST36) as indicated in the figure below and with reference to and taking into account Policy ST34, point 6.266 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan ; My concern is that, although mentioned to the contrary in 6.2.9, unless clearly stipulated in the plan, if allowed, Zone C would effectively be allowed to override the Local Wildlife Site designation and therefore destroy the Local Wildlife Site, which is an area that is home to many animal, bird and wildlife species that were not present whilst the High Marnham Power Station was in operation. 3.2. Is positioned directly alongside the well utilised Fledborough to Harby disused Railway Line, a Zone C area would discourage the community from utilising the from the disused railway line, in this regard and with reference to and taking into account Policy ST34, points 6.265 and 6.267 and ST35, point 6.272 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan, at the minimum the area of the designated Local Wildlife Site should be extended from it's current width and length to a minimum width of 100m / 330 ft and a length that includes the entire length of the proposed High Marnham Energy Hub situated alongside the Fledborough to Harby disused Railway line. This is indicated in the figure below. 4. In addition to the extension of the Local Wildlife Site, there should be an area designated to Zone E between the proposed Extension and Zone C and around the perimeter of the site as indicated below 5. Further thought needs to be given to the inclusion of a carpark in the proposed Hub for the users of the Disused Railway Line, there are residents in the surrounding communities who do not use the line as a result of poor parking availability and the associated dangers of parking vehicles on a main road. 6. As a result of existing heavy industry close to Low Marnham the volume of heavy traffic heavy traffic along the Fledborough road is already a safety and noise concern and risk to local residents utilising the access roads to High Marnham, Low Marnham and Normanton on Trent, therefore access to the High Marnham Energy Hub should be limited to the existing road utilised to access the High Voltage Yard and should not be allowed to positioned further along the road towards High Marnham (see figure below), 7. All buildings and business operations should at the very least be required to be Zero Net Energy Users and preferably produce an excess amount of energy from there operations. Further due consideration could be given to ensuring that the Energy Hub is a net energy generator, meaning that the sum of the energy balance equation of all existing and new/proposed businesses need to ensure that the Energy Hub does not draw energy from the National Grid in any way, but that the Energy Hub is self-supportive as far as energy is concerned. 8. There is already low use activity on the site and the exact classification of this usage is not know in terms of the development zonal classification (Zone A – Zone E) as found in section 6.2.5. or in terms of Economic Use classification B1, B2 or B8 as detailed in Policy ST7. Any potential development in this area will need to assess current activity on the site to ensure adherence to the classifications mentioned above. 9. The Hub needs to be designated as a zero emissions site for waste, noise and smells. 10. To align to policy ST41 and ST 42, particularly referencing Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan points 6.289 and 6.294, 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, for example a scout activity ground, a permanent headquarters for meetings, activities and equipment</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technonly which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council beleive that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
		<p>storage. Potential could also be explored for allowing access to the River Trent via the Hub for water activities for these groups. Local Schools could also benefit from such a youth-based activity area. (Depicted in Figure Below).</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF323	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears	<p>. 1.4 The site is a major previously developed site with a lawful use for employment purposes. Planning permission was recently granted at the site for erection of a storage building (application reference: 19/00818/FUL).1.5 Emery Planning previously made representations on behalf of our clients to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan for the period 2018 to 2035 promoting the site as a major previously developed site with potential to be developed for employment purposes.1.6 Since this time various correspondence and meetings with the planning policy team has culminated in the allocation of our client's land interest under Policy ST7 - High Marnham Energy Hub. We welcome this allocation and look forward to working with the LPA to secure delivery of this site. We are also in communication with the land owners, E-on, who have advised they are also supportive of the allocation and will be making separate representations to that effect. This joint commitment to the delivery of the site as allocated serves to provide certainty that it can be delivered and assist the Council in meeting its aims and objectives as set out through the Plan.1.7 Having reviewed the document as a whole, together with the supporting evidence base, we would like to support the strategy put forward and welcome the Draft Plan which plans positively and proactively for the future of the District to ensure the delivery of sustainable development.1.8 In our view, the Plan as presented is fundamentally sound and provides clear and evidenced justification for the strategies and objectives included which are consistent with national policy, particularly with regard to the reuse of previously developed land and the transition to a low carbon future.1.9 Notwithstanding the above, we reserve the right to make further representations, including oral representations to the Examination in Public, if so required. 2.12 Paragraph 6.2.1 of the Plan highlights that "Supporting its [Former High Marnham Power Station] comprehensive redevelopment is a Local Plan objective and a key Council Plan priority" this is welcomed and supported by both our clients, who have a leasehold and option interest in the site, and the land owners, E-on. E-on's representatives at Cushman & Wakefield have written separately in support of the site's inclusion as an allocation in the Plan. This joint support of the allocation helps to provide certainty as to its future delivery. 2.13 The allocation of this site is in line with the NPPF's encouragement of LPA's to identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development (NPPF, paragraph 151)</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF323	Consultant	<p>2.14 We would support the comment that the site provides a unique opportunity to support this expanding market given its optimal location: with direct connection to the national electricity grid from the high voltage electricity infrastructure that remains on site. This is further supported by J G Pears own direct grid connection from their nearby combined heat and energy (CHP) plant at Low Manrham, which currently inputs surplus energy into the grid, but could potentially be harnessed directly by future development on this site. 2.15 The allocation also serves to meet a priority of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan and emerging Local Industrial Strategy. 2.16 At paragraph 6.2.5 we would suggest that the word 'only' in the first sentence "... employment uses in the renewable and low carbon sector only, such as battery and data storage, and associated power generation" is superfluous and should be removed – the aims of the policy are clear and any development proposals would need to demonstrate their low carbon/renewable credentials as part of any planning submission. Likewise, we would suggest the requirement for proposals to be 'fully compliant' in the second sentence "Proposals must also be fully compliant with the principles and zoning set out in the masterplan framework for the site" is unnecessarily restrictive as there would be no harm arising if uses compliant with the aims of the policy were to come forward within the previously developed part of the site but outside of the 'zone' locations identified in figure 12. In such a case each application should be considered on its own merits in accord with the relevant material considerations. 2.17 The reference made at paragraph 6.2.10 with regard to integration of proposed development into the wider landscape is noted and initial landscape work undertaken on behalf of J G Pears by Randle Thorp, Landscape Architects, has concluded that the site as a whole is very well screened from the wider landscape with only very limited views into it. For information a photograph of the site with operational and historic and present aerial photographs, together with a copy of the photographic study of the site and local area prepared in support of the recent planning application for the storage building is provided at Appendix EP1 and EP2. 2.18 Given the scale of the site as a whole it is considered opportunities for biodiversity net gain will be able to be harnessed in line with local and national policy requirements at the time of any application. 2.19 The requirement for a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening to determine potential impacts on the Sherwood Forest ppSPA is noted. As is, the requirement for developers of the site to contribute to necessary infrastructure works. At present these are considered likely to be primarily limited to road improvements at the A57 junction at Dunham on Trent crossroads and possible water supply improvements. However, it is noted there is an established mechanism for developers under the Water Industry Act 1991 to pay Anglian Water directly to supply water to their site. 2.20 The inclusion of the Former High Manrham Power Station site as a strategic employment allocation is strongly supported by both J G Pears as lease and option holder and E-on as landowner. This is a major previously developed site and we welcome the recognition of the LPA that its development would be in full accord with the aims of the NPPF to make best use of land and deliver sustainable development. 2.21 The overall positive approach to the delivery of the site for employment purposes within this and the next plan period, is welcomed and it is considered that J G Pears is well placed to support the initial development of the site as specified for uses within the renewable energy and low carbon sector. 2.22 The requirement of the policy for a comprehensive masterplan to be produced is noted and supported. However, it is also important to acknowledge that the timing of production of such a masterplan, indeed, also the timing of adoption of this Local Plan, should not prohibit planning applications which are compliant with the principles of the Policy and overall objectives of the Plan coming forward on this brownfield site prior to adoption.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF324	UNIPER	<p>ContextUniper own and operate the Cottam Development Centre (CDC), a combined cycle gas turbine centre power station with a generating capacity of 435MW. The site extends to 7.2 hectares and adjoins the former coal fired power station operated by EDF. A red line plan showing the extent of the Uniper site is attached for your information. The CDC will remain operational for the life of the Local Plan (2037) and beyond. Uniper made a significant investment in the CDC site in 2017 and continues to make significant investments in the UK. Uniper has recently won several contracts in the UK to help decarbonise the National Grid. It is, therefore, of key importance to Uniper that Policy ST5 does not allow development on the former Cottam Power Station site (owned by EDF) that could restrict existing operations at CDC or prevent further Uniper investment in the site. Uniper is broadly supportive of policy ST5 in principle, as the regeneration of the area is a sound policy approach. However, it is critical that existing site constraints and opportunities are taken into account in drafting this strategic site policy in order to ensure it is deliverable. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CDC is served by a gas pipeline that runs across the former Cottam Power Station allocation site • Uniper has a water abstraction and discharge permit to the River Trent which is routed through the EDF Site with associated easement rights. • Uniper has access to the dock for unloading of abnormal loads and subsequent access rights for transport through the EDF site. • Uniper will continue to discharge surface water through the EDF site • The CDC has connections to the 400KV National Grid sub-station. • Uniper has access rights to the Cottam Power Station site for access, operation and maintenance purposes. • Uniper has rights to lay conducting media and HV cabling across the EDF site. • During major outages between 400 and 500 employees can be present on the CDC site. • The CDC requires 24 hour working and permissions (including environmental permits) allow essential operations, which must be taken into account when planning to introduce sensitive uses (e.g. residential) within the area covered by Policy ST5. Uniper is committed to working collaboratively with Bassetlaw District Council, EDF and other partners to assist in the drafting of the policy and subsequent masterplan. The CDC provides an opportunity to support the redevelopment of the former Cottam Power Station site. For example, the provision of power, steam and chilled water, or district heating schemes on the site. 	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF328	E.ON	<p>E.ON is the freehold owner of the site at High Marnham and previously operated former Coal fired Power Station prior to the station's closure and demolition. The extent of E.ON's ownership covers the entire policy area as outlined in figure 11 on the draft Local Plan. E.ON granted a lease and option to acquire the site freehold in September 2018 to JG Pears in order for this significant brownfield site to be brought forward for redevelopment. E.ON is supportive of policy ST7 in principle, as the regeneration of the site is a sound policy approach and E.ON is committed to supporting the delivery of the planned development. In order to provide clarity on the delivery of the policy, E.ON recommends that the comprehensive Masterplan is required to be submitted with the first planning application for the redevelopment of the site. E.ON is committed to working collaboratively with Bassetlaw District Council and other partners to assist in the delivery of the policy.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF354	Sutton-on-Trent Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council is reassured to note that the draft plan for the site at the former High Marnham Power Station does not include a proposal for the 1,500 dwellings it is believed the site has the capacity for. Instead an Energy Hub is proposed which, whilst it would not generate the large number of additional cars accessing the site through Sutton on Trent that a residential development would, it is believed the volume of heavy traffic and lorries would increase to a level that is unsustainable with the existing road network and unacceptable to the small rural communities through which they would travel. Similar arguments apply to the High Marnham site regarding the road network as already mentioned above for the proposed Cottam development. Policy ST7 states that a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for High Marnham would include:</p> <p>i) 'Contributions towards improvements to the A57 junction at Dunham on Trent/Ragnall crossroads; and</p> <p>ii) That vehicular traffic generated by the development, including lorry movements can be safely accommodated'. Whilst the Parish Council commends the plan for proposing to include improvements at the A57 crossroads at Ragnall, it is of the opinion that the additional levels of traffic generated by the development at High Marnham cannot be safely accommodated by the existing and already overstretched road through the villages of Ragnall, Fledborough, Grassthorpe and Sutton on Trent. Sutton on Trent Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to further discuss the proposals included in the draft plan and I understand that another meeting with the Parish Councils impacted by these two developments is to be arranged within the next few weeks. I look forward to receiving details of this meeting.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF355	Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council	<p>This Parish Council feels that the current proposals could be more ambitious and innovative, particularly around the development of the High Marnham site in relation to social, environmental and some economic needs of the eastern side of the District. This could also bring benefits to the adjoining district of Newark and Sherwood. The site has not been identified for housing due to the infrastructure, most notably the highway network and there is little opportunity to be made to take any additional traffic. It does therefore seem a little peculiar that business development for the site is being considered, including B8 which is storage and distribution. If the roads are unsuitable to take additional cars, it is not clear how the road are suitable to take additional lorries. There are currently locations where the road is not sufficiently wide for 2 cars to pass each other and significant damage is therefore being done to the existing road network with the existing lorry usage of the roads, additional lorries will simply exacerbate this situation. The District Council has sufficient land allocated for business use in the draft plan without the need for any business use on this site and should therefore remove this allocation from this site which is clearly better suited to other uses. The proposals that the Parish Council would like to put forward for the site, it is believed would be welcomed by everyone as it could address material planning considerations for future proposals in terms of: > Design and visual impact > Noise, smell, pollution > Access / traffic Health / Health and Safety > Ecology, landscape > Economic impact > Cumulative impact Whilst the foreword of the document states "This Plan promotes an innovative green agenda helping the District better adapt to the impact of climate change. Significant new tree planting, new wildlife habitats and a unique Energy Hub at the Former High Marnham Power Station site will put the District on the map in terms of renewable and low carbon technology development. This Plan places a new emphasis on healthy, green places, where high quality design will protect the fabric of our heritage and distinctive villages and promote the sense of place that helps communities to thrive." The Parish Council believes that further and more ambitious options should be considered as part of this plan development. Site EM007: High Marnham Energy Hub Whilst the site is predominantly brown field (in planning terms) as it has previously been developed, since the power station ceased production in 2003 there is now a significant wildlife presence and a wildlife corridor has been established on the site. The site is in flood zone 2 and 3 and some of the site where the old coal tips were, has formed natural lakes which provides excellent wildlife habitats which should be further enhanced in these plans. There is currently little tourism attraction in the locality in the east of the District, although there is significant evidence from other wildlife sites, both nationally and locally that this could easily be built up in the area,</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
		<p>providing significant health and ecological benefits for everyone to enjoy. This is particularly evident with the increase in cycle use across the country and this site could link very easily to the existing cycle infrastructure across the Fledborough viaduct and onto Lincoln or Newark. The route to Newark is currently being enhanced through the construction of the Trent Vale Trail which would provide an off-road route between Fledborough and Newark in addition to the off-road route already in place to Lincoln. This provides a great family day out in the fresh air and countryside at minimal cost for both cyclists and walkers as well as those with impaired mobility and horse riders. The provision of such a facility would also bring economic benefit as this could facilitate the provision of a café for refreshments, cycle hire etc. providing local jobs for local people, without the need to travel significant distances. This could also help with the District Council goal to “promote the sense of place that helps communities to thrive”. In providing enhanced cycle provision for the area, a suitably designed car park could be considered which would remove the need for inappropriate and dangerous parking which currently takes place on the highway at the end of the current off road section at the Fledborough Station House. The site has a distinctive heritage being a former power station which may include a heritage center as part of its redevelopment which could help “protect the fabric of our heritage”. It would also be possible to link the sites agricultural past with possible education/research facilities and/or tourism</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF355	Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council	<p>The boundary of the site is adjacent to Fledborough, which currently boasts of “dark skies” which provides an excellent habitat for wildlife, but also provides a rare opportunity for those who might want to learn about and enjoy the dark and the stars you can see as a result. This could mean getting out for an activity such as cycling, walking, or running at night, attending a stargazing party, or taking part in a daytime event, learning more about star constellations or making a rocket. These opportunities are rare and should not be overlooked as part of the proposed redevelopment of the site for the Local Plan period including the health, wellbeing and economic benefits for the area that such a facility could provide for generations to come. The Parish Council is not averse to the use of the site for energy generation of cleangreen energy (up to 50 megawatts) but believe that the currently proposed zoning should be considerably reviewed to include the above ideas for social and economic benefit. In summary for this (the High Marnham) site the Parish Council: • do not wish to see further employment land or distribution (B1, B2, B8) nor does it wish to see housing, both of which would be detrimental to the already fragile and unsuitable highway network which would provide the access routes. • Is extremely supportive of the Draft Local Plan policies around Tourism, Health, Heritage and green spaces, which would bring significant benefit to the area which “is next to the 50% most deprived neighbourhoods in the country” • Would accept if suitably designed, energy production of such a type which would not have any detrimental impact on the noise, landscape of the surrounding area, which has a rural nature and significant wildlife habitats which must be preserved With regard to other items contained within the Draft Local Plan: The proposed development of the former Cottam Power Station site for housing development. Some of this development is proposed for this plan period with further expansion for future local plan period. The development of this site is likely to have a significant impact on the A57 Dunham Crossroads. Whilst it is understood that there has been no traffic impact assessment undertaken as yet, the site does have a serious/fatal accident history and any additional traffic wishing to access the site will inevitably be using this junction for access. Consideration will therefore need to be given to the improvement of the junction in the rural location, where the provision of traffic signals would be inappropriate due to the significant visual impact on the surrounding landscape. It should be noted that Laneham Road already has a speeding problem and parking issues relating the primary school located on it. A significant increase in vehicles as might be expected from a development of the size proposed, needs to be mindful of the risks that an increase of vehicle flow of this nature is likely to have on this local amenity and be mindful of the mitigation required in order not to exacerbate the existing problems. With regard to the future housing allocations of 39 new homes for Dunham on Trent. The Parish Council would like to see this number significantly reduced, if not removed completely, as it is not clear why so many additional houses are required or where they would be located. There are currently empty homes in the village showing that there doesn’t appear to be a need for any additional housing. The current facilities are very limited for such a potential increase with the primary school being currently full, there is no shop, there is no public transport (other than “on demand” by phone) and the nearest doctors is in Tuxford for which the capacity is uncertain as it is removed from the parishes. In addition to the lack of facilities, much of the parish is in flood zone 3 and therefore at the highest risk of flood, it therefore seems inappropriate for additional housing allocations to be given to this Parish. The Parish Council are looking forward to working with Bassetlaw District Council and the surrounding Parish Councils/Meeting to develop a sustainable long term vision for the Eastern side of the District and part of Newark and Sherwood, which will bring significant social and health benefits to residents to a wide area of both districts and the county.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF356	Grassthorne Parish Meeting	<p>Re-use of the High Marnham Power Station site. The redevelopment of this site as a whole will have a detrimental effect on the safety and quality of life for residents and on the fabric of properties as well as the road itself between Sutton-on-Trent and Ragnall. This road already struggles to accommodate current traffic evidenced by the breakdown of the road edges and verges especially on its many bends and narrower stretches. Area C in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has 're-wilded' in the years since the power station was decommissioned creating a wildlife haven and an enjoyable buffer to the now well-used cycle route. This rewilding should be preserved. More trees need to be grown to offset climate change that has become more obvious over the past few years. This type of development is required by National Policy to provide net ecological gain. The cycle path is also used regularly by walkers but roadside parking is becoming a problem so the provision of a small car park adjacent to the road could alleviate this. The cycle path also links with several of Sustrans long distance routes and provides cyclists with the only traffic free crossing of the River Trent between Newark and Scunthorpe. These measures would contribute to the objectives within the Bassetlaw Core Strategy for Recreation, the Natural Environment and Transport and Accessibility. Areas A and B should be dealt with sensitively so that they do not impact on the re-wilded area with noise and light pollution which would disturb fauna. Climate change is a reality which we all need to address and low carbon developments can only help if they are truly sustainable rather than just renewable eg. not involving long distance transport. The site was linked to the rail network and this link could be reinstated without much re-engineering. Any development should be required to depend on this form of access rather than road transport. Any essential road access should be by a designated access route which does not affect residential communities. Perhaps some use could be made of the river as well. Measures such as these would contribute towards the very necessary changes required to meet action for climate change.</p> <p>Historically Areas D and E have been agricultural land, distinct from the Power Station site. These areas should not be used as mitigation for development of the rest of the site. A few years ago a scheme was proposed to increase the size and scope of the Electricity Sub Station, but this was abandoned. The eastern part of this area is situated within the high flood risk zone as designated by the UK Government Website. This area should remain unprotected from flooding as part of the natural flood plain along the River Trent to help alleviate risk to riverside communities.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF357	Normanton on Trent Parish Council	<p>There have now been two reports that a covenant was placed when the Power Station ceased generation, it is alleged that the land had to be returned to farmland. We would please ask that this be investigated and, if proven, what effect this will have on the current situation. In principle the Parish Council (PC) fully support and endorse Green Energy production. As discussed, greater clarification of each "zone" is required and, what the permitted development within each area is? The PC welcomes a plan that controls "add hoc" planning applications; a five year plan has been requested from Pears on more than one occasion in previous years! The PC fully support a battery storage project. Low carbon generation? A nuclear power station falls into this category, which the PC would not support. Other low carbon generation needs to be assessed for the possible impact of noise, light pollution, odour from fuel sources and so on which are all of major concern, it needs to be considered the nearest residential property is only 300m from area B. "Energy efficient business use" and 450m away from area A "Low carbon energy production" Local residents don't feel Bassetlaw fully appreciate their concerns due to the fact Bassetlaw have already issued Pears a 24/7 operating licence for the "storage" facility on this site. These areas are adjacent to significant wildlife, light pollution along with noise, which all are of great concern. "Measures to ensure amenity of local communities from noise, light, glare, smell, dust, or emissions are in accordance with relevant environmental standards" From their existing site, JG Pears omit odour with continuous daily complaints, even to an extent of forcing families from their homes. Light pollution is extensive, and complaints are simply overruled by the needs of Health and Safety. Pears is high on the EA lists of sites to "closely monitor". Should I know, existing polluter, who the EA has evidence of breaches along with many complaints be allowed to propose further development so close to more residential properties? There will be better access to the countryside and an improved range of open spaces for local people to enjoy. A car park and picnic area were proposed adjacent to the cycle track, there is an old railway siding adjacent that could be used as car parking. Development in appropriate locations and in helping to protect the countryside, important green spaces and the built and natural environment from inappropriate development, thus enhancing the quality of life for people and communities. As shown with the many photographs, area "C" has been taken over by wildlife, the power generation ceased back in 2003. The PC feels that with the trees and wetlands in area "C", this should be maintained and improved. Southern border of area "B" also has extensive tree growth. To: reduce levels of out commuting; retain employment and skills locally Any development increases this, it's a rural community with few residents that would be employed. How many local people are employed at the existing Pears site? None to our knowledge. Manual type labour is provided by Eastern European workers. More specialised tasks are not carried out by local personnel. Solar farms, battery storage, and other low carbon generation plant require very limited staff. JG Pears already demonstrate that low grade employment needs are met by foreign workers. These are facts that cannot be disputed. This is important for this Local Plan which promotes a significant amount of previously developed land for reuse. The Former High Marnham Power Station is predominately brownfield with a legacy of contamination due to its historical association with a coal fired power station and associated infrastructure. The PC fully supports reuse of previously developed sites in suitable locations, however you have extensive photographic evidence that clearly shows large areas of this site, which are classed as "brown field" have now been taken over by nature and should now be considered as "Green Field" There is work to do to improve existing infrastructure to the site and ensure impacts upon nearby communities are minimised The road network cannot sustain any additional traffic without improvement; A57 cross roads, traffic through rural communities, bridge at Grassthorpe. Unclassified small roads are simply not suitable. A development proposal of 300 houses on this site clearly identified this so how can the road network be suitable for additional HGV traffic, on size alone and not just numbers. Yes, it was an industrial site previously - the fuel, Coal, came in by rail, and the finished product went out on overhead wires. Hence there was little impact on the road network.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF357	Normanton on Trent Parish Council	<p>Compared to the size of the site (Power Station) very few people were employed to run / operate the business. g) A suitable lighting scheme that minimises light pollution to the surrounding communities and biodiversity; h) Measures to ensure amenity of local communities from noise, light, glare, smell, dust, or emissions are in accordance with relevant environmental standards. The site promoter, PEARS, I think I can say without any issues there is historical evidence of all the above standards / regulations being breached. EA have evidence, CAR's reports, of breaches being made, failures of odour abatement, the list is endless. 32 miles by car, 38 miles HGV route is not in our opinion "close proximity to the M1" 6.3.5 Market interest also reinforces the policy approach. There is a growing demand for transport and distribution in the District: DHL are developing 50,005sqm of distribution floorspace on the A57, close to the A1 Why is this comment made? These distribution centres are approx. 3 miles away from the A1, an "A" class road with no residential property links them directly to the A1. The complete opposite to the Marnham and Cottam sites. This Plan places a new emphasis on healthy, green places, where high quality design will protect the fabric of our heritage and distinctive villages and promote the sense of place that helps communities to thrive. From the meeting, I believe you have gauged the feeling of the community towards J G Pears and how their existing site completely goes against the above statement. Families with children have been forced to leave the community due to Pears' activities, and local business suffers (Fishing lake) due to offensive odour. Detrimental impact on our local schools and community.</p> <p>It was also discussed and proposed at the meeting that green houses or similar agricultural uses should also be considered for the site using the low carbon energy. We are given to understand that EDF have carried out a study and put a business case forward not to develop a solar farm on the former Cottam site based on that fact it's not financially viable? I ask the question if this is the case, on a brown field site, why is green field (farmland) being considered at Marnham. The PC represents the community who have little / no trust in Pears. Therefore, we view this with great concern that a potential change of the application will be seen. Green fields should be maintained. In addition to this, the land proposed for Solar energy is prime agricultural land - are there not areas of poor quality land (brown field sites) which would be more suitable? We have also been made aware that a third party who wishes to develop the solar energy area have contacted at least three other landowners in the area. Clear evidence that the development is going to be considerably greater than that of the "plan" How is the local community to trust Bassetlaw to control this development, it's not even been proposed yet and the developers are pushing the boundaries?</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF359	South Clifton Parish Council	<p>We are in support of the area being developed, particularly in the area of Low Carbon Energy production, including solar and green energy. We are concerned that this energy production should be on site (solar and wind/ energy and data storage) and that this process does not require transport movements to the detriment of residents of the Fledborough and Ragnall villages. We would not support energy produced from burning animal by products - oils, fats or chicken litter or anaerobic digestion due to the high number of lorry movements required to transport the substrate for this process. We do support the ethos of the plan to provide local employment particularly using heat or energy produced on the site. We are concerned about the vagueness of the 'business area' and feel there needs to be greater clarity regarding what sort of business is to be involved. At present the policy is sufficiently open as to permit locally produced rendered waste to be used as a fuel. Ideally businesses on the site should be able to demonstrate that their presence will contribute to a reduction in the areas traffic and ideally be able to utilise the proximity of the Trent to receive and distribute their raw materials and products. We welcome the fact that in par 6.3.1. this site is not considered as a Strategic Employment Site. Page 57 1h - we welcome measures to protect the amenity of local communities from the listed factors but are concerned that emissions are not just in accordance with environmental standards but should set a new standard for excellence particularly in regard to any smells produced.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Again if this site had not been previously developed with designation as Brown Field Land, the location would not have been attractive for industrial, commercial, development. With the grid transport infrastructure the site is especially attractive as a Energy hub with production as in Zone use A and Zone use D. There are leisure opportunities and tourism potential on this site. It is noted that a large area of agricultural land has been incorporated into the curtilage of this site to the West and South , and as this is in the middle of nowhere this idea should be rejected. Otherwise the proposed uses would cause dangers, congestion, noise, Diesel fumes along the access roads. The communities here are already complaining about the existing lorries accessing the Trentside road. A survey showed that 90% of the lorry traffic was for access. The accesses are not of a standard where the other suggested uses should be expanded here. Again unsustainable to travel miles into nowhere to do what is suggested. Much needs to be done next to a Main A road. Neither can upgrading access to make it safer and easier be justified with the proposed uses. Access through the village of Sutton on Trent and Grassthorne is a negative. The Tuxford access has been discouraged anyway, as there is a large residential element and a school at the Tuxford end. As well as an additional primary school on the A1 exit North at Tuxford, along Newark Road. Dunham on Trent A57 crossroads junction is probably the most suitable but the Ragnall access has many bends with a considerable number of residences close to the road. Normanton Village is definitely unsuitable for travelling through and Power station traffic was always discouraged from traveling through Normanton and past the primary school. The draft report has acknowledged that the Dunham crossroads would need improvement, but exactly what. I have investigated obtaining a safety scheme for this dangerous junction and there is no money , with many more dangerous road schemes ahead of it in the queue. There is now congestion in Tuxford at rush hour and requests to reduce the heavy traffic using Tuxford for industrial commercial access, safety and air quality are the concerns already expressed. All routes are likely to be opposed on these reasons when the communities learn of the draft plan proposals. The remote location of this site is not justifiable on environmental and sustainability grounds</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF363	Resident	<p>Similarly the plan for the former High Manrham site suffers from poor highways access. Heavy lorries visiting and leaving the site would be using roads not designed to take this kind of traffic. This was noticed in the 1984 strike when the power station was supplied by lorry. O consider the site is not well connected to the type of amenities that people working in the high tech industries you envisage as a necessity.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF367	Resident	<p>We would like to bring the following to your attention. In the early 1950s when the power station was constructed - we believe that in the documents there was a clause that stated when the power station was to be decommissioned at a future date, the area would be returned to agricultural usage, as it was previously. This would obviously need some further research to check whether this was the case. If it cannot be returned to full agricultural usage (ref above point).• The brownfield site (the former power station) needs to be re-developed sympathetically and small businesses attracted to the area. However, as farmers, we are opposed to good fertile agricultural land taken up with hectares of solar panels. This land could be used to produce good tonnages of cereals/ or for mixed farming, producing goods for consumption in this country or for export. • We believe that the type of business encouraged to the hub should be carefully monitored - we do not need another huge J G Pears enterprise on our doorstep. • There is a need for a tree planting scheme along the highway(the road from Dunham-on-Trent to Sutton-on-Trent) going north to south. The plan, as it stands) has taken account of tree planting along the southern and eastern boundaries but the development will be clearly see from the adjacent highway. • If solar panels are to be erected - are there such framework and panels that blend in with the floral and fauna, rather than dull utilitarian dismal dark grey we so often see.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>
REF368	National Grid	Asset map	Thank you for your comment
REF377	Resident	<p>We wish to express our support for the efforts of Bassetlaw DC to produce a Local Plan and SA. We believe that the Marnham Energy Hub (ST7) and the Garden Village (ST3) are excellent ideas.</p>	Thank you for your comment
REF484	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	<p>The existing railway that reaches the site from the west is currently the Network Rail test track. NCC have plans to open the line to passenger traffic as far as Ollerton. With the development of High Marnham as an employment and energy site the line should be retained with a view to possible extension across the existing (but disused) bridge over the Trent into Lincoln. The line of route should therefore be protected. In effect it is protected as St36 a local wildlife site.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST07 High Manrham Energy Hub			
REF491	Consultant	<p>This is a significant employment site covering some 60 hectares. Policy EM07 with regard to High Markham Energy Hub sets out a number of criteria that must be met and Part 2 relating to Transport & Movement sets out the need for contributions to the A57/Durham on Trent/Ragnall crossing. Delivering this very large site require significant front-loaded infrastructure investment. The Council will need to be satisfied that the site is capable of being delivered and is viable. We note that delivery of High Manrham is partly dependent on the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment; we are disappointed that this work has not been undertaken prior to allocation. It may well affect the degree of delivery.</p> <p>Part 1 of the policy sets out the range of employment activities that will be delivered at the site. It is clear that this site is for a niche of uses and we consider that it should be excluded from the general employment requirement as set out in Policy ST6. It is not generally available.</p>	<p>The way in which the site will be managed through Policy has now changed in review of responses to the consultation and discussions with stakeholders. The site is located in a sensitive and constrained part of the District. The proposed uses within the energy and low carbon technology sectors require specific needs whether it being from location, feasibility, operational conditions and practicality. In addition, there are frequent changes to national legislation for the standards of energy production and low carbon technology which could leave a detailed Local Plan policy out of date. The Council believe that a single policy approach for this site would not allow for such conditions and it would be difficult to manage the complex nature of this site. A more flexible, but clear approach is needed which will identify those uses appropriate for the site on a conditional basis and this could be delivered through a Local Development Order for the site. These are legal documents in their own right and can be formed within or outside the Local Plan process. A Local Development Order is subject to a policy process and will also be subject to public consultation and scrutiny</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic Employment Sites			
1194992	Resident	<p>Pg 59 refers to logistics businesses but infrastructure especially roads not adequate for this. Need roads to be improved maybe a motorway extension from M1 before this is possible. Need to improve movement from Newark, Lincoln and Doncaster etc also. Also stated in report earlier that there has been limited success in terms of regeneration of Worksop so why would businesses invest just down the road? There are already lots of vacant industrial units for let, should be used first before more being built.</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Transport Study Part 2 considers the transport impacts of the development proposed by the Local Plan on the existing transport infrastructure, and identifies mitigation where appropriate. This does not identify the need for an extension to the M1 or improvements to any other towns outside the District as being necessary to deliver the development identified by the Local Plan. The Economic Development Needs Assessment 2019 identifies that many vacant industrial units are not fit for modern day purposes or are not situated in optimal locations to meet the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
			needs of modern day businesses so alternative sites have to be identified.
REF198	Consultant	Policy ST8 page 59 This should be extended to include Markham Moor.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for defining a Strategic Employment Site. It states that there is only one site in the District capable of meeting these needs. That does not include Markham Moor.
REF255	Sheffield City Region	<p>The Spatial Strategy set out in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan is based upon a good appreciation of the relationship between Bassetlaw and the SCR, with strong economic and social connections linking Bassetlaw and all four the South Yorkshire districts. Support the Draft Local Plan's emphasis on this relationship and the common interests it identifies, particularly in terms of the logistics corridor, and the relationship of the AI to this, as well as for opportunities to develop the major growth area around Doncaster Sheffield Airport. It will also be important to continue to work together so that the developing Local Plan and emerging SEP continue to be well aligned. In principle, support this aspect of the Draft Plan and recognise the role that the policy could play in helping to attract large scale inward investment to the benefit of South Yorkshire as well as D2N2. In practice, however, implementation needs to be more carefully considered as the Plan develops with further discussion and development to ensure that the operation of Policy ST8 meets the aims of the Draft Plan. Suggest that Policy ST8 and the site-specific Policy 9 on Apleyhead Junction (as well as supporting text) could be strengthened and improved with the inclusion of three further points: A sequential test: taking a sequential approach to assessing applications on the two strategic employment sites, ensuring that any proposals for Snape Lane and Apleyhead cannot reasonably be accommodated on existing sites in other parts of South Yorkshire and D2N2 city regions; Demonstrable added value: the need for any proposals at Snape Lane and Apleyhead to demonstrate that they will bring gross value added to both South Yorkshire and D2N2 areas, as well as locally to Bassetlaw, with specific evidence available to demonstrate this; and Comprehensive development: so that proposals at Snape Land and Apleyhead maximise their potential by seeking comprehensive development of each site, rather than piece meal development which could be accommodated elsewhere.</p>	Support for approach welcome. Acknowledge that further work with SCR is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of the three recommendations it is not considered that a sequential test is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. The policy does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added. To maximise the gross value added to both sub regions it is important that the policy approach is flexible to ensure the right end user(s) are secured. A phased development may help achieve greater economic benefits to the sub-regions.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
REF256	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Specific amendments are requested below to policy ST8: Strategic Employment Sites. Requested changes are highlighted in red with proposed deletions shown struck through and proposed additions underlined. As currently drafted in respect of Part B criterion 3, the supporting text does not provide sufficient guidance on how this criterion would be satisfied by a developer. We are seeking the rewording of this criterion. Suggest that the policy should focus on comprehensive rather than piecemeal developments. Paragraph 6.3.5 in the supporting text refers to planning permission being granted at SEM2 Snape Lane. Welcome clarity on whether this permission is for the full site. A. Development proposals for strategic employment development within the B use classes, either as a standalone proposal or an extension of an existing business, will be supported considered on land at: 1. SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) for logistics 2. SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth (80.9ha) for B2, B8 B. Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment, that all of the following apply: 1. There are significant economic benefits generated by the scheme, in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, Sheffield City Region and D2N2; 2. The development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs; 3. The proposal does not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region, or the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan or the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan; In the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region. 4. In the case of an existing Bassetlaw business seeking to expand significantly: the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on other allocated employment land within the District; 5. The proposal would not compromise the viability or deliverability of sites allocated for development that are identified within Policy ST6; and 6. The development can be satisfactorily accommodated in relation to the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works. C. Use of a Planning Performance Agreement will ensure that a dedicated, specialist officer team is in place to progress each site through the planning system. P 58 supporting text 6.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework⁴ requires policies to recognise and address specific locational requirements of different sectors, including provision for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. 6.3.2 Policy ST8 identifies sites capable of accommodating significant indigenous growth and national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period. Consistent with national planning practice guidance¹¹ this Plan recognises that the logistics industry has distinct locational requirements that should be considered separately from those relating to general employment land. 6.3.3 On that basis, Bassetlaw's existing employment land portfolio and allocations in Policy ST6 must remain the focus for the District's general business development. This will ensure this Plan delivers a sustainable spatial strategy and a balanced approach to housing and economic growth. 6.3.4 The Economic Development Needs Assessment² recognises the need for further land to support strategic distribution in the District. Bassetlaw benefits from being within the A1 and the A57 corridors and in relatively close proximity to the M1: a logistically favourable location. This is reinforced by the Sheffield City Region who identify Harworth as being within the Doncaster Airport Growth Area for logistics as well as the A1 logistics corridor¹. 6.3.5 Market interest also reinforces the policy approach. There is a growing demand for transport and distribution in the District: DHL are developing 50,005sqm of distribution floorspace on the A57, close to the A1; a speculative development of 32,377 sqm B8 floorspace was completed at EM004: Symmetry Park, Harworth; and full planning permission has recently been approved for logistics at SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth. 6.3.6 On that basis, Policy ST8 allocates two sites to provide for strategic distribution operations, specifically non rail served provision. This will help diversify the District's economy, increase local employment and reduce unemployment levels locally. Evidence² indicates that SEM2:Snape Lane, Harworth should be considered as meeting a sub-regional level of demand which is attributable to the A1M, spilling over from the Doncaster market / M18 interchange. Meanwhile SEM1: Apleyhead Junction (Policy 9) forms a logical extension to the</p>	<p>The whole of Snape Lane has planning permission for B1, B2, B8 uses. Acknowledge that further work with SCR and neighbouring authorities is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of the three recommendations it is not considered that a sequential test is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. The policy does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added. To maximise the gross value added to both sub regions it is important that the policy approach is flexible to ensure the right end user(s) are secured. A phased development may help achieve greater economic benefits to the sub-regions.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
		<p>existing longstanding and expanding logistics sector along the A57 corridor, at a key junction with the A1.6.3.7 An important part of planning for strategic logistics investment is consideration of the functional economic market area (FEMA). The FEMA reflects the way the economy works; it is not constrained by administrative boundaries the relationships between where people live and work, the scope of service market areas and catchments.6.3.8 The Economic Development Needs Assessment2 recognises that parts of Bassetlaw are strongly related to the Sheffield City Region, but that other parts of the District have equally strong links to parts of Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire.6.3.9 The Council has signed a Statement of Common Ground with the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority12. This acknowledges that each Council is responsible for identifying employment needs and land supply to meet their own economic needs and growth priorities. It adds that the approach taken to the FEMA in the Economic Development Needs Assessment2 – that at a practical, local level Bassetlaw does not have a separate FEMA in its own right – should be recognised.6.3.10 However, the Statement of Common Ground12 adds that the authorities should work collaboratively to give further consideration to formalising a strategic FEMA for the Sheffield City Region and understanding the operation of it primarily for logistics. On that basis the Council will continue to work collaboratively to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost to the City Region at a strategic level, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority.</p>	
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Specific amendments are requested below to policy ST8: Strategic Employment Sites. Requested changes are highlighted in red with proposed deletions shown struck through and proposed additions underlined. As currently drafted in respect of Part B criterion 3, the supporting text does not provide sufficient guidance on how this criterion would be satisfied by a developer. We are seeking the rewording of this criterion. Suggest that the policy should focus on comprehensive rather than piecemeal developments. Policy ST8 A. Development proposals for strategic employment development within the B use classes, either as a standalone proposal or an extension of an existing business, will be supported considered on land at: 1. SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) for logistics 2. SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth (80.9ha) for B2, B8 B. Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment, that all of the following apply: 1. There are significant economic benefits generated by the scheme, in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, Sheffield City Region and D2N2; 2.The development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs; 3. The proposal does not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region, or the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan or the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan; In the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region. 4. In the case of an existing Bassetlaw business seeking to expand significantly: the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on other allocated employment land within the District; 5. The proposal would not compromise the viability or deliverability of sites allocated for development that are identified within Policy ST6; and 6. The development can be satisfactorily accommodated in relation to the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works. C. Use of a Planning Performance Agreement will ensure that a dedicated, specialist officer team is in place to progress each site through the planning system. P.58 Supporting Text 6.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework4 requires policies to recognise and address specific locational requirements of different sectors, including provision for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. 6.3.2 Policy ST8 identifies sites capable of accommodating significant indigenous growth and national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period. Consistent with national planning practice guidance11 this Plan recognises that the logistics industry has distinct locational requirements that should be considered separately from those relating to general employment land. 6.3.3 On that basis, Bassetlaw's existing employment land portfolio and allocations in Policy ST6 must remain the focus for the District's general business development. This</p>	<p>Acknowledge that further work with SCR and neighbouring authorities is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of the three recommendations it is not considered that a sequential test is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. The policy does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added. To maximise the gross value added to both sub regions it is important that the policy approach is flexible to ensure the right end user(s) are secured.A phased development may help achieve greater economic benefits to the sub-regions.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
		<p>will ensure this Plan delivers a sustainable spatial strategy and a balanced approach to housing and economic growth. 6.3.4 The Economic Development Needs Assessment² recognises the need for further land to support strategic distribution in the District. Bassetlaw benefits from being within the A1 and the A57 corridors and in relatively close proximity to the M1: a logistically favourable location. This is reinforced by the Sheffield City Region who identify Harworth as being within the Doncaster Airport Growth Area for logistics as well as the A1 logistics corridor¹. 6.3.5 Market interest also reinforces the policy approach. There is a growing demand for transport and distribution in the District: DHL are developing 50,005sqm of distribution floorspace on the A57, close to the A1; a speculative development of 32,377 sqm B8 floorspace was completed at EM004: Symmetry Park, Harworth; and full planning permission has recently been approved for logistics at SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth. Paragraph 6.3.5 in the supporting text refers to planning permission being granted at SEM2 Snape Lane. We would welcome clarity on whether this permission is for the full site. 6.3.6 On that basis, Policy ST8 allocates two sites to provide for strategic distribution operations, specifically non rail served provision. This will help diversify the District's economy, increase local employment and reduce unemployment levels locally. Evidence² indicates that SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth should be considered as meeting a sub-regional level of demand which is attributable to the A1M, spilling over from the Doncaster market / M18 interchange. Meanwhile SEM1: Apleyhead Junction (Policy 9) forms a logical extension to the existing longstanding and expanding logistics sector along the A57 corridor, at a key junction with the A1. 6.3.7 An important part of planning for strategic logistics investment is consideration of the functional economic market area (FEMA). The FEMA reflects the way the economy works; it is not constrained by administrative boundaries the relationships between where people live and work, the scope of service market areas and catchments. 6.3.8 The Economic Development Needs Assessment² recognises that parts of Bassetlaw are strongly related to the Sheffield City Region, but that other parts of the District have equally strong links to parts of Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. 6.3.9 The Council has signed a Statement of Common Ground with the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority¹². This acknowledges that each Council is responsible for identifying employment needs and land supply to meet their own economic needs and growth priorities. It adds that the approach taken to the FEMA in the Economic Development Needs Assessment² – that at a practical, local level Bassetlaw does not have a separate FEMA in its own right – should be recognised. 6.3.10 However, the Statement of Common Ground¹² adds that the authorities should work collaboratively to give further consideration to formalising a strategic FEMA for the Sheffield City Region and understanding the operation of it primarily for logistics. On that basis the Council will continue to work collaboratively to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost to the City Region at a strategic level, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority.</p>	
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>Land to the south of Snape Lane, Harworth has been promoted for circa 81ha of employment land and has been granted outline planning permission (LPA Reference: 15/00971/OUT) on 14th March 2017. A subsequent S.73 Application (LPA Reference: 19/00886/VOC) was supported at the Council's Planning Committee of 6th November 2019 and is subject to the signing of a S.106. Overall, we are supportive of the draft Local Plan's economic aspirations for Bassetlaw. Policy ST8 identifies sites capable of accommodating significant economic growth over the plan period. The 2019 EDNA recognises the need for further land to support strategic manufacturing and distribution sectors, and Bassetlaw benefits from its strategic highways within the A1 and A57 corridors and proximity to the M1. Strongly support the Council's approach to strategic employment growth across the district and support the strategic employment allocation for 'SEM2' which relates to our Client's site to the south of Snape Lane in Harworth. Harworth is identified as an employment growth area and the SEM2 allocation for 80.9ha of B2 and B8 uses at will generate considerable economic and employment growth within the District. Welcome this allocation as a strategic employment site and emphasise the role of our Client's site for</p>	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
		driving forward economic growth and employment opportunities in Harworth and the District as a whole.	
REF282	National Trust	National Trust also objects to Policy ST8. Part B.3 of the policy states that proposals will be supported provided that they do not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region. We suggest that this ought to be established upfront (i.e. in justifying any land allocation) and also ought to take account of the potential for a large greenfield allocation to compromise brownfield development elsewhere.	D2N2 have confirmed their support for the site for footloose investment. As a site for such investment it is difficult to know upfront which company(s) would be developing the site. It is on that basis that this criteria is needed. The Plan supports the positive re-use of brownfield land. But to accommodate the growth required some greenfield land is necessary.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Specific amendments are requested below to policy ST8: Strategic Employment Sites. Requested changes are highlighted in red with proposed deletions shown struck through and proposed additions underlined. As currently drafted in respect of Part B criterion 3, the supporting text does not provide sufficient guidance on how this criterion would be satisfied by a developer. We are seeking the rewording of this criterion. We suggest that the policy should focus on comprehensive rather than piecemeal developments. Paragraph 6.3.5 in the supporting text refers to planning permission being granted at SEM2 Snape Lane. We would welcome clarity on whether this permission is for the full site. A. Development proposals for strategic employment development within the B use classes, either as a standalone proposal or an extension of an existing business, will be supported considered on land at: 1. SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) for logistics 2. SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth (80.9ha) for B2, B8 B. Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment, that all of the following apply: 1. There are significant economic benefits generated by the scheme, in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, Sheffield City Region and D2N2; 2.The development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs; 3. The proposal does not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region, or the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan or the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan; In the case of a major inward investment, the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on allocated employment land within either D2N2 or Sheffield City Region. 4. In the case of an existing Bassetlaw business seeking to expand significantly: the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on other allocated employment land within the District; 5. The proposal would not compromise the viability or deliverability of sites allocated for development that are identified within Policy ST6; and 6. The development can be satisfactorily accommodated in relation to the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works. C. Use of a Planning Performance Agreement will ensure that a dedicated, specialist officer team is in place to progress each site through the planning system.	The whole of Snape Lane has planning permission for B1, B2, B8 uses. Acknowledge that further work with SCR and neighbouring authorities is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of the three recommendations it is not considered that a sequential test is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. The policy does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added. To maximise the gross value added to both sub regions it is important that the policy approach is flexible to ensure the right end user(s) are secured.A phased development may help achieve greater economic benefits to the sub-regions.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Policy ST8 carries forward the key employment land thread from ST1 and ST6 and identifies the Apleyhead Junction site as being suitable for employment uses. Although this strategic objective is fully supported and critical to the delivery of the economic vision for the District, Caddick are concerned that the detailed policy wording and the inconsistencies between policies as already identified for Policies ST1 and ST6 will serve to frustrate the much needed delivery of the site. ST8 – Part A There are inconsistencies within ST8 which must be corrected. Part A of Policy ST8 supports ‘strategic employment development within the B use classes’, whereas Part A1 then identifies the site as being suitable for ‘logistics’. This latter reference in Part A1 is presumably an error as delivering only logistics uses on the site would not achieve the mix of employment and ‘significant proportion of highly skilled jobs’ sought in Part B(2). That is not to say that a logistics only development cannot provide highly skilled jobs, more that it is self-evident that a wider range of employment uses is likely to deliver a wider range of jobs. Part A of ST8 should therefore be amended at Part A1 to reflect that the site could deliver a mixed B1(c)/B2/B8 (with ancillary B1(a)) Use development in order to maximise the significant benefits of development. ST8 – Part B This part of the policy is unclear as it could be read either that Part B refers to the requirements for sites identified in Part A or that Part B refers to further strategic proposals. We have presumed the former applies (that Part B refers to the sites listed in Part 1) and is commented upon on that basis. Caddick is concerned that Part B of Policy ST8 contains unrealistic and onerous expectations at too early a stage in the planning process. Several policy points in Part B are understandable, but it could prove to be very onerous for a major strategic site to be brought forward through an outline planning application and still be required to demonstrate accordance with specified criteria. Equally the requirements set out in Part B could discourage potential investors that the need to meet the requirements set out in B1-6 could introduce significant uncertainty and delay into the planning process. Part B states ‘Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment, that all of the following apply’ (NJL Consulting emphasis) and then lists a range of policy and development aspirations. Part B – point 2 Of note, point 2 requires ‘...the development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs...’. A development of this scale (4.5m sqft) is likely to be delivered in part through a hybrid or outline planning application with a portion of the site therefore being promoted ‘speculatively’ with occupiers for only the early phase. The type of jobs created will only be known once an occupier is in place and therefore the mix of jobs across the site is simply too variable to be demonstrated at this stage in the planning process. Major sites, such as Apleyhead Junction, will attract a wide variety of companies because of the type of product that can be delivered here as compared to other employment locations within the district. Modern day employment floorspace that is likely to be attracted to the site will incorporate a wide cross section of jobs ranging from manual positions to highly qualified employees. Terms such as “a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs” are inappropriate because they are inflexible and over-prescriptive, and the effect would be to deter much needed investment. Therefore, Caddick would strongly urge that criterion B2 be removed in its entirety or altered to remove reference to “a significant proportion of highly skilled jobs”.</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the approach taken to policy development. This site is identified is additional to local employment needs and is proposed for allocation on that basis. Terminology will be addressed to ensure consistency in approach. It is understood that at outline stage end users may not be in place and that flexibility is required to ensure end users have the confidence to invest in the site. But in order to allocate this site for strategic employment uses the Local Plan must ensure that relevant criteria are identified to provide certainty with delivery differentiate this site from the general supply. Reference to a significant proportion of higher skilled jobs will be amended to including higher skilled jobs, to reflect the priorities of the Council Plan and the objectives of the Local Plan.</p>
REF347	NJL Consulting	<p>Part B – Points 3, 4 and 5 7.12 The rationale and evidence base to support the release of sites in Policy ST8 provides the justification for the need for the allocation to be delivered as part of the overall economic objectives of the Plan. The strategic employment sites in Policy ST8 are an integral and vital part of delivering a step change in the future growth of the District and the delivery of these sites compliments the overall employment strategy. 7.13 The very nature of the site in terms of locational importance and size will dictate that it is specifically geared to delivering large scale commercial units that would not be attracted to the sites set out under Policy ST6. Unnecessary and counterproductive to refer to the development of sites in Policy ST8 as needing to demonstrate that they would neither compromise the economic strategy of adjoining authorities nor the delivery of alternative sites within Bassetlaw as set out in Policy ST6, since this, by its very nature, would undermine the whole rationale for</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 provides the basis for the approach taken to policy development. This site is identified is additional to local employment needs and is proposed for allocation on that basis. Terminology will be addressed to ensure consistency in approach. It is understood that at outline stage end users may not be in place and that flexibility is required to ensure end users have the confidence to invest in the site. But in order to allocate this site for strategic employment uses the Local Plan must ensure that relevant criteria are identified to provide certainty with delivery differentiate this site from the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST8 - Strategic	Employment Sites		
		<p>Policy ST8. The wording of Point 4 and Point 5 effectively introduces a form of sequential testing to demonstrate that no other site in Policy ST6 would be capable, suitable or have enough market attraction to be considered an alternative location. At the very least, these criteria could act as a significant delay in bringing site SEM1 forward and, even more alarming, could act as a significant barrier to occupier interest and investment. In order to deliver the Local Plan vision in full (i.e. achieving step change growth and investment) all allocations within the plan must be delivered. The land at Apleyhead Junction would inevitably attract a different market sector and operator demand to smaller scale more local employment sites set out in Policy ST6. Its attractive location coupled with the much larger size of unit that the location would deliver, would naturally differentiate between the objectives behind policies ST6 and ST8 without the need for the level of requirements set out in points 4 and 5. Criteria 4 and 5, in effect, place greater importance on the employment sites specifically listed in ST6; note the Apleyhead Junction site is not currently listed in ST6 Part B but is referred to in ST6 Part A as a separate strategic site. Consider the ST8 approach, whereby general sites are prioritised over strategically important sites, to be unsound as it is not supported by evidence or logic. The local and sub-regional evidence base emphasises the importance of a rounded employment land offer which can meet a range of occupier needs (including specific larger scale needs). Part C refers to the use of a Planning Performance Agreement ('PPA'). Although a PPA approach can deliver certainty to the planning process and therefore can be useful for major sites, it is unusual for a PPA to be a specific policy requirement. Policy should be revised to avoid inferences that a PPA is required in order to deliver a policy compliant planning application. Caddick is concerned that ST8, as a key policy, is currently inconsistent in terms of how the various parts of the policy relate to, and are consistent with, other strategic policies and with the overall vision as set out in the Local Plan. These inconsistencies need to be addressed to ensure that Policy ST8 delivers on its objectives. Suggested policy changes Caddick suggest the following amended wording to Policy ST8. POLICY ST8: Strategic Employment Sites A. Development proposals for strategic employment development within the B-Use classes, either as a standalone proposal or an extension of an existing business, will be supported on land at: - SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) for logistics - SEM2: Snape Lane, Harworth (80.9ha) for B2, B8 B. Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated through an economic assessment that all of the following apply: 1. There are significant economic benefits generated by the scheme, in terms of development value and gross value added for the District; 2. The development would provide a significant number of new, permanent jobs, including an significant proportion of highly skilled jobs; 3. The proposal does not compromise the economic growth of authorities in the D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region, or the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan or the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan; 4. In the case of an existing Bassetlaw business seeking to expand significantly: the needs of the business cannot be reasonably met on other allocated employment land within the District; 5. The proposal would not compromise the viability or deliverability of sites allocated for development that are identified within Policy ST6; and 6.3. The development can be satisfactorily accommodated in relation to the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works. C. Use of a Planning Performance Agreement will ensure that a dedicated, specialist officer team is in place to progress each site through the planning system.</p>	<p>general supply. Reference to a significant proportion of higher skilled jobs will be amended to including higher skilled jobs, to reflect the priorities of the Council Plan and the objectives of the Local Plan. Reference to a PPA will be moved to the supporting text.</p>

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

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

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

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST09 - Apleyhead Junction			
		<p>paragraph 6.4.2 states the Apleyhead Junction site can boost the housing market, particularly as it will be well connected to the proposed Garden Village. It is important that SEM1 does not infer the employment proposition is somehow linked to the garden village. Fundamentally, delivery of the employment site is not dependant on additional housing growth in the district nor is it tied to the garden village. Furthermore, the supporting text should also not infer the level of contributions needed to mitigate highways concerns. Paragraph 6.4.3 refers to works to the A57 (with reference to the Bassetlaw Transport Study and junction assessment work). However, it is notable that the council's junction assessment work, as part of the local plan evidence base, questions the necessity, viability and deliverability of major A57 works. Paragraph 6.4.5 refers to detailed visual, landscape, biodiversity and lighting matters. It is recognised this is policy supporting text rather than policy itself, nevertheless the text regarding development mitigation should be careful stated to reflect the scale and nature of development. For example, the paragraph states '...development should be seamlessly integrated into the wider landscape...', yet it is almost impossible to 'seamlessly integrate' an major employment development with circa 25m buildings into an area of limited apparent development (it is noted the existing Wilko and B&Q developments had existing substantial planting on the northern boundary).</p> <p>8.14 The policy supporting text should be updated to reflect the circumstances of the site and requirements of development.</p> <p>30 Suggested policy changes</p> <p>8.15 Caddick suggest the following amended wording to Policy 9.</p> <p>POLICY 9: Site SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, WorksopA. The Council will support the delivery of a strategic employment site at Apleyhead Junction, Worksop, as identified on the Policies Map. The site will be expected to deliver a minimum of 118.7ha of employment land for Class B1, B2 and B8 development within the Plan period (to 2037).</p> <p>B. The development will guide the creation of a sustainable and high quality working environment which will make provision for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Good Quality Design and Local Character) High quality, innovative design which makes the most of its prominent location, adds value to the local area, endures over time and reflects the design principles in Policy ST32 and the Design Quality SPD; a) A layout and design informed by the site context and responds to this context landscape character and ecological value and an archaeological desk assessment, to positively incorporate and enhance on site woodland, hedgerows, biodiversity value and landscape features where feasible and appropriate; c) Energy, water efficiency and sustainable construction to achieve BREEAM very good-excellent standards or any successor scheme; d) A comprehensive sustainable drainage system and maintenance arrangements; e) A suitable lighting scheme that minimises light pollution. <p>2. Transport and Movement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) A scheme of an appropriate scale, layout and form supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, and advice of the Local Highways Authority, Highways England and public transport providers, which further details, where feasible: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. A reduction in reliance on motorised vehicles and a step-change towards promotion of sustainable and public transport, including the ii. Provision of suitable footpath and cycle paths that link to the existing network; iii. Safe access to the site from the A57; iv. Contributions to improvements to the roundabout at A57/B6040; v. Contributions to improvements to the roundabout at A614 Blyth Road/A57/A1(T)31; vi. Contributions to capacity improvements at the A57; vii. Appropriate servicing and parking provision for each development parcel; b) impacts of development on air quality through traffic and other emissions are mitigated and an air quality assessment is submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority as part of a future planning application. <p>3. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The protection and enhancement management of Top Wood/Great Whin Covert Local Wildlife Site informed by an arboriculture survey and ecological survey; b) Green infrastructure connectivity within the site and to neighbouring green infrastructure assets to support climate resilience; c) An appropriate landscape buffers are considered; between the site and the A1 to the east and to the railway line to the north; d) A project level Habitats Regulation Assessment screening in accordance with Policy ST36. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST09 - Apleyhead Junction			
REF401 -	East Markham Parish Council	6.3.6. Apleyhead does form a logical extension to the logistics of the A57 corridor but EMPC is concerned about the impact of any development on existing links and also Clumber Park.	The impact of the development of the site to the A57 has been identified in the Bassetlaw Transport Assessment. It will require appropriate mitigation in the form of access into the site and an improved carriageway on part of the A57. There is no evidence to show that the development of the site will impact Clumber Park.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - Existing Employment Sites			
1195486	Resident	Why are the industrial areas of the airfield at Gamston and Bevercotes not included as they were in the previous plan?	Policy ST10 protects Existing Employment Sites which are considered essential to the long-term economic success of Bassetlaw. The employment site to the south of the airfield is not considered to meet that definition. The land at Bevercotes has planning permission for employment use but there is no development on the site so it is not considered to meet the definition of an Existing Employment Site. However, the Gamston site is considered to be another employment site under Policy ST11 and can continue to operate in that capacity.
REF182	Consultant	Would prefer that the EIP site is allocated under Policy ST6 nevertheless welcome the identification of the site as an Existing Employment Site under Policy ST10. This is a significant improvement over the previous Regulation 18 draft Local Plan since it now explicitly supports new or additional B1, B2 and B8 development or small-scale ancillary uses on the site. Support part A of the policy, although have some concerns about the presentation of this on the Policies Map. Concerns over the drafting of part C of the policy. No objection to the main principle, the wording as drafted may have unintended consequences by preventing otherwise acceptable employment uses. As drafted, this part of the policy states that any change of use or redevelopment to a non-B1, B2 or B8 employment use would only be permitted where certain criteria are met. It is not currently clear whether all of the criteria must be met in order to accord with the policy. It is entirely conceivable that a non-B1, B2 or B8 employment use, such as a sui generis employment use was proposed, which would have the same benefits as a standard B-class use. As worded, the policy would require evidence of 12 months' marketing and a viability assessment, which would seem unnecessary. However, if the word "or" was added to the end of each criterion, in this example it would still accord with the policy as the second criterion would be complied with. Request that the policy is amended in this way.	Explore Industrial Park will be allocated as a general employment site under Policy ST6.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - Existing Employment Sites			
REF182	Consultant	<p>Client controls Explore Industrial Park (EIP) and has been developing it for industrial development over the last few years. It is essential that the site is properly recognised as forming an important part of the Council's economic development strategy in the emerging Local Plan. EIP is a major cross-boundary employment site to the west of Worksop. The EIP site is a large former quarry, colliery and brick refractory site which was acquired by Laing O'Rourke in 2007. The site area is divided almost equally between Bolsover (Derbyshire) and Bassetlaw (Nottinghamshire). The area within Bassetlaw comprises the most developable land. Planning permission granted in 2007 for the existing pre-cast concrete manufacturing facility, in 2010 outline planning permission for a B1/B2/B8 off-site manufacturing hub on the wider EIP site. Due to the nature of the proposal, 10 years were allowed for the submission of reserved matters. Invested millions of pounds into the site to date. A new off-site manufacturing facility making pre-cast concrete products constructed in 2008 with a new access road onto the A619. Other enabling works have taken place, including decontamination of the site, ecology translocations and a substantial new ecological mitigation area, interim drainage works including the realignment of part of Darfoulds Dyke and structural landscaping. Development platforms have also been created. The substantial investment ensures it is ready and available for development. Planning permission been granted for a further large-scale manufacturing facility (the "AMF") to the west of the current factory, within Bassetlaw. Development has commenced. Two further development parcels available in the part of the site in Bassetlaw used on an interim basis as open storage and car parking (planning permission 2018). The longer-term plan is to develop industrial buildings. Overall, 16ha of employment land is available in Bassetlaw. C.270 people are employed at the existing facility. Once developed is likely to employ in excess of 1,000 people. The site does not benefit from any specific designations on the current 2011 Proposals Map. As a result, the site is treated as being in the open countryside. The adopted Core Strategy is silent in relation to the site so Policy DM1 (Economic Development in the Countryside) applies. This policy is aimed at rural employment uses generally, rather than a major employment development site such as EIP. Contrary to the incorrect summarisation of the site in Table 17 of the Economic Development Needs Assessment, EIP is not yet a fully-developed employment site. Whilst all of the plots in Bassetlaw are either in permanent or temporary use, some of the existing plots are used on an interim basis rather than the more intensive uses proposed in the masterplan. These plots remain available for B1, B2 and B8 uses. Laing O'Rourke regularly bids for major construction projects, some of which may require further facilities to be constructed at EIP, depending on the nature and location of the project. Laing O'Rourke has previously undertaken pre-application discussions with Bassetlaw District Council about plans for such potential buildings, although to date the buildings have subsequently not been required. However, in the event of a successful bid requiring a new facility to be constructed, it will often be necessary to erect the building quickly. As a result, whilst at present there are no detailed proposals for any of the under-utilised Bassetlaw plots, that position is liable to change rapidly should a particular contract require development of these plots. Off-site manufacturing restriction The current masterplan permission is limited to uses which form part of an off-site manufacturing hub concept. Condition 4 states:</p> <p>The Reserved Matters submitted in accordance with conditions 1 and 2 shall be accompanied by a Statement demonstrating the way in which the proposal forms part of the off-site manufacturing hub concept as described in the application documents (i.e. a centre of manufacturing excellence that will benefit from efficiency and sustainability gains through the use of shared resources on a single site".</p> <p>The site is now a well-established employment site with substantial investment having taken place as set out above. If the current restriction of off-site manufacturing uses was to be lifted and a general B1/B2/B8 allocation confirmed, this would allow greater flexibility, assist with investment decisions and encourage further job growth at the site. In this scenario, the landowners could market parts of the site for alternative employment uses where this would not conflict with the smooth operation of the existing site, further enhancing employment prospects. As set out further below, Bolsover District Council has agreed that it would be appropriate to lift this restriction in its emerging Local Plan.</p>	Reflecting this site's importance to the employment land supply for the plan period the Explore Industrial Park will be allocated under Policy ST6 as a General Employment Site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - Existing Employment Sites			
		<p>Emerging Bolsover Local Plan</p> <p>Bolsover District Council is at a very advanced stage in preparing its own Local Plan, with the Inspector issuing her report in January 2020. Bolsover's Planning Committee has recommended that the Full Council now proceed to adopt the Local Plan, and the plan is expected to be adopted in March 2020.</p> <p>The new Bolsover Local Plan allocates the developable parts of EIP within its jurisdiction for general B1/B2/B8 employment uses. These are not restricted to off-site manufacturing uses.</p> <p>To date, Bassetlaw and Bolsover District Councils have worked closely on all strategic matters relating to the EIP site. For example, the Councils collaborated closely on the outline planning permissions, which include the same conditions and wording on both permissions.</p> <p>We have welcomed the support of Bolsover District Council in allocating their part of the site for general employment uses, and we request that Bassetlaw takes the same approach in its emerging Local Plan. This would be appropriate, especially given that paragraph 9.9 of the Council's latest Economic Development Need Assessment recognises that EIP is one of eight important employment sites within the district.⁴ It goes on to note that:</p> <p>"These are good quality employment sites and there should be a presumption of retention for continued employment uses. However, it is recognised that some operational flexibility may be required."</p>	
REF198	Consultant	<p>Policy ST10 page 63 This list of existing employment sites is incomplete, once again no mention of Markham Moor. This policy is therefore not sound.</p>	<p>The Economic Development Needs Assessment 2019 considers Markham Moor to be a mixed use area around the junction on the A1. However, the development opportunities are limited to relatively small parcels of land among the junction infrastructure and varied existing uses. It is therefore considered that the commercial attractiveness of the site is more limited than other sites along the A1. On that basis the area is not considered to be essential to the long term economic success of Bassetlaw so does not meet the definition of Existing Employment Site. Nevertheless, the relevant B uses within the area would be addressed by Policy ST11 as Other Employment Sites.</p>
1197063	Resident	<p>There is no mention of current large employment services in the area specifically NHS establishments such as Bassetlaw District Hospital and Rampton Hospital (Nottinghamshire Healthcare) and others. How have these organisations responded to the Local Plan? How are their development strategies included? Are they growing their services or declining? They are significant employers and may require more or less staff in the future and they need to be considered when developing the plan.</p>	<p>Policy ST10 only looks at sites that are in the B Use Class so offices, general industry or storage and distribution. While Bassetlaw Hospital and Rampton Hospital are important local employers they are not B Class development so fall outside the scope of Policy ST10. NHS Bassetlaw are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan. The impact of new development on their services has been taken into account in the production of the Plan.</p>
REF289 -	Consultant	<p>Endorse Policy ST10 allowing new and extended employment development to be provided (beyond those sites proposed to be allocated), subject to various criteria being met.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - Existing Employment Sites			
REF298	Consultant	Policy ST10 protects employment areas that are both suitable and viable for continued employment growth. It confirms that existing employment sites are important drivers for the District's economy. FCC's site which has permission for employment uses should be identified within Part A of Policy ST10. The proposed employment development at FCC's site can come forward in a sensitive manner which reflects its location on the edge of the urban area. The supporting technical reports which accompanied FCC's application for the east of the site demonstrated that the Site can come forward without detrimentally impacting the environment and surroundings. Pre-application discussions have taken place with the Council regarding the remainder of FCC's site and an application for employment uses on this part of the Site is due to be submitted to the Council within the next few months. Given the very clear credentials of FCC's site, and for the reasons explained elsewhere within this representation, we believe that the whole site should benefit from an allocation under Policy ST6. Should the Council decide not to allocate the site for employment uses, then development on the western part of the site (the part without planning permission) might be considered favourably against Part B of Policy ST10. However, this policy is at odds with Policy ST11 which only allows for economic development outside the settlement boundary subject to very rigid policy requirements. This conflict should be corrected.	An existing employment site is one that is in use for employment uses and are located in the strongest demand areas for ongoing employment uses. Whilst this site has planning permission it is not developed or in use. Equally it is not a location which the evidence base considers is essential to direct the long term growth of the District. However, the site benefits from planning permission so employment uses can be promoted on the site through that means.
REF325	Resident	Alternatively, Policy ST10B (1-3) should be amended to permit new employment development outside the allocated employment sites either where (as currently drafted) there are no significant adverse impacts or (to be added) where adverse impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Policy ST11 will be the appropriate policy to reflect these comments.
REF345 -	Councillor	Why is Welbeck not listed here if you take into account the Garden Centre / Courtyard area, the old pit site, the Works Department, The Artists Workshops, the School of Artisan Food, The Brewery Yard Food businesses, The Farms Depts., The Water Businesses, The Woodland, The Housing, plus other sundry businesses Welbeck is a thriving Rural Industrial Estate (Don't just see it as a Heritage site). This view of Welbeck is WRONG.....the estate is a living thriving area and NOT JUST A HERITAGE SITE longer discussion around the possibilities here for the Visitor Economy, Rural Industry, Education and Training, Rural Leisure, Sustainable Living and Working need to happen before the final plan is crated this is a massive missed opportunity.	Policy ST10 only covers employment sites that can accommodate B class development. All of the commercial businesses listed generate employment, just not within those use classes. Visitor economy is covered by Policy ST12 and the rural economy by Policy ST11.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST11 - Rural Economic Growth			
1195911	Resident	Object to criteria A3 of Policy ST11 as this is in direct conflict with NPPF paragraphs 83 and 84 which supports the sustainable growth of ALL TYPES OF BUSINESS IN RURAL AREAS as opposed to just those directly related to agricultural, horticultural or forestry operations and other activities, which by their nature would require a rural location. The policy as currently worded would inhibit farm diversification opportunity by effectively limiting the re-use or conversion of existing buildings for employment generating use that do not fall within the remit of criteria 3 or meet the criteria for permitted changes of use under Classes R and S of the GPDO. Understand why policy ST11 should be more restrictive towards stand-alone new build economic development that does not fit the criteria but to potentially limit conversions and new build opportunity within already established commercial locations in the rural areas would stifle rural enterprise and employment opportunity, lead to longer travel for rural employees and potentially lead to under-utilisation of rural buildings now unsuited to modern farming or horticultural use. There is the opportunity to reword this policy to ensure it is NPPF compliant and limit only free-standing, large scale new build economic development that is better located in allocated industrial areas.	The Local Plan must be consistent with the NPPF to be found sound. Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses. Permitted development legislation would still apply.
REF198	Consultant	How outdated can a policy be? This has been trotted out review after review and the proof that it is wrong is the continued identified decline of our rural areas to the benefit of the urban areas yet, when it suits the Council's purpose, a wholly new village can be promoted. The restrictions within this policy mean clearly that our rural areas will always be second or third best unless residents can take up low impact employment such as "yoghurt knitting", sawdust plaiting, weaving etc. These immensely restrictive policy ideas should be ditched and replaced with a logical approach to providing employment in the countryside that does fit in well but is not automatically rural by nature. Industries and employment can grow quickly in the rural areas if allowed simply because land values will be so much less. What also would help would be a better public transport system which the Council for many years have been saying we all should have but nothing has been done. It has been left to the individual bus operators to either serve the areas or not. Some of the CIL money could be spent towards providing this local bus service.	Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses. Public transport is largely a commercial enterprise, and outside the Council control. But the Council will continue to work with bus operators to ensure that public transport provision is appropriate in the rural area.
REF215	Consultant	Paragraph 3.2 of the Draft Local Plan sets out a fundamental concept: "The performance of the local economy is a key driver that shapes Bassetlaw into a successful and growing location" and then in Paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 draws attention to the fundamental changes in the structure of the economy. Paragraph 3.5 notes: "...The logistics sector continues to grow, with significant investment taking place and market interest evidenced along the A57 and AI corridors". Given the extent to which Bassetlaw is a substantial rural area it is surprising that Draft Policy ST1 does not address the extent to which the rural economy has been and will be called upon to support economic growth. Generally and partly by its very nature the AI would normally be more associated with rural Bassetlaw than urban Bassetlaw. But there are a few locations that exemplify the changes from a rural area more than "North Blyth" given the extent that the developments already present are changing and the development permitted but yet to come will continue to significantly change the character of the area. Rural economic growth in Bassetlaw has a different dimension than might normally be expected in a rural authority. "North Blyth" offers an outstanding opportunity to not only strengthen the local economy but also appropriately locate other key elements of employment infrastructure i.e. housing without harm to any issue of normal importance.	Policy ST1 2a supports the growth of the Large Rural Settlements - which includes Blyth - and 2d supports development in the countryside necessary to the location, including those which support the rural economy.
REF222	Resident	Transport should be included specifically in section A i.e. to demonstrate that; the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, and freight, can be addressed, that there isn't a road safety problem that cannot be removed, and local routes are suitable or can be suitably upgraded to carry the additional traffic and the types of traffic generated by the development.	It is important that all new development can be safely accessed. Policy ST11 will be amended accordingly.
1196559	Resident	There is very little opportunity to develop business with the SETTLEMENT of Bothamsall. Any growth would need to be within the Parish. We have already see the closure of our basic amenities (Post Office and very small Shop) and the reduction of the Bus Service to one that is totally inadequate and of little use to the Residents of Bothamsall.	Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST11 - Rural Economic Growth			
REF289 -	Consultant	Welcome Policy ST11's support for new employment development in rural locations and the creation of 'rural enterprise hubs', in particular. The policy should recognise, however, that the range of employment activities associated with such hubs is likely to be much broader than those listed under Part A, 4 of the same policy. Policy ST11 should, therefore, be revised to exclude Part A, 4.	Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses.
REF298	Consultant	FCC's site currently lies outside the settlement boundary of Worksop and whilst it is most closely related to the urban area of Worksop, for planning policy purposes, it is within the rural area. Despite this rural location, the site has a history of built development and in part benefits from planning permission for employment uses. The east of the site has planning permission (ref: 18/01093/OUT) and should be included within the employment sites listed within Policy ST6. It is anticipated that by the time the Local Plan is submitted for examination in December 2020 the entire site will benefit from planning permission for employment uses and that the submitted version of ST6 will reflect this. At present, the site does not benefit from an employment allocation and would fall to be considered against Policy ST10 and other relevant policies in the Plan, including Policy ST11. Whilst Policy ST10 could lend support for proposed employment uses in unallocated countryside locations, Policy ST11 as currently drafted is a prescriptive policy which seeks to limit rural economic growth to those developments which require a rural location. Whilst 'rural' is not defined within the Plan, FCC presume that 'rural' is all land that is unallocated land which is outside of the settlement boundary. This should be clarified. The current wording of the policy requires a number of criteria to be satisfied, which includes criteria relating to agricultural and farming which are clearly not applicable to B1, B2 or B8 uses. As such, employment development such as that proposed on FCC's site would not be able to meet all of the criteria as required by the Policy ST11 and thus would be contrary to the policy. This would preclude most types of economic development coming forward on a countryside (rural) site, including on sites which already benefit from planning permission for similar uses (such as FCC's site), and/ or which comply with Policy ST10. Policy ST11 should be amended to allow greater flexibility for certain types of development in the rural area (land beyond the settlement boundary), particularly where compliance with Policy ST10 and other relevant policies is demonstrated.	Policy ST11 will be amended to ensure it is applicable to all types of rural businesses. See comments for Policy ST6.
REF327 -	Parish Council	Good to see proposals to enhance / protect the rural economy and employments levels, even if they are to be put in danger by the arbitrary nominal growth in Policy ST2.	Support noted and welcome.
REF339 -	Consultant	Welcome the positive approach to the historic environment within Draft Plan strategic policies such as Policy ST11: Rural economic growth.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST12 - Visitor Economy			
1189777	Resident	Do not forget the possibility of new marinas on the Chesterfield Canal. Support the proposed new marina at Walkeringham.	Policy ST12 supports proposals which would provide facilities to enhance the visitor offer in the District. This would include marinas.
1191455	Resident	If our area become a serious a tourist attraction (and a provider of part-time & seasonal employment) them more strategic thought is need to link development and encourage visitors to stay in Bassetlaw. The Council will need to lead on this to encourage our existing attractions to work together and with new attractions to make visits to Bassetlaw a rewarding experience	Comments noted.
REF092	Consultant	Suggest that the following criterion is added to Policy ST12: The diversification of existing touring caravan pitches to static lodges or pods will be supported where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposals are for the expansion of an existing business; and • there are no significantly detrimental impacts on the area's landscape, ecology, amenity of neighbouring land uses, the historic environment, designated heritage assets and the character of the area by virtue of increased noise and impacts on light or highway safety and the operation of the highway network. Overall, and considering the above, policies must be sufficiently flexible to allow businesses to adapt to changing economic trends and changes in the demands of tourists. Policy must enable the Caravan and Motorhome Club to support the growth of the local economy by ensuring the ability of its existing sites to be developed and enhanced. Overall, this ensures the future viability of the business, and supports the tourist industry within Bassetlaw. Given the Club's ambition to operate in Bassetlaw for a long-term period in the future they need to guarantee the economic viability of their sites. In turn, wish to see the Council develop a policy to support the expansion and diversification of holiday and caravan sites. 	To better enable the Caravan Club to support the District's tourist industry the policy will be amended as suggested.
1194992	Resident	Pg 66 restricting holiday homes, may have a negative effect on housing market as taking houses out of supply long term.	Planning conditions are used to ensure holiday accommodation is appropriately used for a short period of time and is not a way of developing/living in a home in a location which may be unsustainable.
REF198	Consultant	This policy is very short sighted and establishes numerous "hoops" that rural development has to jump through in order for it to be acceptable. Siting many of the rural operations adjacent to towns is not really an option. Acknowledge that Bassetlaw has much to offer the visitor and part of that is its rural setting and offering a more proactive Tourism sector within the Council would be a start. Springvale Fisheries at Bevercotes was quite vehemently objected to by the Council, Notts County Council and some, not all, nearby residents. This was a totally new standalone fishery, rather than making the best use of an extinct quarry but a purposefully designed and built visitor attraction. It is now one of the premier angling locations in the UK and is fully booked up for match fishing for the next 2 years at weekends and 75% booked for weekdays. It is a major success that would never have happened without an Appeals Inspector seeing beyond the restrictive policies. This policy is so far out of date it needs wholly rethinking and is not sound.	Policy ST12 reflects the town centres first approach to tourism development in national policy. However, Policy ST12 recognises the importance that rural attractions bring to the economy and are covered by part C of the policy. The proposed policy framework is very different to that set out within the adopted Core Strategy (against which Springvale Fisheries was assessed). It is considered that Policy ST12 provides a positive framework against which visitor attractions in the countryside should be assessed.
REF282	Resident	National Trust supports Policy ST12 which supports the visitor economy of the district, particularly Part E which supports developments that will enhance the environment or bring neglected or underused heritage assets back into appropriate economic use.	Support noted and welcome.
REF283	Consultant	6.7.3 Should include development of cycle routes linking visitor attraction sites to form attractions themselves, like the Derbyshire Peaks & Rutland Water.	Reference will be added to para 6.7.3 to include support for sustainable transport links to and between visitor attractions.
REF300 -	Consultant	Natural England welcomes paragraph 6.74 "Balance must be achieved between priority visitor experience and protecting unique qualities of natural and built environment". Suggest that this point should be emphasised within the policy wording itself to ensure protection of recreational sites, such as Clumber Park, which experience high visitor pressure threatening fragile natural habitats.	Reference to Clumber Park will be added to para 6.7.4. Ensuring the District's natural and historical assets are not adversely affected by visitor attractions is important. Reference to their appropriate protection will be added to Policy ST12.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST12 - Visitor Economy			
REF327 -	Parish Council	Para. 6.7.7 Visitor Accommodation should also include an item that will stop holiday accommodation usage turning into permanent accommodation via 12 month licences and rigid enforcement. Made Neighbourhood Plans can also be a delivery mechanism too, if visitor accommodation and economy is included.	Planning conditions are used to ensure holiday accommodation is appropriately used for a short period of time and is not a way of developing/living in a home in a location which may be unsustainable. This is referenced at para 6.7.7.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST13 Town Centres and Local Centres			
1191455	Resident	To make our Town Centres viable, the Council needs to block any more large retail developments around Worksop or Retford	The Bassetlaw Retail Study identifies that there no large scale retail is needed for the plan period. Policy ST13 sets out the thresholds above which an impact assessment would be required. This will helps ensure that any potential impact of new retail development outside the Primary Shopping Area are assessed in detail.
1192494	Resident	The provisions of this policy are welcomed and supported. The policy should also indicate what would not be allowed or encouraged outside the designated areas	Policy ST13 sets out the thresholds above which a retail impact assessment would be required. This will helps ensure that any potential impact of new retail development and other town centre uses outside the Primary Shopping Area/town centre are assessed in detail. But for clarity further detail will be added to Policy ST13 on the type of uses that would be appropriate in each tier of the hierarchy.
REF085	Resident	Disappointing that the Draft Plan says very little about Retford town centre. The Council is to produce a development plan document for Worksop town centre. There is a reference to an emerging Retford Centre Business Neighbourhood Plan, but it is unclear how this would be produced, what it would cover, and what if any weight it would carry in planning decisions. The Society would welcome a forward-looking development plan document to guide and encourage development in the town centre and would wish to be consulted in its preparation. In the absence of such a document, consideration should be given to identifying in the Local Plan and drawing attention to sites within the town centre suitable for development which would benefit the local economy. Two areas that should be considered in this context are the land on the north side of Bridgegate and the two-car parks between Wharf Road and West Street. The Society welcomes the Draft Plan's identification of a Primary Shopping Area where all ground floor premises should have an active frontage. Ensuring that frontage uses all contribute to the vitality of the town centre is essential if the centre is to thrive and if its character is to be protected. The protection afforded by Primary Shopping Area status should be extended to Canon Square. This is visually and historically a very important part of the town centre. Any further loss of active frontages here would cause serious harm to its attractive character and should be resisted.	The Retford Business Neighbourhood Plan is being produced by the Retford Business Neighbourhood Plan Group. Once made it will form part of the development plan for the District so would have the same weight as the Local Plan and any other Development Plan Document when planning decisions are made. A new Town Centres Management policy will provide additional focus on the three town centres including Retford. The Retail and Leisure Study defines the extent of the Primary Shopping Area and annual monitoring has confirmed that approach, with some slight exceptions to reflect changes on the ground since the study was undertaken. These boundaries are considered to accurately reflect the Primary Shopping Area as the focus for retail growth.
1194992	Resident	Pg 70 There needs to be more retail in villages to create sustainable communities ie convenience stores so people don't need to drive places. Should also make use of village halls which are unused most of the time for education or other services eg electric charging points for cars, GP practices etc.	Policy ST13 B protects local shops and services and identifies the criteria that needs to be met to provide for a change of use. Community facilities are protected and new community facilities supported in appropriate circumstances subject to the criteria in Policy ST40.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST13 Town Centres and Local Centres			
1196000	Consultant	Although there is a leaning towards ensuring shop fronts are maintained as a presence on the high street (agree that would be the preferred option), there is no obvious indication as to how the council intend to support that, as opposed to simply standing in the way of changes of use. The reality is that the nature of the high street is changing, due to changing lifestyles, the rise of online shopping and the increasing dominance of the supermarket chains. To be fair, aside from cutting business rates to small retailers, not sure what the council can do, but it would be futile to ignore the grim reality.	Policy 33 provides a positive framework to maintain and enhance shopfronts, signage and security particularly in the town centres. The policy balances heritage concerns with maintaining active frontages and supports innovative design that respects the character of the location. Such measures can be achieved in a cost effective way and can add value to the use of the building rather than being an obstacle to change.
1196559	Resident	Development within or close by the existing built environment is always the best option. Invariably Public Transport and Shopping/Medical facilities are already existing and will welcome the additional custom. Other infrastructure may need upgrading, but this should be far simpler than starting from scratch, as would be required on the proposed green field sites.	Comments noted.
1196860	Resident	ST13 is supported	Support noted and welcome.
REF272	Consultant	Despite being referenced in Policy ST13 A.1d little account appears to have been taken of the positive impact of the significant footfall created by people accessing public services such as health services e.g. Newgate Medical Centre in Worksop.	Policy ST13 recognises that outside the central retail core of the town centre uses such as health care facilities will be supported. Paragraph 6.8.7 refers to uses being supported in town centres that attract a reasonable level of customers and footfall as these can generate passing trade for other units in the town centre. By specifically highlighting health facilities (in D1 use) as being one of these appropriate uses, considerable weight is given for future development of such facilities in the town centre in future. But for clarity further detail will be added to Policy ST13 on the type of uses that would be appropriate in each tier of the hierarchy.
1197186	Resident	There are good ideas in this plan. Wonder if they fully address the changes in shopping & working habits. With more online shopping there may be more of a move towards niche businesses such as small shops/cafes offering something different. In Retford, Mama Giusi's, The Honey & Fig, BeerheadZ and The Barrister in Wonderland Bookshop are examples. Wonder if one way to protect our high streets is to introduce town centre housing as existed in the past. There are former town centre houses still in Retford even though the frontage and use has changed. If people are working more from home, therefore less commuting being needed, there may be a demand for business/work hubs being created. This allows people to socialise and work from one base across a number of companies. Secure high speed broadband is essential for this. ITV Calendar recently showed a good example of a hub in action and the benefits it brings to individuals, the town centre and the environment.	Policy ST13 provides a flexible framework to respond well to potential changing shopping, leisure and working habits. Policy ST13 also promotes active frontages so provides a flexible framework to supporting the full range of town centre uses within the town centre. Only in the Primary Shopping Areas would retail (shops) be the preferred use. But change of use to non retail uses may be supported where the criteria in the policy can be met. Policy ST13 supports opportunities for residential use above ground floor units in the town centres.
REF350 -	Resident	Welcome that the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) of the town centre has been extended to include the whole of the PSC including where the consented foodstore is proposed and that Policy ST13 states that "Proposals for retail use outside the Primary Shopping Areas or for other main town centre uses, outside the town centre boundaries will be required to demonstrate their suitability through a sequential test in line with the National Planning Policy Framework" Welcome the requirement for retail impact assessments for any retail proposals over 929sqm outside Worksop town centre given the need to ensure that such proposals do not have a significant adverse impact on the town centre. Note that paragraph 6.8.8 refers to the town centre being supported by a Development Plan Document for the Worksop Central Area (WCA) which will provide a framework for the regeneration of the area as set out at Policy ST4 of the draft Local Plan. Paragraph 5.4.7 of the Local Plan explains that the WCA includes four delivery areas including 1. New Sandhills; 2. The V2 Experience; 3. Concentrated Retail Centre (which includes the PSC); 4. Worksop Station Gateway; and 5. Old Town.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST13 Town Centres and Local Centres			
REF475 -	Resident	Regeneration policies (ST5, ST13) – support	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing Distribution			
1180212	Resident	My previous comments are relevant to this point. I also think that the numbers suggested for Retford are very high. Many houses are now being built in retford and with the addition of the North Road site there will surely be adequate properties to house the local population and to revise housing targets for small rural communities.	Thank you for your comments. Retford is the second largest town in Bassetlaw and contains services and facilities to support a higher level of growth than all other areas of the District, with the exception of Worksop. As such, it needs to deliver housing to support the growing population and to support the local economy.
1189633	Resident	I do not know your policy numbers but I think you have over-estimated the number of houses required. I think the balance between rural and urban development is not appropriate. A considerable increase in car journeys from villages to Retford and Worksop is in conflict with your aim of sustainability.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is in the process of reviewing housing distribution and will make any necessary amendments.
1191848	Barnby Moor Parish Council	I understand that the proposed new dwellings is quite a bit higher than the number required, This seems unfair to smaller parishes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is in the process of reviewing housing distribution and will make any necessary amendments.
REF085	Retford Civic Society	<p>The Draft Plan proposes a scale of house building which is far in excess of what is required using the ‘standard method’ required by the government. This method is intended to establish a minimum requirement, but the Society sees no justification for exceeding it to the extent proposed.</p> <p>The more recent OPCS projections of need gave a much smaller housing requirement for Bassetlaw. Although it is government policy that this projection should not be used, it does give some indication of the direction of change likely as more up-to-date projections are made available.</p> <p>The Draft Plan indicates that between 2011 and 2018 the District’s population increased by 3.4% and that it is projected to increase by 3.8 % by 2037. The annual rate of population increase is projected to fall significantly.</p> <p>Neither of these projections points to housing growth on anything like the scale proposed in the Draft Plan. On the contrary, they suggest that there is no justification for exceeding the minimum required under the government’s ‘standard method’.</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that the current output of housebuilders in Bassetlaw is significantly restricted by a shortage of land or that they could increase their output to the extent proposed in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The scale of housing proposed in the Draft Plan is said to be justified by expected employment growth. We have looked at relevant background papers, particularly the G L Hearn report, and see no logical basis for this. Although the Draft Plan makes provision for new sources of employment, particularly by capitalising of access to the A1, there is no reason to expect a massive upsurge in the number of jobs actually provided. The Council has been striving hard to attract more employment since the miners’ strike and before and these efforts have had considerable success. Efforts in the future may be a bit more successful, but they are unlikely to be dramatically so. Our leaving the EU and the end of the free movement of labour is particularly pertinent to this point. There is nothing in the state of the local or national economy or in the availability of public finance to suggest a change on such a scale as to require a substantial increase in the rate of house building.</p> <p>The Society considers that the scale of house building proposed in the draft Local Plan is excessive and that it should be reduced to around that required by the government’s ‘standard method’ of assessment. If this is not done there will be an unnecessary and unjustified loss of greenfield land. Market considerations limiting what housebuilders can sell are likely to result in the house building rate failing to grow at the rate proposed. Housebuilders are likely to cherry-pick and develop the easiest and most profitable sites rather than more complicated ones with more community benefit.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is in the process of reviewing housing distribution and the evidence and will make any necessary amendments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
		There is a substantial risk of under-delivery and this could lead to the Council being penalised and losing control over where development takes place.	
1193159	Resident	There are no provisions for adding infrastructure to support 250 new houses in Ranskill. The roads and school will not be adequate and there is little provision for any new businesses	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Infrastructure requirements have been, and will continue to be
1193555	Resident	House building is great but have you considered the .schools and how they will be able to provide the spaces.	Yes, we have worked with Nottinghamshire County to ensure school provision is assessed and delivered.
REF089	NEDDC	3.1 On the strategic matter of housing the Draft Plan states that ‘to ensure a sustainable strategy is delivered, the number of homes must be balanced with the number of new jobs expected to be delivered in the District. Jobs growth will generate a need for an increased labour supply to meet increasing employment demand. In turn this will lead to new homes to accommodate the new population’ .3.2 In proposing the District’s housing requirement figure it is stated that ‘on that basis, the Economic Development Needs Assessment, 2019 identifies that the housing requirement be increased to a minimum of 478 dwellings (per year) to support economic growth in the District’. 3.3 Bassetlaw is therefore proposing a total housing requirement figure of 9087 dwellings, i.e. 478 dwellings per year for the period 2018 to 2037. Officer Comments: 3.4 This Council supports, in principle, Bassetlaw’s strategy to deliver sustainable development and growth; and to accommodate all its development needs within its own boundaries. However, it is noted that the Draft Plan’s housing requirement figure is significantly higher than both the SHMA based OAN of 374 dpa, and ‘Growth Scenario’ of 417 dpa (the economic led housing need figure from the Growth Scenario 2014-2035 in the SHMA). It is also well above the figure of 390 dpa for 2018-2035 which is identified as the overall housing requirement figure to support the Oxford Economics Growth Mid-point scenario in the evidence base .3.5 It is acknowledged there is a difference in time periods covered by the evidence and the Draft Plan, but it is unclear from the evidence presented exactly how the housing requirement figure has been arrived at. The relationship between jobs growth and the employment land requirement as set out in the Draft Plan is also unclear. 3.6 North East Derbyshire District Council does not object in principle, to the scale of development proposed. However, further and clear justification for the housing requirement figure is necessary to enable the Council to make an informed decision on the likely impacts upon this District and the wider HMA; and ultimately sign up to a new statement of common ground on these cross boundary strategic matters.	Thank you for your comments. The Council has undertaken an Economic Development Needs Assessment to inform the housing requirement. This evidence is available to view on the Council's website.
REF091	Consultant	We consider that my clients land (as outlined in red) has the potential to be a ‘housing allocation’ in the Worksop Area. The area is located outside of the Conservation Area and not affected by any ‘designation’ on the Proposals Map. The area measures approximately 13.9 hectares and is located within Flood Zone 1. We would anticipate that vehicular access could be established from Woodsetts Lane and Owday Lane which link with the A57 Worksop and B6041 Gateford Road. The site would be suitable, available and deliverable within the Plan Period and it is considered that the LPA should consider its development potential at this early stage in the plan making process.	Thank you for your comments. The Council will review the site through the Land Availability Assessment to determine if it is suitable for development. If the site is considered suitable, it will be assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal process and considered for allocation.
REF108	Globe Consultation	Whilst supportive of Policy ST14 in principle, Globe is disappointed to note the omission of their client’s site at Blackstope Lane, Retford, which was put forward in January 2019 for its inclusion in any future Land Availability Assessment (LAA) review. Liaison with Planning Policy Officer Debbie Broad confirmed that this site was discounted and omitted from the LAA at Stage 1 of the site selection process due to its location within flood zone 3, coupled with the Council’s opinion that Blackstope Lane does not achieve adequate highway standards. However, Globe would like to raise awareness to the ongoing liaison between Roy Lobley Consulting and the Environment Agency with regards to the site’s flood risk. The most recent hydrological modelling undertaken by the Agency confirms that the risk of flooding at this particular site is much less severe than both that of the surrounding area and that had been assumed prior to the modelling (as is demonstrated by the attached document which shows the site is free from flooding barring a 1 in 75 year event). Accordingly, the omission of this site from the LAA on the grounds of flood risk is no longer justified by the available evidence and has been based on incorrect and now outdated information. Given the above, it is considered that there is scope to regenerate this currently unsightly brownfield site, which is of course located within close proximity to Retford town centre and is easily accessible by foot, cycle or private car.	The site is located within the highest risk Floodzone (Floodzone 3b). As such, development would be contrary to policy. The Council has not taken it forward for further consideration due to the severity of the constraints.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF114	Ranskill Parish Council	The Parish Council would like to see further clarification in the plan as to why Bassetlaw District Council are seeking to build far in excess of the number of homes that is required under the NPPF Standardised Methodology. In "Housing Need" page 29 para 5.1.42, the Plan states that the NPPF Standardised Methodology results in a minimum housing need of 307 dwellings per annum. While it is understandable that the District Council would seek to build more than the minimum requirement the Parish Council does not understand why the proposal is to build such a large percentage more i.e. almost 56% more - 478 dwellings per annum a total of 9087 in the plan period (page 29 para 5.1.46). The figures for population growth given earlier in the Plan would seem to be at odds with the number of homes proposed to be built. On page 15 para 3.12 it states that the District population is "projected to increase by 3.8% by 2037 equating to more than 4350 additional residents". If this is the case, why is it proposed to build a further 9087 dwellings? (page 29 para 5.1.46) This does not appear to make sense. The Plan states that the minimum figure has been adjusted "to take account of local factors affecting migration and household formation rates and employment growth forecasts". However, this is not sufficiently transparent. The Plan should provide a clear, understandable summary of these "local factors", especially as it could reasonably be assumed by residents that the NPPF Standardised Methodology which resulted in the figure of 307 dwellings would have accounted for such variables. Based on the above comments, in the interests of transparency the Parish Council would also like to see clarification of the "Statement of Common Ground" which it is stated has been signed with the local authorities in the Sheffield City Combined Authority page 29 para 5.1.47. What does the statement referred to mean for the residents of Bassetlaw? Ditto the statement in para 5.1.43 on the same page "this means working with other local authorities in the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Housing Area". Working in what way?	The standard method, based on Government guidance, is the minimum starting point in the calculation of housing need. The Council also needs to take into consideration economic growth. Evidence can be found in the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment which indicates that a higher level of housing growth is required to support the economic growth proposed.
REF136	A and D Architecture	4) Policy ST14 should be modified to include sites to be allocated for Park Home static caravan site development. Preferably these should be new sites to ensure competition and choice of location in the market.	The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate sites for Home Parks. There are policies in the plan which can be used to determine applications for Park Homes.
1195294	Resident	Seems the council are pushing through mass house building, almost a thousand already underway, and thousands more all on green belt land and the majority on conservation areas. It's ok to stop some development because of it being placed in conservation areas but when the council get involved it's ok. The worry of many residents especially in Carlton in Lindrick the peaks hill development looks to have already been given the go ahead without consultation and this is providing your ok to the plan. Many people don't agree with this development as recently the Carlton in Lindrick plan was to have no more than the 2 developments one in costhorpe the other on the firbeck colliery site. Now the parish is being forced to accept another thousand plus development within the parish boundary. This is unacceptable and increasing what was a quaint quiet village into a town in its own right or merely merging Worksop and Langold. As an ecologist I'll record plants insects mammals amphibians and birds of the area and will definitely find great Crested newt has I've seen them before in that area. I've also seen Merlin in the summer breeding in the woods. If i record them here and the planning goes ahead it will be destroy the credibility of the council to protect the ecology and environment of the area. Which will be a big issue with the press especially bad in an area where there is little wildlife to speak of.	Bassetlaw does not have any areas of Green Belt land. Peaks Hill Farm is still a proposal, it has not been approved by the Council. The Council is required to deliver enough new homes to meet the needs of the District over the next 15 years. Peaks Hill Farm is considered to be a sustainable location and it provides opportunities to enhance infrastructure, including public open space, highways improvements etc. The Council continues to work with partnering organisations to ensure sites taken forward will deliver sustainable development.
REF150	Resident	Flexing Housing Requirement Numbers It is expected that the minimum housing requirement will be exceeded in several larger settlements, which will by-and-large be able to accommodate greater housing growth due to their proximity to services and availability of suitable housing sites. I would ask that the Council should therefore consider and explain how they will therefore reflect the need to accept lower than the minimum housing requirements in other, predominantly smaller and less well served, settlements i.e. how they will decide which settlements can accept lower housing unit targets. Despite the Rural Settlement Study and the draft Local Plan not using either a settlement's conservation status nor its availability/proximity to services as an initial filtering criterion (due to the Council recognising such an approach would be unsound at this stage), serious consideration should be given to reintroducing them at this more advanced stage, to prioritise which settlements could see their housing numbers reduced. Given Clayworth's 'enhanced' conservation status and its lack of basic services, either in the village or in any reasonable proximity, it should be prioritised for lower housing requirements.	The Council is reviewing the Rural Policy and wil make any necessary amendments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
1195325	Resident	<p>I dispute the number of homes required in the plan period. Given the large number of houses being built at Harworth and Shirebrook I fail to see why 750 are required to the north of Worksop. Where and how are the numbers justified. The plan shows a disproportionate amount of housing to the north of Worksop i.e. 750 at Peakks Farm and 258 for the whole of the rest of Worksop. There are many unoccupied houses in Worksop kept vacant by absent landlords. These could help to meet the home numbers required rather than the easy option to build on open farmland. Would any brownfield sites be used for home? Unless the local plan pushes these areas develop as well always choose the easy option of open farmland. I am realistic and understand that some development will take place to the north of Worksop. When we purchased our bungalow on Rosedale we liked the fact we were near open countryside and there was then no indication of this very large ' large urban extension ' being built nearby. Also the correct wording must be put in the local plan to ensure that BDC can control the development and resist any obtrusive forms of development for this ' rural fringe location,' with ' prominent natural assets'. The guiding master plan in 7.2.2 can only be as good as the wording of the local plan allows. e.g. C2a) page 78 starts with the words ' at least ' 750 dwellings - what does this mean? A proposed developer could stretch this to a much higher figure. The local plan must have a top figure in order to control the housingdevelopment. As stated I believe 750 are too many never mind a lot more. Low density development should also be felt more appropriate for this area. 7.2.3 and 4. The retention of the trees and existing hedgerows on the site is an important with reference to its rural fringe location. Trees at Long Plantation should be protected and any proposed road should be designed to run along side the wood thereby not requiring felling of trees. There should be a tree frontage to the existing roads again due to its rural location and in keeping with the character of other road entrances to Worksop. 7.2.5. Bassetlaw's character with lots of villages is important and the green gap between Worksop and Carlton must be retained. Historically Carlto is a separate settlement.It is also important to retain the wooded and green open land to the East of Blyth road. This is a well used recreational space for the local community and Worksop as a whole. This area must link to the green gap and the Carlton road trees forming landscape corridors accross the proposed development site incorporating Long Plantation and the trees of Eddison Plantation. Is essential to try to help the wildlife presently in this area. 7.2.6 refers to the development starting in 2026. With the current homes being built at the end of Thievesdale Lane, these between 2026 and 2036 with proposals for a further 750 (presumably in the next local plan, but this is unclear from the paperwork/press info.) you are subjecting our neighbourhood, inc. many senior citizens, to years of living close to a building site with all its noise and disruption. Stated before this is too big a development for this area. 7.2.7 This wording should clearly state what type of houses would be on suitable for this area e.g. No high-rise developments. Are Affordable homes appropriate for this area given the distance from the town centre and its facilities. 7.2.8 The wording of the local plan should ensure individual small scale business and employment sites in keeping with the character of the area. Other areas of office space (new-build and existing) are available in Bassetlaw and is there justification for yet more on this site? 7.2.9. A number of houses are to be built on this site then the local plan must ensure that the local Centre health and education facilities etc. are provided - often Developers prefer to sign Agreements to provide a lump sum to be used elsewhere. I am also concerned that the wider community facilities e.g. GP surgeries, the Hospital including A&E and the existing schools cannot cater for such a large population increase. Waiting times are already long enough. 7.2.10 If development proceeds I can see the need for a new road between Carlton Road and Blyth Road. But 750 houses will generate many more car journeys (property could easily have two cars) and the roads either side of the site are already well used and congested. Blyth road is particularly difficult with the hospital roadside parking. Many cars travelling along the new road would still use Thievesdale Lane Canon trafficlights or Kilton Hill traffic lights. These are already well used by local people and commuters from the wider area with quest forming at busy times. 7.2.11 to 7.2.13 refer to many road alterations which will themselves adversely affect the character of this area in its rural setting. Retention of trees and hedgerows will help and should be stated in the wording of this section of the local plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The aims and objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan is to deliver the required amount of sustainable development based on evidence. It seeks to protect and enhance the environment through well designed, sustainable development which is required to provide a net gain in biodiversity.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF169	Highways England	<p>In January 2017 Highways England provided comments on the initial draft version of the Local Plan, with a housing target of 6,525 dwellings and a minimum of 177 hectares of employment land, identified to come forward. While no specific sites had been identified, the majority of the development was expected to target the towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes.</p> <p>With regard to the current version of the Local Plan, the housing target has increased significantly to 9,087 dwellings. This is shared over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2,180 in Worksop; • 1,574 in Retford; • 2,000 in Harworth; • 1,764 in large rural villages and 1,090 in small rural settlements; and • 750 in Bassetlaw Garden Village, located adjacent to the east of the A57 / A1 / Blyth Road junction at Upper Morton. 	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
1195911	Aspbury Planning Limited	<p>We do not object per se to the allocations set out in ST14 yet consider that an insufficient number and variety of sites have been allocated in Retford to meet the housing requirement for the town and compensate for any under delivery at the New Garden Settlement within the plan period. We are particularly concerned by the omission of the site LAA138 at Welham Road, Retford, which is part within and part out with by the current (old) development boundary yet has been acknowledged in writing by the former Interim Development Team Manager Myles Joyce and subsequent officers as being 'read' as part of Retford rather than as part of the countryside. The latest Land Availability Information for the site with regard to its flood status is overstated in its reporting of the flood risk associated with the site which has previously had a residential consent. As recently as 2019 a subsequent mixed use application (19/00141/FUL) drew no objections from the EA or the LLFA. We have taken issue with the scope and extent of the F22 designation of the site and that the EA have acknowledged in communication dated 03/07/19 that they did not have current resources to update their modelling of the Retford Beck and its knock on impacts and so the reliability of the EA data on a site which we have undertaken extensive FRA remains highly questionable. We note that there are a number of allocated sites within policy ST14 that take in elements of F22 and F23. We question therefore why a previously consented site for residential with no flood risk objections from the relevant flood authorities should not be included at this stage.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial distribution of housing and will make any necessary amendments accordingly.
REF198	Consultant	<p>Para 5.1.46 page 29 The housing requirement for Bassetlaw over the plan period is 9087 which the Council feel comfortable can be delivered, see 5.1.47 and 5.1.48.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF198	Consultant	<p>Policy ST14 page 75 This policy is flawed due to the lack of inclusion of the possible housing site at St John's College Farm. Site reference NP04 is a most incongruous addition being, as it is, right on the very entrance to the village in open countryside. The Tuxford allocations should be reconsidered also given that NP11 has provision for 60+ affordable/social housing with no full time market housing.</p> <p>Neither of these allocations appears to include the relevant number of senior citizen housing which has been identified both by Bassetlaw District Council and Tuxford Town Council/Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>This part of the policy is therefore not sound.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is proposing to enable the Neighbourhood Plan process allocate appropriate sites. The policy proposed for the rural area will support development which meets the policy criteria.
REF214	Oxalis Planning	<p>Overall, we agree with the Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw insofar as it seeks to deliver development in the most sustainable locations throughout the lifetime of the Local Plan. In order to achieve sustainable development across the District, we agree that the most logical and sensible solution for the provision of development is to ensure that the larger 'main towns' remain the focus for the majority of development and that the Large Rural Settlements form the next tier in the hierarchy and will accommodate the majority of the rest of the District's housing need. However, we do not consider that the proposed use of Neighbourhood Plan allocations alone will provide the necessary strategic scale of sustainable development for the Large Rural Settlements and we believe that the Plan should contain built in flexibility to ensure that it can be responsive to change and therefore relevant throughout its lifetime. We also consider the arbitrary 20% cap on development for the Large Rural Settlements to be restrictive as it could impede the Council's ability to ensure that development is distributed and delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the Local Plan. In this regard, we have proposed additional wording to be included in Policy ST1 and we believe</p>	The Plan is considered to be sufficiently flexible to enable sustainable development to occur in the rural areas.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
		that the 20% cap should be revised to become a guide for the level of development that the Large Rural Settlements should achieve	
REF218	Central Lincolnshire	We note the intention of Bassetlaw to meet the District's housing and employment needs within the District area and would wish the support of the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee to be recorded. We note that you are seeking to meet a need higher than the current nationally derived Local Housing Need for Bassetlaw in the Local Plan. Whilst we do not object to this approach, given the challenges in the region in maintaining land supply, it might be preferable to include a housing range in your plan where the nationally derived Local Housing Need figure is the bottom end of the range and the aspirational figure in your plan forms the top end. Changes to the Planning Practice Guidance now allows for this in Paragraph 027 (Reference ID: 68-027-20190722), specifically stating that for land supply calculations purposes you will be tested against the bottom end of the range. This will help your plan aspire to a higher level, whilst giving the greatest chance of success in maintaining a five year supply of housing land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is looking to deliver economic growth and, in order to support this, there is a requirement to ensure enough homes are delivered. As such, given the fact that the Council can demonstrate a healthy housing land supply, it is not considered appropriate to adopt a range for the housing requirement.
1196560	Resident	Additional housing planned is in excess of the amount needed. There is sufficient housing proposed in Bassetlaw with the identified developments found by Neighbourhood Planning Groups, the proposed site at Upper Morton and potential for re use of existing building for there to be no need for a large housing development at Cottam. However, the council's own policies and aims are at complete variance with the strategies to develop in Retford and Cottam. The proposed new builds will have a damaging effect on the environment and the life of the community.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the Strategy and will make any necessary amendments. The Plan proposes policies which will seek to protect the environment/deliver sustainable development.
1196694	Resident	Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that of the new developments: 81% are greenfield and 19% are brownfield. This is an appalling scenario for our environment. Bassetlaw is ahead of schedule to meet its targets for housebuilding by 2037. It should not be approving plans to build on so much greenfield land. It should continue to review what brownfield sites become available in the decades to come. There will be new brownfield sites available before (and after) 2037 which can be considered for residential building. 5.1.49 refers to building more quality housing than is required – this cannot be justified: once greenfield land is built on, it is lost forever; there is nothing sustainable about this approach. Building on greenfield sites to such a level as is proposed, especially at Peaks Hill, does not meet the definition of “sustainable development”. The ability of future generations to meet their own needs for enjoyment of the natural environment, clean air, space and nature will be adversely impacted by this huge development and the consequent growth in traffic. Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that 20% of the greenfield units and 10% of the brownfield units will be affordable, ie 80% of greenfield and 90% of brownfield units will not be affordable housing. How is this meeting the local demand identified at 3.13: the huge percentage increase in over 65s and over 80s and the percentage decrease in the numbers aged 16-65? There is a need for smaller houses and for bungalows, not for large houses.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is seeking to deliver regeneration, and supports brownfield redevelopment. However, there are not enough available brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the District. Consequently both brownfield and greenfield sites are required for development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>Housing Requirement Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy identifies a minimum housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). This is expressed as an average annual requirement of 478 dwellings per annum (dpa). The expression of the housing requirement as a minimum is supported and is considered consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>2.5 The NPPF, paragraph 60 states.... The standard method for determining local housing need referred to within paragraph 60 is set out within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). This suggests a minimum requirement of just 286dpa. Setting the housing requirement above the minimum identified by the standard method is supported.</p> <p>2.7 The PPG re-iterates that the standard method is the minimum housing requirement and identifies circumstances where greater levels of housing should be catered for. This non-exhaustive list includes; i. growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable, for example where funding is in place to promote and facilitate additional growth (e.g. Housing Deals); ii. strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or iii. an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground; (PPG ID 2a-010-20190220)</p> <p>At least the first two reasons are appropriate in the case of Bassetlaw. The third will be dependent upon neighbouring authorities. This is discussed in greater detail below.</p> <p>2.8 The PPG (ID 2a-010-20190220) further notes that;.... In the case of Bassetlaw both additional reasons apply. With respect to the SHMA this is discussed in detail below. In terms of previous levels of housing delivery Bassetlaw has, on average, delivered significantly more than 286dpa, as illustrated in the following table. The long-term average delivery since 2001/02 is 318 dwellings. More recently, over the last 5-years delivery has improved to an average of 404dpa. To plan below the five-year average would be contrary to paragraph 59 of the NPPF which re-iterates the Government's continued objective of 'significantly boosting' the supply of homes. 2.11 It must also be recognised that the Government has committed to reviewing the standard methodology. This is intended to commence later this year. Given that the Government has re-stated its commitment to delivering 300,000 homes by the mid-2020s and the sum of the standard method falls well short of this requirement it would seem logical that a future iteration of the standard method would generally increase housing need across the country. The Draft BLP (para. 5.1.45) identifies that the housing requirement is based upon evidence provided within the 2019 'Economic Development Needs Assessment'. However, the 2019 'Economic Development Needs Assessment' identifies a range of housing requirements based upon differing economic scenarios. The outputs are identified in table 16 and summarised below. The differing scenarios suggest a large range in future housing need. It is, however, notable that none directly relates to the proposed housing requirement of 478dpa. Furthermore, the assessment dates 2018 to 2035 do not match the plan period 2018 to 2037. Prior to the next stage of consultation, it is recommended that the Council clarify its position with regards to the derivation of the housing requirement.</p> <p>2.14 The proposed housing figures is placed at the upper end of the identified range, this is supported. It is, however, notable that it sits comfortably below any of the 'High Growth' scenarios. The proposed housing requirement sits within the 'Midpoint Growth' range. This is surprising given the economic potential of Bassetlaw. The district sits within two Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). These being the Sheffield City Region LEP and the Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire LEP (D2N2).</p> <p>2.15 Both LEP areas have significant growth ambitions. The Sheffield City Region LEP Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) seeks to provide 70,000 additional jobs between 2015 and 2025. Similarly, the D2N2 SEP has strong growth ambitions and whilst not having a clear jobs growth target it is anticipating significant growth in higher paid jobs. Given this backdrop a higher overall housing requirement would be justified. 2.16 It is noted that at this stage Bassetlaw has not been approached by any neighbouring authority to assist in taking any unmet housing needs. This will need to be kept under review.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing the distribution of housing and will make any necessary amendments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>The Draft BLP identifies a housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Over the 2018/19 monitoring year 434 dwellings were delivered. Notwithstanding our comments upon the housing requirement this The January 2020 Land Availability Assessment (2020 LAA) identifies that as of 1st January 2020, 6,984 dwellings benefitted from some form of planning permission. A further 540 dwellings are identified as allocations (without permission) within made Neighbourhood Plans.4.3 Table 7, replicated below, of the 2020 LAA identifies proposals to allocate 2,881 dwellings. The total deliverable supply over the plan period is therefore 10,375 dwellings (Gross) or 10,339 dwellings (Net). This provide a buffer of approximately 19.5% or 1,686 dwellings. Whilst at face value this appears a healthy buffer it is heavily reliant upon several factors.4.5 In addition, the Council has not factored in any non-implementation rate into the supply from sites with permission. Even a relatively modest non-implementation rate of 10% would have a significant effect upon the buffer reducing it by approximately 700 dwellings. Furthermore, the supply is reliant upon at least 750 being delivered at the New Garden Village. These are discussed in greater detail above (sections 3). This is a complex site which will take a significant time to commence and deliver. Any slippage in the delivery of these key sites will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer.4.7 On this basis a greater buffer is considered appropriate. Any additional buffer should be focused upon Retford to balance the level of development in this main town.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing the distribution of housing and will make any necessary amendments.</p>
1196860	Sheffield City Council	<p>We note that the Local Housing Need figure currently calculated for Bassetlaw is 307 homes per year, and that the Local Plan housing requirement of 478 homes per year is higher in order to reflect the need to support economic growth in the district. This housing target that is significantly above the 'baseline' LHN figure produced using the Government's standard methodology is welcomed in supporting economic growth in SCR and providing flexibility in relation to overall housing delivery across the SCR. We note that the document confirms that Bassetlaw is able to meet all of its housing requirement within the District. On this basis, we assume that Sheffield is not required to meet any of Bassetlaw's housing needs</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing this policy and is in the process of producing a Local Housing Need Assessment. Amendments will be made, where necessary, based on up to date evidence.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>Bassetlaw's Housing Need</p> <p>2.59 The NPPG states the minimum number of homes should use the NPPF Standardised Methodology for calculating Objectively Assessed Needs (SMOAN), resulting in a minimum need of 307 dwellings per annum over the plan period. This is not a housing requirement but provides a minimum starting point for LPAs which should seek to provide as much sustainable development as they can. 2.60 With regard to the above, we agree with the Council at paragraph 5.1.45 of the Local Plan that there is a need to increase the minimum housing requirement considering economic growth assumptions in the borough and to ensure that enough homes are delivered to support that growth. However, we consider that there are several reasons why the Council has underestimated the level of uplift (478 dwellings) which it has sought to increase from the minimum SMOAN figure to account for economic growth. We set these out below. 2.61 Paragraph 5.1.45 of the Local Plan notes that the Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) 2019 within the evidence base identifies that the housing requirement be increased to a minimum of 478dpa to support the District's economic growth. We do not agree with that statement. 2.62 The EDNA shows that the industrial market in Bassetlaw demonstrates strength in a number of aspects. The total stock is above average compared to other more rural authorities in the sub region and has shown 16% growth over the last 15 years, outperforming regional and county benchmarks. We note that the EDNA comments that industrial activity in the District is currently focussed around Worksop but that the A1(M) is considered an emerging or longer -term market with commitments at Harworth subject to securing occupiers. We support those conclusions and have provided evidence of such within our Client's planning applications at Harworth. 2.63 The 2019 EDNA considers completion trends as well as forecasts from Oxford Economics, Cambridge Econometrics and Experian. Based on the strength of performance in the last decade or more in transport and manufacturing sectors, uplift scenarios have been applied to the baseline forecasts that are considered to more accurately reflect the district's performance (which the Council is aiming to surpass) . A preferred scenario anticipated jobs growth of 3,400 to 2035 which has translated into a need of 63ha of employment land taking into account a flexible margin and mitigating for future losses. Considering past employment trends and current commitments there may be potential for growth above, this subject to monitoring. 2.64 The EDNA considers that an economic-led housing need is identified in conjunction with the preferred scenario being of 390dpa. Although the Local Plan states an uplift to this figure has been made to 478dpa, it is not clear how this figure has been arrived at. Whilst we support an approach which seeks to increase housing land supply to take account of economic growth, we consider that the assessment does not go far enough and is simply not justified by evidence. 2.65 The above concludes a modest level of growth which is essentially based on a District that is already starting to grow organically better than its neighbours and based on sectors which exist within the District forecasting further growth, particularly in transport and manufacturing. In essence, it appears that the EDNA is based on the District continuing to do what it has already started to do modestly well at economically and, therefore, the forecasts do not appear to reflect Bassetlaw's ambitions for a step-change in the District. 2.66 We expressed in our previous representations that it was not clear why the EDNA sought to support the Oxford Economic (OE) 'mid -point' forecast for growth within the borough for 390dpa. Table 16 of the EDNA sets out a number of growth scenarios and demonstrates that the OE baseline, midpoint and high growth scenarios are significantly lower than those provided by Cambridge Economics (CE) or Experian forecasts. 2.67 With regard to the above, whilst we support the uplift in housing from 390dpa to 478dpa, we suggest that the conclusion of the EDNA is unclear . From our analysis, the evidence base provided to justify the Council's previously suggested requirement and the newly emerging requirement appears substantially the same, but with a different conclusion reached. It is simply not clear how that alternative conclusion has been reached and, contrary to the assertion of the Local Plan, the figure of 478dpa is not a recommendation or the EDNA.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing this policy and is in the process of producing a Local Housing Need Assessment. Amendments will be made, where necessary, based on up to date evidence.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>For the reasons set out below, we do not consider that it represents a logical conclusion from the evidence provided within the EDNA. 2.68 We consider that the level of housing provided should be tailored around supporting a 'high growth' economic forecast (which the Council wants to achieve) which, across the forecasts, would provide between 6,500 (OE) and 8,700 (CE) jobs (7,533 jobs is the mean average of the 3 forecasts) which would require between 518dpa and 608dpa respectively (mean average of 560dpa across the 3 forecasts). As such, we would consider that an aspirational plan that sought to support the level of growth which could be achieved within Bassetlaw would provide for circa 560dpa or 10,640 dwellings across an 19-year plan period. 2.69 Notwithstanding a steadily rising rate of housing delivery, we note the continuing trend of the Council's evidence base to underestimate housing growth needs within the District. 2.70 As market conditions for economic growth improve within the District, and delivery rises, the Council's evidence base is demonstrating a concerning level of housing it considers needs to be delivered. We have significant concerns that underestimating the supply of housing needed over the plan period could constrain economic growth below the potential that the Council has helped to cultivate. 2.112 Policy ST14 seeks to allocate land for housing in accordance with the Spatial Strategy. For the reasons set out above in detail, our Client objects to the housing allocations set out within the Local Plan and Policy ST14 which seeks to distribute that housing. It is our Client's view that this policy should be amended to include our Client's site to the south of Ordsall for the reasons set out in Chapter 3 of these representations.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing this policy and amendments will be made, where necessary, based on up to date evidence.
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST14 – Housing Distribution allocates land for a minimum of 1,703 dwellings at the following locations :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 sites (HS1 to HS6) (Policies 15 - 20) in Worksop for 1,008 dwellings ; • 3 sites (HS7 to HS9) (Policies 21 - 23) in Retford for 545 dwellings ; and • 2 sites (NP04 & NP11) (Policies 24 & 25) in Tuxford for circa 150 dwellings. <p>Under the 2019 NPPF, the Council should identify at least 10% of its housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare or else demonstrate strong reasons for not achieving this target (para 68). The Council should confirm its compliance with national policy. The Council's overall HLS should include a short and long-term supply of sites by the identification of both strategic and non-strategic allocations for residential development. Housing delivery is optimised where a wide mix of sites is provided, therefore strategic sites should be complimented by smaller non-strategic sites. The widest possible range of sites by both size and market location are required so that small, medium and large housebuilding companies have access to suitable land to offer the widest possible range of products. A diversified portfolio of housing sites offers the widest possible range of products to households to access different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs. Housing delivery is maximised where a wide mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways, creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector, responds to changing circumstances, treats the housing requirement as a minimum rather than a maximum and provides choice / competition in the land market.</p> <p>The HBF is supportive of the inclusion of a contingency buffer to overall HLS. There is no numerical formula to determine the appropriate quantum for a buffer but where a Local Plan is highly dependent upon one or relatively few large strategic sites or settlements / locations then greater numerical flexibility is necessary than in cases where HLS is more diversified. The HBF always suggests as large a contingency as possible to maximise flexibility.</p> <p>Land Availability Assessment January 2020 sets out as at 1st January 2020 the Council's estimated total HLS is 10,405 dwellings (or 10,339 dwellings less demolitions) comprising of :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sites with planning permission for 6,984 dwellings ; • Neighbourhood Plan allocations without planning permission for 540 dwellings ; and • proposed site allocations for 2,881 dwellings (Cottam deliver an additional 1,150 dwellings beyond 2037). <p>In 2018 / 2019, 434 dwellings were delivered so the District's residual housing requirement is 8,653 dwellings from 2019 to 2037 (Housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings minus 434 completions). If the overall HLS is 10,405 dwellings then there is a potential surplus of 1,689 dwellings (19.5%) assuming that all consents and allocations come forward exactly as predicted. The Council has not factored in any lapse rates or allowances for non-implementation. As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the Local Plan should include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period. It is noted that there is a lack of detail in the Council's Housing Trajectory in Appendix 3. The HBF would not wish to comment on the merits or otherwise of individual sites proposed for allocation but it is critical that the Council's assumptions on lapse rates, non-implementation allowances, lead in times and delivery rates contained within its overall HLS, 5 YHLS and housing trajectory in Appendix 3 are correct and realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing and sense checked</p>	The Council will review the requirement for 10% of housing to be on sites of 1 hectare or less and make any necessary amendments. The Council is seeking to deliver a mix of development on a range of sites (small, medium and large).

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
		by the Council using historical empirical data and local knowledge. The Council should provide evidence of its 5 YHLS position on adoption of the Local Plan using 478 dwellings per annum as the basis for the 5 YHLS calculation. It is noted that the Bassetlaw 5 YHLS Report 2019/21 applies a 5% buffer however if under the 2019 NPPF the Council is seeking to formally fix a 5 YHLS through the Local Plan then a 10% buffer should be applied (para 73). At time of the pre-submission consultation if the Council provides additional evidence on HLS then the HBF may wish to submit further comments.	
1197091	William Davis	While there are no objections to the proposed housing allocations it is considered that, as noted above, additional housing allocations are required to provide flexibility given the reliance on new settlements and sites to be allocated by Neighbourhood Plans; this will ensure that the housing requirement is met. As set out in the Spatial Strategy, Worksop is the most sustainable settlement in the District and will experience substantial employment growth and regeneration during the plan period. Additional housing allocations in appropriate edge of settlement locations can help provide this buffer, contribute to providing a mix of dwellings across the area and assist in improving the vitality and viability of the town centre. As such it is considered that land north of Mansfield Road (LAA206) should be allocated for residential development. It is considered that the recent planning application (Ref 17/01356/OUT) robustly demonstrated that the site was sustainably located and could be accommodated in the landscape through good design with a less than substantial impact on nearby heritage assets subject to an appropriate design response being followed. No technical objections or reasons for refusal were also raised in respect of access, drainage or impact on local infrastructure.	The Council's approach to the proposed allocations in Worksop is considered appropriate.
REF304	Pegasus	4.1 The Draft BLP identifies a housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Over the 2018/19 monitoring year 434 dwellings were delivered. Notwithstanding our comments upon the housing requirement this leaves a residual housing requirement of 8,653 dwellings from 2019 to 2037. 4.2 The January 2020 Land Availability Assessment (2020 LAA) identifies that as of 1st January 2020, 6,984 dwellings benefitted from some form of planning permission. A further 540 dwellings are identified as allocations (without permission) within made Neighbourhood Plans. 4.3 Table 7, replicated below, of the 2020 LAA identifies proposals to allocate 2,881 dwellings. 4.4 The total deliverable supply over the plan period is therefore 10,375 dwellings (Gross) or 10,339 dwellings (Net). This provide a buffer of approximately 19.5% or 1,686 dwellings. Whilst at face value this appears a healthy buffer it is heavily reliant upon several factors. 4.5 The supply is heavily dominated by sites with permission (6,984 dwellings). This makes up over two thirds of the supply. The impact of the plan upon housing distribution is therefore severely limited. This has led to limited allocations and delivery in Retford (see para. 2.5 above). This hardly appears to be the plan-led approach advocated by the NPPF (para. 15). 4.6 In addition, the Council has not factored in any non-implementation rate into the supply from sites with permission. Even a relatively modest non-implementation rate of 10% would have a significant effect upon the buffer reducing it by approximately 700 dwellings. 4.7 Furthermore, the supply is reliant upon at least 750 dwellings being delivered at the New Garden Village (see section 3 above). This is a complex site which will take a 26 February 2020 MG P20-0395 Page 10 significant time to commence and deliver. Any slippage in the delivery of this key site will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer. 4.8 On this basis a greater buffer is considered appropriate. Any additional buffer should be focused upon Retford to balance the level of development in this main town.	The Council is currently reviewing the Spatial Strategy and will make amendments where necessary.
1197187	Resident	I have concerns about developments at Leafields, Sandhills and on the Trinity Estate on North Road. I feel it is important to maintain active green sites within communities. Allotments and wild parkland are great ways to allow people to be active close to where they live. It also protects wildlife under stress such as hedgehogs and some bird species. It allows wild flowers to cultivate themselves supporting insect life such as bees and vice versa. It gives a breathing space supporting our physical and mental well being within a built up area. The plan to move allotments on to the Trinity property will mean much further	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Ist Council are reviewing ist distribution Christopher housing and will make any necessary amendments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
		travelling for those living near Leafield and mean that those with mobility restrictions will have more difficulty in accessing that site.	
1197219	Resident	No properties tshould be built on a green field site which includes established woodlands.This proposed site contradicts Bassetlaw councils strategic objective 4:2. which in summary states that locations should make use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of high quality agricultural land.	There is a need to allocate enough land to deliver the number of new homes needed in Bassetlaw up to 2037. Given the lack of available brownfield sites, it is necessary to allocate greenfield sites.
REF316	Fisher German	The Local Plan proposes to allocation two sites for residential development in Tuxford, totalling some 150 dwellings, 100 dwellings short of the minimum requirement. Presumably the Local Plan is therefore relying on the shortfall in housing to be provided for through a Neighbourhood Plan. The Made Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan has not identified any site allocations for the village. It is understood that Tuxford Town Council are currently progressing a review of their Neighbourhood Plan in order to identify sites to allocate for housing. However, at this time there are no firm timescales to confirm how long it will take for this review to progress and when the revised Neighbourhood Plan will be adopted and unless this is rectified, there is a risk that the 100 dwelling shortfall for Tuxford will not be delivered.We believe that the allocation of sites in the Large Rural Settlements should not be delegated to Neighbourhood Plans when there is not any clear evidence to demonstrate when the allocations will be made. As such we believe the Council should be allocating the full housing requirement for Large Village Settlements within the Local Plan itself.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing housing distribution. The housing and will make any necessary amendments.
1197269	Resident	A very large rural extension rather than urban and Carlton in lindrick has fully met their number. Rather than 'more'. Much more detailed evidence for transport will be needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure highway issues are addressed should the site be taken forward. The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment will inform decisions made on the Local Plan.
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Much of Bassetlaw is an attractive rural area , our existing villages were an attractive place to live. Much of the rural area Is not too densely populated , and this helps wildlife in general. If the minor roads get busy ,Barn Owls toads and hares will be exceptionally affected as will birds of prey which are killed when hunting on the roads and verges and scavenging on road kill. 25% of Barn Owls can be killed on the roads for instance. Many other species from flowers to bumble bees and insects suffer from urbanisation. Mentioning mitigation in a draft plan does not magically reduce the damage that is done, but makes the planners and councillors involved with urbanisation feel better. Fragmentation of open country is damaging to all species, odd belts of trees as proposed do not break the fragmentation which is likely to occur around areas of proposed development such as Apley Head junction for instance. Urbanisation of our Bassetlaw garden villages will continue if the 20% increase in building permissions is incorporated into the plan. The Bassetlaw draft Plan appears to propose to supply much more residential land than needed by statute, and there is a suspicion that the proposed luxury provision of residential housing land is connected with the Sheffield City Regions wish to send people out of the City to live in Bassetlaw ! An easy option for them, and councillors and planners wishing to co-operate rather than look at the needs and future quality of life in Bassetlaw for the existing residents. Little effort has been expended to ascertain where residences should be provided to minimise traveling, by establishing where jobs will be needed. Because the draft is expecting an increase in the elderly population and a decrease in the younger working population it is not clear why so much employment land is needed in the more rural areas. The Bevercotes colliery site and the existing Gamston Airfield employment areas should provide much of the land required, now that these sites have been rejected for residential development.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing housing distribution. The housing and will make any necessary amendments.
REF387	Resident	No more housing to be built in and around Retford until provision of police force upgrade in Retford. To have police on the beat in Retford town 24/7 and a manned police station of at least enough policeman to count. Retford and District correctly and safely for all who live here.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is reviewing housing distribution. The housing and will make any necessary amendments.
REF475	Resident	Amount and location of homes (ST14, ST26, ST27, ST28, ST29, ST30, ST31) – don't support Generally yes but, as stated before, the Garden Village is a poorly executed idea.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
1195356	Resident	<i>Workshop will deliver.....</i> Therefore we do not require green land to be destroyed for unrequired housing and destroying the natural very old and established landscape , trees , bio diversity with wildlife some of which is protected such as the bats that exist, owls, sparrow hawks, buzzards, herons, frogs, toads , hedgehogs, hares and the insect population This proposal is monstrous and should not be allowed to proceed	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Local Plan is seeking a net gain in biodiversity. Policies are proposed which seek to protect wildlife (both flora and fauna) and trees and hedgerows. The Plan is looking to deliver more trees/community woodland schemes throughout the district.
1195356	Resident	Good access !!!!!!!!!!! The Cannon Crossroads are always backed up and at peak times you can be waiting a good 10 minutes for any considerable movement through the traffic lights , this then extends along the A60 with a knock on effect and you want to create 1500 houses with a little link road from Blyth Road to Carlton Road with no changes to either Blyth Road / Thievesdale Road junction or the Cannon Crossroads. This will create deadlock likened to a large city and is a likely accident hot spot	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure highway issues are addressed should the site be taken forward. The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment will inform decisions made on the Local Plan.
1195356	Resident	Destroying green fields and heritage assets, prominent natural assets and long established woodland is not beneficial to the area and will not enhance the area. Its not sustainable or innovative its called commuterville and concrete jungle You are destroying a green agricultural environment that would be better suited to solar farms or wind farming, that would be retaining the natural landscape of the land and supporting the green climate change policies that are more important than 1500 unrequired houses ST15 HS1 Peaks Hill Farm	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Local Plan is seeking a net gain in biodiversity. Policies are proposed which seek to protect wildlife (both flora and fauna) and trees and hedgerows. The Plan is looking to deliver more trees/community woodland schemes throughout the district.
1195356	Resident	You cannot provide the infrastructure quoted here until all the houses are built and sold and money been received from years of council taxes because you have scrapped the community levy and are using loop to avoid implementing infrastructure.....Rippon Homes The Lodge on Thievesdale Lane.....agreement made between yourselves , the developers and Highways Agency that if you only build 42 houses at a time then you don't have to change the road junction. Madness to expect the current roads and junctions to cope with minimum of 3000 more cars. And as for health centres , schools etc what are you going to do with minimum of 1500 extra school children who will needs doctors, dentists and other associated facilities	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Local Plan process is the best way to ensure infrastructure is delivered. If the Council does not have an up to date Plan in place it makes it more difficult to plan for infrastructure because development evolves piecemeal/unplanned.
1195356	Resident	How can this link road improve flow in and around Workshop..... you are adding a minimum of 1500 cars to the area and expecting a link road from Blyth Road to Carlton Road to ease flow in Workshop !!!!!!!!!!! You are going to make Workshop even more difficult to access as well as the surrounding estates and access to A57 and A1... the road infrastructure cannot cope as it is and you are not doing any improvements to any other roads of junctions and this little link road is not going to improve that , it is going to add to the heavy congestion that currently exists and gets worse every day. Bikes and people walking will be an absolute minority as the roads are not safe for cyclists and walking from this area is not really an option to reach train station or and other services . How can this link road improve flow in and around Workshop..... you are adding a minimum of 1500 cars to the area and expecting a link road from Blyth Road to Carlton Road to ease flow in Workshop !!!!!!!!!!! You are going to make Workshop even more difficult to access as well as the surrounding estates and access to A57 and A1... the road infrastructure cannot cope as it is and you are not doing any improvements to any other roads of junctions and this little link road is not going to improve that , it is going to add to the heavy congestion that currently exists and gets worse every day. Bikes and people walking will be an absolute minority as the roads are not safe for cyclists and walking from this area is not really an option to reach train station or and other services .	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Local Plan process is the best way to ensure infrastructure is delivered. If the Council does not have an up to date Plan in place it makes it more difficult to plan for infrastructure because development evolves piecemeal/unplanned.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST 14 Housing	Distribution		
1196000	Resident	Unfortunately, I am not familiar with all of the proposed development sites, so I can only comment on the one I am familiar with. This is HS9 - Sandhills. I can see the potential advantages of using this site from a developer's point of view. There are several arguments against it from the point of view of existing local residents. Of these, I feel the most important is the impact on the local roads and the safety of road users and pedestrians. The current plan lacks detail in terms of how the development would be set up. However, a previous proposal indicated that the only point of access would be from Manvers Road which, in turn, comes off West Carr Road. The turn into Manvers Road from West Carr Road is on a bend close to the bottom of the railway bridge. The flat stretch of road going away from the bridge is congested with parked cars most of the time. In itself, this seems to be negotiated reasonably safely most of the time. However, in recent years, we have already seen an increase in housing on the old Bridon site, as well as other developments in the area, so traffic levels have already risen. Linked into this, we have an increasing number of schoolchildren making their way along this road to Retford Oaks school and the Sixth Form site. Coming out of Manvers Road on to West Carr Road, visibility isn't terrible, but we have the bridge on one side (with sometimes unseen traffic coming up the other side), and a virtually blind bend only 50-100 metres away on the other side. In principle, this is hazard enough. My concern is that, with most households having 2 cars, the proposed minimum of 75 houses in the period up to 2037 (and that could rise afterwards) means there are likely to be around 150 additional vehicles using that junction on a regular basis. (And this ignores the increased use of heavy vehicles while any building work is taking place.) If the railway line didn't border the other side of West Carr Road, it might be possible to do something to widen the road or put in other traffic safety measures. However, the presence of the railway pretty much rules any measures being taken. I do recognise that it has been noted that the proximity to the town and other facilities means road use could be minimised, but there would have to be significant incentives used to stop people using their cars to the degree they do at present.	This is a very early stage in the Local Plan process. More detail will be added as the plan progresses.
REF255	Sheffield City Region	In terms of housing, the Draft Plan seeks to deliver 478 new homes per year between 2018 and 2037 - above and beyond the Local Housing Need calculation and a reflection of the economic growth planned for Bassetlaw. This is a positive expression of the growth ambitions held by the SCR LEP who have consistently emphasised the important role that housing plays in creating the right conditions for economic growth. As such, the LEP and the MCA will continue to support an increase in housing delivery across South Yorkshire, complementing similar ambitions in Bassetlaw's Local Plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1177570	Resident	I think that this is too big and in an attractive area of countryside that should be preserved. Despite the vague references to green gaps, which seem to have no actual legal basis (the plan admits that development IS allowed in these areas), this will lead to the joining up of Worksop and Carlton, in a way that we are already seeing to the west of the town between Worksop and Shireoaks.	The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained.
1180212	Resident	I strongly object to the plans to build on the field alongside the A60 at Peaks Hill Farm. This is a beautiful piece of countryside, part of the view across woodland and farmland as you travel from Worksop towards Carlton. The field is surrounded by woodland which follows the relief of the land. The view when travelling from Carlton towards Worksop is equally stunning, with the houses at the edge of Worksop only visible as you top the brow of the hill. I would urge the planning department and relevant councillors to walk/cycle/drive along this stretch of road and contemplate the impact their plans would have on the character of the area, on the amenity value, on the present community and on future generations. This field and woodland is a crucial part of the green buffer between Carlton and Worksop. Once this is breached, development is likely to continue to encroach on this beautiful green space. The woods on either side of the A60 have muntjac and roe deer and buzzards. Building near the woods at Peaks Hill would inevitably disturb the wildlife. I question the safety of building a link road onto the A60 at Peaks Hill. There have been fatal accidents on this stretch of road. Visibility is affected due to the gradient and cars accelerate as they descend from the brow of the hill.	The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1180445	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Overall, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (BLP) has much to commend it – there are innovative ideas, such as the garden villages, green energy site and welcome references to the need for cycling and walking connectivity and green infrastructure. Serious concerns about the inclusion of a special area of countryside on the western fringe of the large proposed Peaks Hill Farm housing development site. If you travel north from Worksop towards Carlton on the A60, on the edge of the town, you pass the G4S offices on the right in woodland. This mature wood on the right covers a hill and ridge that curves round to Peaks Hill farm enclosing a sloping, triangular shaped field on the right/front, bordered by the A60 (circled blue on the map below). This field is included in the plans for residential development. As you carry on north you pass Freshfields house on the left and down the hill, extensive and beautiful views of the rural landscape open out across the horizon towards Carlton direction. This landscape, the views, the mature woods and fields to the right and front, is one of the most beautiful I know. Often, as I travel back from Worksop this view will lift my spirits. It is unique and precious landscape. Once it's built on, it will be spoilt and lost for ever. It is current and future generations that will lose the enjoyment of this landscape (or 'amenity value'- really it is priceless). I was shocked when I saw the plans to build on this field (just a few days before it went public). It is out of sight from Worksop, on land sloping down to Carlton and enclosed by woods. This would be building in pristine countryside clearly separated from the town envelope. The plan states the need for a green belt or buffer between Worksop and Carlton. I would argue that this field and its surrounding trees and ridge must be included in that green belt or buffer zone (it's visible from the Carlton direction but not from Worksop). To build on it would set a dangerous precedent and surely other fields and woods will be built over until Worksop merges with Carlton. I would urge all councillors and relevant officers to visit the site to see with their own eyes. Note on p.59 of BDC's commissioned Site Allocations: Landscape Study, below is their conclusion on the Peaks Hill Farm (site 12H in the report) site: 'A combination of topography, the landscape value of existing woodlands and the extent to which the site extends north into open countryside, suggest that only a limited development in the middle and southern sections of the site could be achieved without an overall adverse landscape impact.'https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5295/bassetlaw-draft-landscape-study-2019.pdf That means, it is the western, A60 side of the site that will be most adversely affected. I do not feel as strongly about the other parts of the proposed Peaks Hill development, as the largest part is to the East of the Peaks Hill woods, stretching over to Blyth Rd – backing on to Thievesdale, on a slope facing south to the town and joined on to Worksop. Another aspect of the development is a relief road running through the site from Blyth road and coming out on the A60 near the Peaks Hill farm (though this is not confirmed). Highway matters are clearly for the County to consider but I have serious concerns as it a dangerous stretch of fast road, on a bend and a hill, that has had several fatalities due to the poor visibility. I also believe the consultation period should be extended. I have yet to meet a member of the public who is aware of the Draft Local Plan, let alone that this piece of land is affected. Such an important plan with huge changes for Bassetlaw needs extensive publicity and consultation. In conclusion, I recognise the pressures on the council to find space for more housing to allow Worksop to grow and prosper but I believe the particular field, woods and views described above are precious to local people, to wildlife (deer and buzzards are regularly seen here) and to future generations, and therefore, the boundary of Green 'belt' or buffer zone should be redrawn to include and protect this relatively small but special piece of land near the A60 (and remove the residential designation).</p>	The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme.
1183048	Resident	I object to homes being built on the land as again we are destroying valuable habitat and it is again one step closer to merging the rural village of Carlton in Lindrick with Worksop, when the town is already struggling to maintain any decent shops as people are not shopping local, adding a further 750 homes and 750 more in the phase 2 will not regenerate the town but just add to congestion.	As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet housing needs and jobs growth. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits including a net gain in biodiversity which is a national policy requirement and retention of existing woodland. Additional homes will provide additional footfall to support the town centre.
1188066	Resident	a) The proposed area includes a considerable area of woodland. When the UK government is committed to increasing the area of woodland, I would oppose the felling of any trees in the ST15 development. b) I would oppose any new roads which connect with any existing roads in the Hemmingfield housing area which subsequently connect to Thievesdale Lane.	The majority of trees and woodland will be protected. Any lost will be required to be re-provided on site. No roads to Thievesdale.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1189740	Resident	<p>For many years I have travelled from Carlton to Worksop. As you head into Worksop the open fields at Peaks Hill give you a more positive view to the day. No sign of houses or stress just that bit of relaxation before you hit the chaos of Worksop and the queue at the Canon traffic lights and everyone rushing around. The road has had many accidents over the years including fatalities and even if you reduce the speed to 30 you cannot see over the hill to the right towards Carlton plus the bridleway comes out on the top of the hill and it is used by many walkers and horses. The relaxing view of Peaks Hill is seen for many miles including from the bridleway in front of Walkers Farm on Owday Lane. Building at Peaks Hill would have a huge impact on a large area and make the daily commute to work for many more stressful. This seems to be the only green field site to developed in the local plan. Why should it be developed? There would also be an impact on the wildlife in the area and a lot of the trees would be cut down. The woodland has been there for many years and is not somewhere you would ever expect to be developed. A number of deer have been seen in the area. Carlton in Lindrick is already joined onto Costhorpe via the developmetnt on the A60 opposite the Co- Op and I am sure in a few years Langold will also the joined up. Do you not think enough green fields have already been developed along the A60. There must be far more suitable sites than Peaks Hill Farm and a connecting road between Blyth Road and the A60 is madness.</p>	<p>As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet housing needs and jobs growth. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits including a net gain in biodiversity which is a national policy requirement and retention of existing woodland. Highways safety is a prerequisite of development so any new roads/junctions will be required to meet appropriate standards.</p>
REF019	Resident	<p>I am compelled to put forward my objections regarding the proposed Peaks Hill Farm Development in Worksop as it will directly affect our home, our enjoyment of life in the area, the surrounding homes and people and the existing wild life, some of which is protected.</p> <p>I understand that the development is for 750 new dwellings from the year 2026, with a further proposal of an additional 750 new dwelling after the year 2037.</p> <p>I do not feel that this massive development will be of benefit to our community because the area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is not in place.</p> <p>Worksop currently has multiple property developments in progress at the moment, for example; the Gatefold estate is still not fully complete and houses remain unsold. The Shireoaks area has 3 building developments in progress, Carlton in Lindrick has another and the St Anne's estate development is set to start soon. There is a mass of development in progress and this proposal will add to many difficulties of the existing communities.</p> <p>Worksop does not have the capability to safely and adequately offer full Health Care and schooling to accommodate the massive number of extra people coming into the area.</p> <p>This proposal will also destroy habitat for the local wildlife living around us, such as foxes and hedgehogs (statistics show that they could be extinct in 10 years if their habitat is not protected), multiple species for bats (many of which are protected) would be driven out and deer would be prevented from using the wood as they do at present.</p> <p>Could you please respond with your comments and detailed confirmation how you intend to address all of the above points and fears, which I have raised, for the benefit and protection of all existing dwellers in the area and the existing natural habitat.</p>	<p>As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF023	Water Management Consortium	'This site is outside of the Board's district'.	Comments noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF025	Resident	<p>As residents of Westerdale we have strong concerns about the draft plan for Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>Firstly residents have been given very little information about this plan which will have a major negative impact. We were notified for the first time that this plan existed only a week ago via tiny pieces of paper attached to lamp posts. The consultation meeting at Thievesdale Community Centre has been arranged at a time when most residents will be at work hence we are unable to raise concerns and ask for information and the deadline for concerns is very short, February 26. Secondly there are already several major new housing estates under construction around Worksop, is there any concrete evidence that there is a market for these houses? The housing websites such as Rightmove, are flooded with new houses that no-one seems to want, many have been up for sale for several months even after reducing their price.</p> <p>Are there any plans to increase the size or number of schools, doctors' surgeries and hospital services in the area in line with these increased number of houses? Residents currently struggle to book doctors' appointments and the wait for hospital appointments is already a huge problem as the current facilities are struggling to cope with current demands.</p> <p>The plan includes shops at a time when there is clear evidence that there is no support for small shops. Shops in the town centre are closing as they cannot compete with the increasing number of supermarkets in Worksop and online shopping. Shops next to the Celtic Fields development have struggled to be economically viable with many shops closing after a short time, even Tesco Express failed.</p> <p>The plan also fails to consider the important national and global issue of climate change. The destruction of the natural environment coupled with the building work and the eventual existence of another huge housing estate will no doubt add to the problem of global warming. Doesn't the council have any social conscience and awareness of its responsibility towards this issue and our children's futures?</p> <p>Finally the ongoing building work will seriously effect the value of residents' houses. As we are about to have our tranquillity ruined by the building work lasting for years we cannot move elsewhere as no-one would be willing to buy our properties. Surely there are grounds to reconsider this proposal? Or at the very least wait until there is concrete proof that there is a market for the current homes already under construction. We look forward to a response to our concerns.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
REF027	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The main points raised with me are, urban sprawl towards Carlton and the building on green fields and the secondary school places with the traffic/ accidents coming in fourth place.</p>	<p>The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. A financial contribution will be secured to provide for secondary education and traffic management and road safety will be addressed through the Transport Assessment for the scheme. The Council has allocated sites on brownfield land but there isn't enough suitable and available sites to meet needs. So greenfield land is required.</p>
REF028	Resident	<p>We have received the leaflet informing of the proposed build on Peaks Hill Farm and we would like to strongly object to this application based on the points below: There has been recent building activity on the farmland off the bottom of thievesdale lane and we have already witnessed wildlife displacement due to this. Before this build foxes very rarely entered the populated area around Airedale, however we are having regular visits where they are in search of food which is causing distress to our dog and small animals housed in our garden shed. Reducing the natural habit of wildlife by building on the proposed land is only going to aggravate the matter further and force wildlife into populated areas. What gives us the right to take away more land that is occupied by our fragile wildlife? Worksop is full of new build sites at the minute, Gateford and Thievesdale just to name a couple, so where is the justification of a further development on a green field site rather than brown field?</p> <p>Developments of this size will increase traffic congestion in the area and make it unsafe for the local children and elderly. You also have to consider the increase of children to our local schools, that are already at capacity. Finally, you will be removing old and established oak trees, which are just off of Carlton road, again where is the justification for this?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF033	Resident	<p>I object in the strongest possible terms to the development from Peaks Hill Farm to Blyth Road, I think it has been dealt with very underhanded, 1 notice on 1 streetlight at the bottom of Colsterdale the day before the meeting in town & the time of the meeting on thievesdale lane, absolutely disgusting, people still at work & fetching their children from school, furthermore the people from the council were very incompetent, no idea what they were doing, would not answer any questions properly, senior people should have been there to answer questions put to them, but I guess its a case of it bring N. I. M. B. Y, well it's in mine, my late husband & I worked hard to buy our own property & all you have done is devalue it, who wants to look out on industrial units & a main road??, also I want to know about the wildlife, whats going to happen to them, we have deers, pheasants, rabbits & numerous wild birds to view at present, don't they count for anything, obviously not in your eyes, with 750 houses you are talking roughly 1500 cars, the pollution will be awful, no mention of schools, doctors, its impossible to get a doctors appointment now & Bassetlaw Hospital isn't big enough to deal with the demand that would be put on it, I truly hope this planning doesn't get passed, build on the brown field sites, countryside is precious.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF036	Resident	<p>I was shocked to see the size and scale of this plan, it will essentially join Gateford with Thievesdale and Carlton in Lindrick, this will change Worksop beyond recognition. I was speaking with someone who moved from Sheffield to Gateford for a more rural lifestyle and they too were appalled at the plans. ANOTHER main road is a huge concern and this will link both Carlton Road and Blyth Road together - both very busy roads with 50 and 60 mph speed limits, increase in the traffic to these areas is an incredibly troubling thought, likely to lead to even more accidents. More roads and housing / shops means more traffic which means an increase to both noise and light pollution. What greatly concerns me is yet more loss of wildlife and their habitat, the world is currently in a climate emergency and the government / councils still destroy the few precious green spaces / fields/ trees/ hedgerows that are left to build even more new housing. After the worst flooding Worksop has ever seen, how does ripping up fields and trees and hedgerows (the very things that are needed to counteract and mop up the flood water) and concrete over it all make any sense?! No matter what "green plan " you have in place it will NEVER make up for the loss of all of this established habitat. Period. Our UK wildlife is in dire straights and species are struggling to survive due to council plans just like this up and down the country, please do not push ever more closer to making these species extinct. The "State of Nature Report" statistics for the flora and fauna facing extinction - one quarter of mammals - one in five plants- 15% of fungi and lichens- 40% of vertebrates- 12 % of invertebrates There has been a 60% decline in priority species since 1970. This is unforgivable. PLEASE do not add to these sobering statistics, do not let greed have the upper hand. I prefer MY tax money being put towards regenerating run down buildings and areas, not leaving them to rot and just building a load of new builds. Any more shops away from the town centre will only kill it off completely. These plans at best show no consideration to local residents and at worst utter contempt.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF037	Resident	<p>Should the suggested access road be adopted, then major alterations would have to be made both on Blyth Road and Carlton Road since both of these roads are major roads out of and into Worksop, carrying large volumes of traffic without additional traffic. Speed restrictions do not work, traffic lights or roundabouts would need to be constructed. Blyth Road already has commercial units, within close proximity to the proposed road, you have a transport unit where heavy goods vehicles enter and leave the storage area, then within a short distance a livery unit and stables for horses, there again slow moving vehicles entering and leaving the site. Should this suggested access road be adopted then all internal roads will have to be returned to the main access road, since roads on the Hemmingfield and Ambleside roads are not suitable for heavy vehicles in particular service and emergency vehicles, since the width of the roads and bends cause problems for already existing residents. Regarding the existing properties on Hemmingfield Rise, all the properties overlooking this site are bungalows, therefore the building of high storey houses would not be in the best of interests to residents, further along this boundary the houses are built very close to the boundary and again would invade residents' privacy. Should this site be given planning permission then I fail to see any benefit to Bassetlaw since you are only providing housing for residents mainly working in nearby cities, who can purchase properties at a lower rate than in cities, no benefit could be enjoyed by Worksop and its facilities. Regarding a medical service, we have only two General Practices in Worksop, both of which are already under extreme pressure, building a new practice would only be a building, where does one expect to find the doctors and staff, I appreciate this is not a problem being felt only in Bassetlaw but nationwide, the same applies to our hospital where departments are being closed due to lack of funding and staff. I ask that consideration be given to my comments along with all the others which you may receive, it is my opinion that greater benefit could be gained for all Bassetlaw if attention was given to the town centre.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF039	Resident	<p>I find it hard to believe that you are using valuable Farm land to build housing when we import more food than we can produce. Does Worksop really need 1500 houses it's not like we need attract workers to fill jobs that have long since gone along with what once was a nice little town. If we are not going to use the land to produce food then why not put solar panels there and produce green energy which will benefit everyone and help to carbon emissions. So planners and councilors is a fist full of dollars or a giant leap for mankind to help save our planet.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF040	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plan re the above policy at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>1. There are considerable types of wildlife in the woodland area - buzzards, owls, bats, foxes and hedgehogs, which we all know are becoming extinct. Removing any part of the woodland would affect their longevity. 2. The field behind the houses on Westerdale drops about 5 feet which could cause issues with drainage and future flooding. Any houses built on the field would be lower than the current houses which would cause issues with privacy. 3. Infrastructure on surrounding roads - the two road junctions (off old Thievesdale onto Blyth Road and out onto main Thievesdale Road) are already busy with traffic throughput from cars, lorries and buses and will not be able to support more traffic to the point where it will become dangerous for the drivers and considerably affect commute time. 4. Broadband issues - broadband is sporadic in this area - increased population in this area can only decrease the speed per household unless there are plans to spend government funds on this - ref the government policy on Building Digital UK. 5. Worksop town centre had declined rapidly over the past 15 years - shops closed due to rent increases, and increased drug use and crime. The proposed new houses will only bring people into Bassetlaw who want to buy affordable homes and continue to commute to their workplace which will not help Bassetlaw's economy. The factories and employment mentioned in your plan don't offer the wages and hours to support people buying these houses - whatever 'affordable' means to the individual! Typically, Wilkinsons and B&Q offer zero hours contract at either living/or minimum wage which is not attractive to people with degree education or above, which seems to be the type of people you're trying to bring into the Bassetlaw area. 6. On visiting the hospital for an emergency through A&E, we were informed that the hospital had been reduced from 140 + beds to 90 beds hospital - staff were working round the clock as there was such a shortage, machines were having to be plugged in rather than have batteries due to costs/budget restrictions. The children's ward is closed at night and discussions re closing the A&E department and moving it to Doncaster are on-going. The hospital cannot support the current population in Bassetlaw let alone support additional homes. 7. The doctors and dentist are at capacity in the town. You have to wait 2-3 weeks currently for a doctors appointment, and longer for a dental appointment. Doctors are encouraging social prescribing and referral through pharmacies and their own reception team. Elderly people are not able to get the support they need through the social system for home visits and support. The situation is at breaking point - why would you stretch this further to the point that existing people within the town will leave and move to other areas where provision to look after their family is much better and safer! 8. Schooling - The primary schools in Worksop are full with some having to teach in porter cabins. The secondary schools don't have enough places to support all the children currently coming through the school system, let alone with increased population - with many having to travel outside of Worksop to get school places. 9. The process of notification about the Bassetlaw Plan falls out of your policy with only 2 flyers on lampposts on Westerdale and one tweet on twitter. According to your policy each home affected such have been notified by letter to give them the opportunity to attend the consultation sessions - this hasn't happened. We were informed at the consultation meeting that notice of these meetings was on Social media. This is not inclusive to all residents and doesn't meet the government policy for assisted digital. 10. The 'consultation' meeting at Thievesdale was unhelpful with staff not having the answers to the many questions raised by the residents in this area. This consultation event would have been much better if Bassetlaw staff would have chaired the meeting with seating for people to be given the opportunity to ask questions and everyone to hear the answers. Similarly, it would have been helpful if all staff were fully informed about the plans and dates, as a number of us were told different dates by different staff members! It was chaos and I don't think anyone who attended came away with any answers. It clearly wasn't a consultation meeting - as no one was consulted on the day! Also, why have a meeting when people are working and can't attend!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF041	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plan re the above policy at Peaks Hill Farm. 1. There are considerable types of wildlife in the woodland area - buzzards, owls, bats, foxes and hedgehogs, which we all know are becoming extinct. Removing any part of the woodland would affect their longevity. 2. The field behind the houses on Westerdale drops about 5 feet which could cause issues with drainage and future flooding. Any houses built on the field would be lower than the current houses which would cause issues with privacy. 3. Infrastructure on surrounding roads - the two road junctions (off old Thievesdale onto Blyth Road and out onto main Thievesdale Road) are already busy with traffic throughput from cars, lorries and buses and will not be able to support more traffic to the point where it will become dangerous for the drivers and considerably affect commute time. 4. Broadband issues - broadband is sporadic in this area - increased population in this area can only decrease the speed per household unless there are plans to spend government funds on this - ref the government policy on Building Digital UK. 5. Worksop town centre had declined rapidly over the past 15 years - shops closed due to rent increases, and increased drug use and crime. The proposed new houses will only bring people into Bassetlaw who want to buy affordable homes and continue to commute to their workplace which will not help Bassetlaw's economy. The factories and employment mentioned in your plan don't offer the wages and hours to support people buying these houses - whatever 'affordable' means to the individual! Typically, Wilkinsons and B&Q offer zero hours contract at either living/or minimum wage which is not attractive to people with degree education or above, which seems to be the type of people you're trying to bring into the Bassetlaw area. 6. On visiting the hospital for an emergency through A&E, we were informed that the hospital had been reduced from 140 + beds to 90 beds hospital - staff were working round the clock as there was such a shortage, machines were having to be plugged in rather than have batteries due to costs/budget restrictions. The children's ward is closed at night and discussions re closing the A&E department and moving it to Doncaster are on-going. The hospital cannot support the current population in Bassetlaw let alone support additional homes. 7. The doctors and dentist are at capacity in the town. You have to wait 2-3 weeks currently for a doctors appointment, and longer for a dental appointment. Doctors are encouraging social prescribing and referral through pharmacies and their own reception team. Elderly people are not able to get the support they need through the social system for home visits and support. The situation is at breaking point - why would you stretch this further to the point that existing people within the town will leave and move to other areas where provision to look after their family is much better and safer! 8. Schooling - The primary schools in Worksop are full with some having to teach in porter cabins. The secondary schools don't have enough places to support all the children currently coming through the school system, let alone with increased population - with many having to travel outside of Worksop to get school places. 9. The process of notification about the Bassetlaw Plan falls out of your policy with only 2 flyers on lampposts on Westerdale and one tweet on twitter. According to your policy each home affected such have been notified by letter to give them the opportunity to attend the consultation sessions - this hasn't happened. We were informed at the consultation meeting that notice of these meetings was on Social media. This is not inclusive to all residents and doesn't meet the government policy for assisted digital. 10. The 'consultation' meeting at Thievesdale was unhelpful with staff not having the answers to the many questions raised by the residents in this area. This consultation event would have been much better if Bassetlaw staff would have chaired the meeting with seating for people to be given the opportunity to ask questions and everyone to hear the answers. Similarly, it would have been helpful if all staff were fully informed about the plans and dates, as a number of us were told different dates by different staff members! It was chaos and I don't think anyone who attended came away with any answers. It clearly wasn't a consultation meeting - as no one was consulted on the day! Also, why have a meeting when people are working and can't attend!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF044	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plan re the above policy at Peaks Hill Farm. 1. I have seen many types of wildlife in the woodland area - buzzards, owls, bats, foxes and hedgehogs. By building close to the woodland area, it would disturb the wildlife's habitat. Consequently, decreasing numbers of our British wildlife.2. The field behind the houses on Westerdale drops about 5 feet. This could cause issues with drainage and future flooding. Rainfall in Nottinghamshire in Autumn 2019 was the wettest since record began, with nearly twice as much rainfall than average. 3. Houses built on the field would be lower than the current houses which would cause issues with privacy.4. The two road junctions (off old Thievesdale onto Blyth Road and out onto main Thievesdale Road) are very busy with traffic throughout from cars, lorries and buses and will not be able to support more traffic to the point where it will become dangerous for the drivers and considerably affect commute time. 5. Broadband issues - broadband is very sporadic. I work as a teacher, and have had to use my parent's internet in order to work from home. An increase in population can only decrease the speed per household.6. Worksop town centre is poor. Shops have closed due to rent increases, and increased drug use and crime. The factories and employment mentioned in your plan do not offer the wages and hours to support people buying these houses. Wilkinsons and B&Q offer zero hours contract at either living/or minimum wage which is not attractive to people with a degree education.7. The hospital has been reduced from 140 + beds to 90 beds. The children's ward is closed at night and discussions of closing the A&E department and moving it to Doncaster are on-going. This is a huge cause of concern when thinking of starting a family. It has encouraged me to think about moving out of Worksop. 8. There is a wait of 3 weeks currently for a doctors appointment and longer for a dental appointment.9. Elderly people are not able to get the support they need through the social system for home visits and support. This is encouraging people to move their loved ones out of the area.10. I have heard about children being taught in porter cabins. Once again, this discourages me to want to start a family in Worksop. 11. The process of notification about the Bassetlaw Plan falls out of your policy with only 2 flyers on lamposts on Westerdale and one tweet on twitter. I heard that at the consultation meeting, notice of these meetings was on Social media. This is not inclusive to all residents and doesn't meet the government policy for assisted digital.12. I was unable to attend the 'consultation' meeting at Thievesdale. Due to the timing, I was at work. I heard how unhelpful it was. Staff did not have the answers to many questions – it sounded pointless. Numerous people have been given different start dates from the staff!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF052	Resident	<p>I object to plans to build the Peaks Hill Farm development and the plans that include the Thievesdale Lane changes I believe this is not needed we have many empty properties in Worksop the land should be left as it is and let wildlife live on it will cause too much interference with peoples homes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF053	Resident	<p>Please don't build on Peaks Hill Farm land, there is a lovely wood where buzzards nest and we need some green land. It would be better to build on Gateford site towards Carlton where they are already building hundreds of houses. They will need a lot more things in place. Busses, doc's schools they have been cut my bus it is a job to get a doc's app as well.</p>	<p>The development will make sure that necessary infrastructure is in place and that wildlife is protected through an ecological assessment for the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF055	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Specifically I object to the inclusion of a triangular field to the east of the A60, between G4S and Peaks Hill Farm. The view, the aspect of this field, surrounded by mature trees on a woodland ridge is really beautiful. It is also separated from Worksop, and from the rest of development by this woodland ridge. To build in this field would be urban intrusion into pristine countryside. It will set a precedent – moving Worksop down the hill towards Worksop. (rest of the development, east of the ridge is on the Worksop side of the ridge and adjoining thievesdale and therefore less damaging. The quality of life (and wildlife) will be damaged for everyone who walks, cycles or drives along this route – losing such a wonderful vista/aspect. Damage to woods and its wildlife – deer, buzzards etc... will be considerable. In conclusion, any buffer zone between Carlton and Worksop should follow the topography – follow the wooded ridge line from G4S to Peaks Hill Farm and the field in question should be removed from the residential designation. I am also concerned at the safety implications of a link road joining the A60 near Peaks Hill. It is a fast, busy road and there have been several fatal accidents on the hill/bend at Peaks Hill – visibility is very poor.	The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. The woodland will be mostly protected and wildlife protected through an Ecological Impact Assessment for the site. The green gap between Carlton and Worksop starts at the site boundary to maintain separation between the two settlements. Road safety is vital and will be factored in to the transport assessment for the site.
1191664	Resident	In my opinion there is a conservation issue with all the houses now being built in and near Worksop. I do not support this as I live in a small estate near Peaks Hill Farm and I am worried about the council giving access from this small estate to the new development. As I live on a small estate near the Peaks Hill Farm development, I am worried about the council constructing a through road to the new development from our estate. The roads on this estate are not good as it is and are not wide enough I do have photos of the state of the roads, if required there is a small T junction at the top of Ambleside Grange and it would be impossible for the residents to back out of there drives if there was through traffic, This would cause problems and may result in accidents There is also the issue of conservation and the wildlife in the area, we have Owls, Pheasants, Foxes, Bats and Deer these all come down into our gardens from the Peaks Hill Farm Proposed development	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
1192641	Resident	Peaks hill farm. I have lived on westerdale for the past 18 years and on ribblesdale before that. I used to walk my dogs on westerdale before it was built, it was wasteland but had a lot of wildlife which has now gone. The area which you are planning on building has the same wildlife. From deers to owls, buzzards and every other bird we have in our area. This morning on a visit to clumber, it was so nice to hear all the birds and spot buzzards and deer. And I thought when you start to build all this will be gone. And for what? People making more money. People meaning council. There is houses being built in our area at the moment. Too many, 3 sites in shireoaks, Carlton Rhodesia Gateford and soon in langold. Where are all the people coming from to purchase these and where is all the money coming from for people to buy them. There was planning to build on Kilton golf course for years. Has this been put to one side now and passed onto westerdale. We have 4 golf courses in Worksop and Kilton is the one least used. It is council owned already so it wouldn't cost to buy the land and wildlife wouldn't be an issue. There is also a field on Blyth road which stands empty nearly all year round. The odd football match and Bassetlaw show is all what takes part on this ground. There has been bad flooding in Worksop recently. Wouldn't it be a good idea to spend more money on flood defences and better drainage. Think of how much water will be added to our drains from surface water drainage when more concrete replaces fields. I hope someone reads this and puts it on the no pile and hopefully you will decide not to go ahead with this build and move your plans to else where. Do the finance people ever look at the budget on these plans.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF081	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	My opinion as a member for the Carlton ward is that the piece of land aside the A60 should not be built on and the existing tree lines be retained. I feel that this would maintain the current green buffer along the A60 and shield the rest of the development from view. I also feel that the proposed road should be as close as possible to the the G4s site, again to maintain a boundary. Finally the planting of new trees I feel should be primarily along the northern side to again give a fixed boundary when viewed from the hundred acres lane area. If these points are adopted I will support the plan.	The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement.
REF083	Resident	<p>I am against the building of anything on this rural landscape. I live on an estate adjacent to the eastern side of this proposed development, which has a high density of woodland before it meets Carlton Road. We see various wildlife around the estate, which comes from these wooded areas. We get squirrels and hedgehogs frequently, and are often lucky enough to see an owl and other birds of prey just sitting on the garden fences. By building across the open areas surrounding the trees these animals will no longer have places to feed and will be forced out, or perish. The proposed land is at a higher level to where we are and I have a concern about flooding. Currently, the open fields and woodland can soak up the water and it causes us no problems. Once the ground is covered with houses and roads, will the water take its natural route downhill and find its way onto our estate roads, potentially causing a flood risk. The boundary of this development has many places where access could be put through to link up with current development. My particular concern is Winster Grove, which has nothing more than a wooden fence separating the road end from the development land. I am aware that the original builders in 1996, retained ownership of this thin strip of land and clearly had the intentions of one day continuing the road through. Winster Grove is a cul de sac of predominantly OAP bungalows who currently do not have passing traffic. If this were to be opened up as an estate road then it would become the most direct route for anyone leaving the new development intending to head towards Worksop Town centre. Even if it were opened up as a pedestrian access, it would be abused by motorcycles taking a shortcut. Our estate has a virtually 0% crime rate currently, and many people do not even know it's here, but opening it up to pedestrian and cycle/motorcycle access is almost certainly going to cause an increase in crime rates. The increase in traffic along Carlton Road concerns me. Currently, when trying to get out of Ambleside Grange onto Carlton Road in the morning, traffic from The Cannon traffic lights is backed up past Ambleside Grange and sometimes out of sight around the corner past Ashes Park Avenue. By adding 750 houses (initially) you potentially add 1000+ cars since most homes have two or more cars. These cars can only use two ways into Worksop and I would suspect those on the western side of the development will use Blyth Road, whilst those on the Eastern side use Carlton Road. Realistically, you could add 250 more cars to this traffic queue in the morning. When I came to Worksop in 1987 there were two doctors' surgeries for the whole town. Today, there are still two doctors' surgeries in the town, but the housing stock has increased by many thousands. When Gateford was developed and thousands of houses were (and still are) built we were promised new amenities. Gateford Park school was built and was oversubscribed before it opened its doors. The Secondary schools are full. Here we have again promises of new amenities and a new school, but not before 2037. The town is full of supermarkets and more are coming, so buying a pint of milk will never be a problem, but getting to see a doctor or dentist in person and in reasonable time, is now impossible. These are a dense line of mature trees that run parallel with Carlton Road and would prevent any road access through from that side. The plans obviously include removing some, or all of these trees in order to make an access road, yet trees of a similar age and size that stand within homeowner's gardens are protected. Several local residents have applied for permission to reduce or remove their trees and have been refused. Why are these trees any different?</p> <p>I suspect that, regardless of what anyone says, this development will get pushed through and these houses will be built and we will have to live with the subsequent consequences. I have been told that a large number of trees are to be planted around the site and would like to see some kind of green buffer between the current developments and the new one, and the linking of the two, by footpaths and roads, kept to a minimum.</p>	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF101	Resident	<p>I would like to begin this letter by giving you a small profile of me. I have lived at this address for 37 years and was born in Worksop. I am now retired but worked as a teacher for forty years, for the most part as a class teacher but also as a senior manager. To me Worksop is a pretty, historical market town, the centre of the town has suffered and become tired and drab. With that in mind, I am interested in, and in favour of any development which will benefit the local community and economy. Thank you for organising the meeting at Thievesdale CC on 4th Feb. Regrettably I came home embarrassed and appalled by the behaviour of some of the people from the local area. Some were rude, boorish and offensive. My apologies on their behalf. My thanks go particularly to the young planner stood by the plan. Understandably she, I think, was rather upset by the lack of respect she was shown and the rudeness of some of the public. I am not critical of Bassetlaw Council with what I write next, but I thought the meeting would have been easier to control and manage if it had been more formal. Perhaps a senior officer giving a presentation and then opening the floor and asking the audience to raise hands if they had any questions would have been more successful for the council and public. As it was, very few people got to ask questions or hear the answers of others. Finally, thank you for taking the time to read the enclosed. Comments re Peaks Hill: Positives: • Boost for Worksop town's economy • Housing offering a range of prices • Extra medical facilities • My perception of the dispersion road is that the junctions where it joins Blyth Road/Carlton Road will slow down the traffic on those roads. The effect of the 30MPH limit on Blyth Road has been positive but still a lot of drivers exceed that limit. • Provision of employment • Possible increased footfall into the town centre Negatives: • There are deer in the woods • If an access road were to be joined to Westerdale, concerns about volume and speed of traffic • Medical facilities i.e. more pressure on Bassetlaw Hospital • Doctor's Surgery, positive if this happens but it was promised for the Ashes Park Road development 38 years ago when I saw the plans but it didn't happen, so potentially a negative as the existing doctors' surgeries are struggling with demand • Loss of farm land • Loss of views for the householders who bought their properties adjacent to fields • Increased pollution in the area</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF109	Resident	<p>As a resident of Wharfedale I oppose the scale of this plan. The Development site is too large and will have a great impact on residents. I have lived in this house for 29 years I don't want to lose my privacy and be over looked. Also the traffic and noise pollution this massive build will bring will be immense. What about our quality of life to green spaces and clean air?. The effect it will have on our local wildlife and green environment will be such a loss. The amount of Dwellings planned is far too many.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1194059	Resident	<p>We totally oppose the proposed development of land for housing on the Thievesdale site. The vast increase in volume of traffic, the risk of increased pollution, the loss of natural habitats for wildlife, the immense increase on demand for local services, the vague promises of increased employment opportunities - none of these issues appear to have been addressed. In 2018 there were just under 700 empty homes in the Worksop area, there are new homes on the Gateford estate that have never been occupied, possibly others on the various developments taking place in the area. None of these plans are justified, it is just a scheme to bolster the construction industry and stimulate the financial sector by way of increased mortgage borrowing - local government and central government are reverting to the tried and failed policy of building our way out of a recession/sluggish economy. It hasn't worked in the past and it won't work in the future. Our countryside deserves better treatment and care than the plans BDC are putting forward.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF110	Resident	<p>With regards to the above proposal I wish to make my comments known to all concerned.</p> <p>I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm policy , within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. This development is too large a project and will be of great inconvenience to local residents. Because of the amount of dwellings proposed, this would cause great disruption and pollution to residents for at least 15 years, many of these residents are now or will be elderly, resulting in the rest of their lives being spent on a noisy building site.</p> <p>Current climate change has resulted in heavier rainfall. In the past year Thievesdale has had regular flooding due to drains being unable to cope with heavier downfalls of rain. This has resulted in burst drains under Thievesdale Road (where the road has actually fractured and had to be repaired). At the moment rainfall soaks in to the fields. With extra dwellings in the area, this would put more rainfall into the system which eventually ends up in rivers producing more flooding in Worksop.</p> <p>The fields currently support a vast amount of wildlife. They are a regular valuable hunting ground for Buzzards and falcons as well as in the nearby trees, important nesting locality for owls, Buzzards and Woodpeckers whose young feed at feeding stations in residents gardens.</p> <p>My own Bungalow which overlooks the fields is built on a higher elevation than the fields, I accept that I have no rights to a view, but even if construction does go ahead and a six foot fence is erected, I will spend the next 15 years with absolutely no privacy from construction work in my kitchen, bedroom or garden.</p> <p>Building the type of houses in the price range that developers will be proposing will not have any effect on housing shortages, Worksop is full of new homes which cannot be sold already.it will just result in more commuters moving into area and clogging up unsustainable roads, GP surgeries, Hospitals and Dentists.</p> <p>Thank you for listening my comments I hope they go towards you re-considering this proposal.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1194203	Resident	<p>I would not wish to see construction on the peaks farm proposal to build on the a 60 highway out side calton in lindrick towards worksop.this should be left as farm land.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
			considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement.
REF121	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change8. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook18. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF128	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change8. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook18. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1194849	Resident	<p>For me, the beautiful uplifting view from the A60 Carlton Road (hedgerow in front of field with undulating mature wood land to the rear) should be protected. It is a huge community asset (visually, environmentally, ecologically), particularly so in a largely post-industrial landscape where much natural beauty has been lost. I feel that all the woodland on the proposed site should be protected and the public given access via new footpaths. I don't believe that we should be driving a new road from the A60 through these woods. If there have to be two access points to the new development then let both be from the B6045 Blyth Road. If any trees are lost they should be replaced by at least twice as many - provision should be made to regularly water and protect new trees for at least a year after planting to ensure that they establish.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However a through road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1194878	Resident	<p>I am against Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15. I am against the use of prime farmland and green spaces to build the project. The development site is too big and will have a huge impact on the local residents of Worksop. The demand for such housing is low, just look at the Gateford estate which is still not complete 22 years on. It will lower existing house prices and make it more difficult to sell our existing properties. An initial 750 properties + 174 being built by Rippon homes, will create approximately 2750 new residents (based at an occupancy of 3 per dwelling) and approximately 1850 extra vehicles on our roads, (Based on 2 cars per property). This will subject the area to extra noise, pollution and disruption for years to come. Our roads will not cope with the extra traffic. Our schools have no spaces to take the extra 750 children. Our doctors surgeries and our hospital are at breaking point and will not find places for 2700 extra residents. The building of the 750 properties (174 Rippon homes) will be built BEFORE any supporting infrastructure such as Doctors, Schools, Hospital improvements and dentists. Yet you want to add approximately 2750 extra residents to the area. There is already great pressure on these services and great amount of inconvenience and dissatisfaction for Worksop's residents. Police, Ambulance and Fire services will also need to cover a greater occupancy. Commuting is going to become a bigger problem as many house buyers will have come in from Sheffield, Doncaster and Nottingham. Their travel to work will impact A1 A57 A60 and M1 routes and our poor and unreliable train services.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1194878	Resident	<p>How will our local roads improve ? The Plan says, Its putting a new distributor road linking Blyth Road and Carlton Road. This will NOT ease congestion on our local roads. The Plan will be Adding an extra 1850 vehicles in Phase 1 (based on 2 cars per property) The cannon cross roads is a nightmare at times. As is Kilton Road. Sandy Lane and many other well known bottlenecks. The distributor road will NOT improve these problematic roads, it will simply soak up some of the extra 1850 vehicles. Adding hundreds of extra vehicles to problem roads every day. This is not a solution its a 'tick-box'. The amount of housing development proposed exceeds our Local need for a population of just 40,000. Gateford estate has already reached saturation, with planned building areas left unwanted. Planning permissions have already been agreed by the council in numerous other areas of Worksop. Why are we looking at proposing a further 750 (+750) extra properties with NO extra supporting infrastructure for the area. ? Why are we using our Farm Land to buildupon?.This is a loss of prime local crop growing land. This invaluable "Climate Friendly" green space is necessary for wildlife birds insects and importantly the town and its people of Worksop. In a time of Climate change we should look at recycling used land and preserving green and farm land. If the farmer wants to sell, it should be for Green energy purposes rather than unnecessary buildings. Once lost this land and its wildlife will be lost forever. Known for its established trees, Goss hawks, buzzards, sparrow hawks, a heron, owls, bats, hedgehogs, rabbits and hares. Gone forever. Adding new tree siblings which may not establish, may die or residents may remove, will not encourage the wildlife or greenery back . Its gone forever. The way the council has conducted itself regarding this matter so far has been poor. Failure to alert home owners especially elderly about the proposals within the Plan, have been poor. Notifications and ability to object has been poor. Trust in the council within this process has been low.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1194921	Resident	<p>I am against the Peaks Hill Farm Building Project. I object to it because</p> <p>1) It is terrible for our Climate. Why build on beautiful green farm land when there are so many other sites available.</p> <p>2) It is awful for the wildlife. My bungalow is next to the fields and woodlands and the wildlife, birds, hawks, squirrels and butterflies, they are beautiful. Why are you taking away my pleasures. This is exactly why I bought my bungalow.</p> <p>3) The disruption and inconvenience will run through the rest of my life, with no benefits to me. I will have to suffer Noise and pollution and lose my privacy to be overlooked by strangers.</p> <p>4) It will impact me personally with Health services. Already difficult to get Doctors and Hospital Appointments. I understand there are no plans to build more Doctors surgeries for the extra population, until 750 houses are built. That's not acceptable in my opinion.</p> <p>5) We don't need more housing in Worksop. We need to improve a lot of town centre housing for people at entry level. Knock down and replace some old buildings and rebuild.</p> <p>6) The increase in traffic will affect me. Ability to get a taxi. 750 new houses means a lot of extra vehicles. More road chaos and queues.</p> <p>7) Building is happening all over Worksop. We do not need anymore . Stop It !! We don't need 750 extra houses. We need farm land and green areas. Build on brown land and leave these fields alone. It is bad for me personally and its bad for Worksop. No one in Worksop will benefit. This will bring people in from Sheffield and overload our resources and services.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF134	Resident	<p>Having visited the consultation presentation re the Bassetlaw plan I was shocked and disappointed to see you had included a huge swathe of Carlton in Lindrick land into this plan. Less than two years ago Carlton approved their building plan with a referendum and we were assured the result would protect the parish boundaries from further major development for the next fifteen years. This was stated clearly in the village plan and we were told the District Council would support us in this!! Simply by calling it North Worksop doesn't change the fact it is the parish of Carlton look where the sign for Worksop is on the A60 if you haven't got a map ! The open aspect down the A60 should be protected as a rural view.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However a through road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement. Although sitting in Carlton parish the site is adjacent to Worksop and relates better to its urban form. Its is also reasonable to expect residents to use the facilities of Worksop rather than Carlton.</p>
REF135	Resident	<p>I visited the consultation presentation regarding the Bassetlaw plan and was surprised and disappointed to see you had included a huge swathe of land belonging to Carlton in Lindrick parish in it. Less than two years ago Carlton in Lindrick approved a building plan with a referendum and we were assured the result would protect the parish boundaries from any further major development for the next fifteen years. We were also told that the District Council would support us in this. I object to the fact that the piece of land is identified as North Worksop in the draft plan. In reality I can see if it was identified correctly I could support a much smaller development area behind Westerdale and Hemmingfield Rise that connected to the new development that is taking place in the corner of Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road. The open farmland below Peaks Hill Farm and the woodland behind, along the A60, I think should be protected. Once these rural aspects have gone they cannot be replaced and have gone forever. If this open farmland beside the A60 is built on the credibility of the Parish Council and the District Council will be called into question by all those people who voted in the referendum to support the Carlton in Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However a through road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. A robust woodland belt along the northern boundary will be a requirement. Although sitting in Carlton parish the site is adjacent to Worksop and relates better to its urban form. Its is also reasonable to expect residents to use the facilities of Worksop rather than Carlton.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF138	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 8. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 18. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF143	Resident	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plan re the above policy at Peaks Hill Farm. 1. I have seen many types of wildlife in the woodland area - buzzards, owls, bats, foxes and hedgehogs. By building close to the woodland area, it would disturb the wildlife's habitat. Consequently, decreasing numbers of our British wildlife.2. The field behind the houses on Westerdale drops about 5 feet. This could cause issues with drainage and future flooding. Rainfall in Nottinghamshire in Autumn 2019 was the wettest since record began, with nearly twice as much rainfall than average. 3. Houses built on the field would be lower than the current houses which would cause issues with privacy.4. The two road junctions (off old Thievesdale onto Blyth Road and out onto main Thievesdale Road) are very busy with traffic throughout from cars, lorries and buses and will not be able to support more traffic to the point where it will become dangerous for the drivers and considerably affect commute time. 5. Broadband issues - broadband is very sporadic. I work as a teacher, and have had to use my parent's internet in order to work from home. An increase in population can only decrease the speed per household.6. Worksop town centre is poor. Shops have closed due to rent increases, and increased drug use and crime. The factories and employment mentioned in your plan do not offer the wages and hours to support people buying these houses. Wilkinsons and B&Q offer zero hours contract at either living/or minimum wage which is not attractive to people with a degree education.7. The hospital has been reduced from 140 + beds to 90 beds. The children's ward is closed at night and discussions of closing the A&E department and moving it to Doncaster are on-going. This is a huge cause of concern when thinking of starting a family. It has encouraged me to think about moving out of Worksop. 8. There is a wait of 3 weeks currently for a doctors appointment and longer for a dental appointment.9. Elderly people are not able to get the support they need through the social system for home visits and support. This is encouraging people to move their loved ones out of the area.10. I have heard about children being taught in porter cabins. Once again, this discourages me to want to start a family in Worksop. 11. The process of notification about the Bassetlaw Plan falls out of your policy with only 2 flyers on lampposts on Westerdale and one tweet on twitter. I heard that at the consultation meeting, notice of these meetings was on Social media. This is not inclusive to all residents and doesn't meet the government policy for assisted digital.12. I was unable to attend the 'consultation' meeting at Thievesdale. Due to the timing, I was at work. I heard how unhelpful it was. Staff did not have the answers to many questions – it sounded pointless. Numerous people have been given different start dates from the staff!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF144	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15: HS1 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan1. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents in Worksop. 750 dwellings,(Plus the 750 to be built after 2035) in addition to business/ employment and the current 150+ homes being built at the end of Thievesdale Lane will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subjected to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their life time.2. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction.3. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the long wait,some as long as 6 weeks,at the medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of Town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country- style roads. The villages on these routes get congested too and their air quality must already be poor. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable.4. The amount of housing development locally needed exceeds local needs; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of around 42,000. this 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on an already unsustainable road and rail systems.5. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.6. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change.7. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.8. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and Green environment- birds(including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, roe deer and insect population. 9. To build a road connecting B6045 to the A60 will mean cutting down mature trees at the A60 side of the proposed development.We should be protecting them not cutting them down. 10. The land at the moment is a natural 'soak away', if it is turned into dwellings etc and roads there is the potential for flooding. Because of the problem with 'Global warming' extremes of weather will be the norm including the high rainfalls and flooding we are currently having.11. The drains in the area don't cope with this now, more roads and houses will only add to the problem. If my concerns are over-ruled, I would like to see: 1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. A minimum of 15 metres to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife. 2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new homes to extend the green corridor. 3. Any communal areas, eg youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line. 4. New dwellings to have minimum car parking to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution(linked to climate change).5. Minimal street lighting to minimise light pollution. 6. Low level housing near existing homes, such as bungalows, not high- rise town houses.7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.8. Maximise tree/ shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook.9. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings.10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to ' at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195232	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The community consultation was not done correctly. The process was not followed correctly by the council, as outlined in the 2020. * The consultation process should be re-run correctly and the end date should be extended by a month. * The Council is working against its own strategic objective in almost every way. * The plan is not sustainable. * The volume of housing far exceeds the councils own target figure. * No extra school places will be made available. The Plan misleads us to believe it will. * No extra Doctors surgery's will be created. The Plan misleads us to believe it will. * Such infrastructure is only planned AFTER the completion of Phase 1 * It will be subject to the councils collection of council Tax's from new properties. * NO guarantees of required infrastructure can be made by the council . They are all subject to the completion of the plan and building the funds Afterwards to provide them. It is all Lies to deceive the people of Worksop. 	<p>The community consultation was undertaken in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. The community consultation process referred to in the representation relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the housing needs. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
			and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.
1195233	Resident	<p>* The community consultation was not done correctly. The process was not followed correctly by the council, as outlined in the 2020.* The consultation process should be re-run correctly and the end date should be extended by a month.* The Council is working against its own strategic objective in almost every way.* The plan is not sustainable.* The volume of housing far exceeds the councils own target figure.* No extra school places will be made available. The Plan misleads us to believe it will.* No extra Doctors surgery's will be created. The Plan misleads us to believe it will.* Such infrastructure is only planned AFTER the completion of Phase 1* It will be subject to the councils collection of council Tax's from new properties.* NO guarantees of required infrastructure can be made by the council . They are all subject to the completion of the plan and building the funds Afterwards to provide them. It is all Lies to deceive the people of Worksop.</p>	<p>The community consultation was undertaken in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. The community consultation process referred to in the representation relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the housing needs . The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF145	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the above development on the following grounds. My points are in no particular order.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 There is going to be a severely detrimental effect on the local wildlife due to the destruction of habitat 2 Loss of an overly large area of green space, space that gives Worksop its rural feel and is fundamental to its character 3 With the emphasis very much on the issues with the climate, this development will destroy local food producing land that could be used to feed the local community hence reducing food miles 4 Worksop doesn't currently have a good network infrastructure in place and the addition of the traffic these new houses will generate will cause chaos to local community 5 I fail to see why we need such a large number of new houses based on the fact that we currently only have circa 42,000 population. The increase will not be able to be supported by the transport infrastructure which is already poor 6 Local health centres are already working to a five-week waiting list for appointments which in itself is not acceptable. This development will severely exasperate this problem. 7 The local train station car-park is often full and the service unreliable to say the least. This will only get worse. 8 My understanding is that no doctors' surgeries, dental practices and schools will be built until after the houses have been completed. This is surely not acceptable. 9 The size of the development means the hat the area is going to become one big building site for many, many years. This again is not acceptable. <p>Whilst my house backs on my on the fields in question I understand that I cannot hold the magnificent views I currently have forever. However the sheer size of development proposed is, in my opinion, totally out of proportion with the local requirements. I trust you will consider my objection seriously.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF146	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the above development on the following grounds. My points are in no particular order.</p> <p>1 There is going to be a severely detrimental effect on the local wildlife due to the destruction of habitat</p> <p>2 Loss of an overly large area of green space, space that gives Worksop its rural feel and is fundamental to its character</p> <p>3 With the emphasis very much on the issues with the climate, this development will destroy local food producing land that could be used to feed the local community hence reducing food miles</p> <p>4 Worksop doesn't currently have a good network infrastructure in place and the addition of the traffic these new houses will generate will cause chaos to the local community</p> <p>5 I fail to see why we need such a large number of new houses based on the fact that we currently only have circa 42,000 population. The increase will not be able to be supported by the transport infrastructure which is already poor</p> <p>6 Local health centres are already working to a five-week waiting list for appointments which in itself is not acceptable. This development will severely exasperate this problem.</p> <p>7 The local train station car-park is often full and the service unreliable to say the least. This will only get worse.</p> <p>8 My understanding is that no doctors' surgeries, dental practices and schools will be built until after the houses have been completed. This is surely not acceptable.</p> <p>9 The size of the development means the hat the area is going to become one big building site for many, many years. As I am now 94 years old I can only predict that once development begins, I will never again experience the peace and tranquility I currently enjoy and is so important at my time of life. Whilst my house backs on my on the fields in question I understand that I cannot hold the magnificent views I currently have forever. However the sheer size of development proposed is, in my opinion, totally out of proportion with the local requirements. I trust you will consider my objection seriously.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF147	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the above development on the following grounds. My points are in no particular order.</p> <p>1 There is going to be a severely detrimental effect on the local wildlife due to the destruction of habitat</p> <p>2 Loss of an overly large area of green space, space that gives Worksop its rural feel and is fundamental to its character</p> <p>3 With the emphasis very much on the issues with the climate, this development will destroy local food producing land that could be used to feed the local community hence reducing food miles</p> <p>4 Worksop doesn't currently have a good network infrastructure in place and the addition of the traffic these new houses will generate will cause chaos to local community</p> <p>5 I fail to see why we need such a large number of new houses based on the fact that we currently only have circa 42,000 population. The increase will not be able to be supported by the transport infrastructure which is already poor</p> <p>6 Local health centres are already working to a five-week waiting list for appointments which in itself is not acceptable. This development will severely exasperate this problem.</p> <p>7 The local train station car-park is often full and the service unreliable to say the least. This will only get worse.</p> <p>8 My understanding is that no doctors' surgeries, dental practices and schools will be built until after the houses have been completed. This is surely not acceptable.</p> <p>9 The size of the development means that the area is going to become one big building site for many, many years. This again is not acceptable.</p> <p>Whilst my house backs on my on the fields in question I understand that I cannot hold the magnificent views I currently have forever. However the sheer size of development proposed is, in my opinion, totally out of proportion with the local requirements. I trust you will consider my objection seriously.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF148	Resident	<p>The destruction of prime farmland, the construction of so many unnecessary dwellings and associated buildings. The impact on local residents with noise dirt will make their lives miserable plus have an effect on their health. The extra volume of traffic on all surrounding roads will cause havoc accidents minor and major including fatal.</p> <p>The added strain on our now over stretched services roads with a major amount of pot holes, 1 small fire station, railway station congested car park, rail transport and time tables abysmal. The general road infrastructure is very poor mostly single lane carriage ways trying to cope with 30plus tonne wagons trying to negotiate our narrow roads including some local established company's, lorry park and storage park on Blyth road causes a few problems already. All these points need sorting out prior to any building work.</p> <p>Medical appointments are near to impossible to get with the amount of residents that are here. A hospital that can only be described now as a Cottage Hospital frequently on a red.</p> <p>Farm land being lost good agriculture being lost we need food, it may cause the farmers to reduce their work force. We will lose a lot of wildlife which live and breed in the surrounding woods, once their habitats are gone they may not return.</p> <p>Education Worksop schools are almost full, build new ones where the staff to run and operate them come from, nationally teachers are in short supply.</p> <p>The loss of any green land is a crime against humanity, we all need to be able to enjoy the open spaces and benefit from it for our health. Will you be stopping the local shooters from using the woods around Peaks Hill Farm and standing guns in hand in the fields. Just a question.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195290	Resident	<p>The housing projects seem to have been passed regardless of the plan where permission is granted without proper consultation with the residents and putting up thousands of homes on green belt land, which is also a conservation area. But the public seem to don't matter. It would be great to see the money trail.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF151	Resident	<p>I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15: HS1, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>1. The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 750 dwellings (plus the 750 planned for after 2035) and business/employment land in addition to the 150+ dwellings currently being built at the end of Thievesdale Lane, will mean that local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 years building site. For many elderly residents, that is the rest of their lifetime.</p> <p>2. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction.</p> <p>3. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the long wait to see a GP at the medical centres, some as long as 6 weeks. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country- style roads. These pass through small villages which already get congested and their air quality must already be poor! The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable.</p> <p>4. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of around 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.</p> <p>5. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.</p> <p>6. Loss of prime food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>7. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>8. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment- birds(including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, roe deer and insect population. 9. To build a link road from the B6045 to the A60 will mean cutting down mature trees on the A60 side of the development. We should be protecting trees, not cutting them down. 10. The land is a natural soak away but if vast numbers of dwellings and roads are built there is the potential for flooding. We are living at a time when extreme weather conditions are going to be expected so heavy rain will be something we have to accept. The drains don't cope at the moment so more buildings and roads will only add to the problem. If my concerns are overruled, we want to see</p> <p>1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.</p> <p>2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and to extend the green corridor.</p> <p>3. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the trees. 4. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution.(linked to climate change)</p> <p>5. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution.</p> <p>6. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses.</p> <p>7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.</p> <p>8. Maximise tree/ shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook.</p> <p>9. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasing elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings.</p> <p>10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'!(as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF152	Resident	<p>Further to the above proposed plan, we would like to make the following concerns and comments: A supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools is needed before the building, or at the commencement of building, as there is already pressure on existing resources which currently creates problems particularly getting an appointment with the Doctor. The increased volume of traffic trying to get in/out of Worksop will make life very frustrating and unhealthy for commuters as long queues already exist at rush hour and when children finish schools in and around Worksop. This will increase the levels of pollution in the area with the knock on adverse effect on health and wellbeing. If it goes ahead, green space should be made available with tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment. Developers should be made to provide decent size gardens and not allowed to cram as many dwellings as they can onto a space to maximise their profits.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF153	Resident	<p>We have been residents of Westerdale, Worksop for over 18 years. We were horrified to see building works taking place by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road. We received notification from neighbours of the proposed development at the rear of our property at Peaks Hill Farm. No notification was received from the Council. Therefore, it is with heavy hearts that we are having to contact you to explain our upset at the Council's plans to develop a site in such a large way. This will have obvious monetary consequence for all our properties. There was a significant premium to pay in the purchase of our house, which was in no doubt due to the beautiful scenic view. We are against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peak Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>When we attended two consolation meetings, the information was unclear and limited to say the least. No plans or specifications as to the layout of the properties and the amenities were available for inspection. The representatives did their best but to be honest they had been given no sufficient information to answer our many questions. They didn't know themselves how the development was going to look. Why wasn't a senior Planning Officer available at these consultations?</p> <p>We have noticed from other residents' comments that this plan was not made public until after building works had begun. We have also noticed that some people on Westerdale purchased their properties within the last few years and had been given no prior warning as to the new development plans for the rural land to the rear of their properties.</p> <p>We have many concerns about what impact this development will have, for the land, the community and us as homeowners of Westerdale.</p> <p>These fields are filled with wildlife; since moving in, we have seen birds, frogs, toads, newts, hares, hedgehogs, pheasants, mice and insects. If this development is to be implemented this wildlife will be dramatically reduced/eradicated. There is a huge concern globally for the impact of climate change and this development will be contributing massively to our local environment. The introduction of more traffic, building works and construction will further add to issues contributing to climate change such as air pollution, noise pollution and increased traffic. Furthermore, we will not only lose the invaluable green space that has always been there but we will lose a prime local food-growing land. In light of recently leaving the EU, we would urge the Council's aims should be to preserve crop growing space, as we will no longer be importing vital food-sources from EU countries? The prospect of a link road running behind our house is also a major concern. This will turn our tranquil back garden into a heavily congested roadway filled with pollution, noise and traffic. We insist that this link road needs to be positioned at least 1 mile away from the houses to protect residents and wildlife, including pets such as cats, that have been accustomed to roaming on these fields freely for years. We have seen people walking their dogs on this land every day and would be interested to see if this is indeed a public right of way. Furthermore, one of the reasons we purchased this property was for the privacy the location provided. If you are going to build 750 dwellings, a link road plus businesses (in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes) our privacy will be compromised by builders for at least 15 years during the construction works. For many elderly residents, that could well be their lifetime. The disruption this will cause will be catastrophic and how do you ensure we as residents will not be victims of this? How far back from our houses on Westerdale will these houses be built? With new buildings, more people will move to Worksop and this will consequently put further strain on the already unreliable rail services. People will no doubt be choosing to commute to surrounding cities such as Sheffield and Doncaster as Worksop does not have many job opportunities or prospects. We would urge the Council to consider different ways to improve the town centre and put focus into that rather than creating cheaper housing for those working in cities to benefit from.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF153	Resident	<p>Our town centre has been neglected for several years, local businesses are forced to leave as the rent is so high and as a result many shops are vacant. If our concerns are overruled, we want to see something that will respect us as long-term residents. We want to see a 50 meter green buffer-zone between the existing homes and any new development to maintain privacy and protect our wildlife. Please confirm that Long Plantation will remain in situ. The new dwellings should also have gardens backing onto the buffer-zone to increase distance between existing homes and new houses. Following on, communal areas such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches should be located away from any existing homes behind the tree line to ensure our privacy and peace is respected. To promote wildlife and the regrowth of eco-systems this development will have destroyed, the development needs to have an extensive plan to plant new trees, shrubs, bushes and green areas. Green pathways and corridors across all the development need to connect existing woodlands and walking paths to enable easy access to public transport. These new houses also need to have decent sized gardens so people can enjoy the benefits of outdoor space. We feel the residents of our community have been treated very badly in this proposal. Have the Council any plans to compensate residents, such as ourselves, for the loss of value for our properties? We would be grateful for your detailed comments on all the points listed in this letter. We will finish by saying, this development will have a significant impact on the mental health of residents of Westerdale and beyond. This has already caused significant stress for family, my fellow residents and ourselves. The Council needs to take our concerns seriously.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF154	Resident	<p>I am compelled to put forward my objections regarding the proposed Peaks Hill Farm Development in Worksop as it will directly affect our home, our enjoyment of life in the area, the surrounding homes and people and the existing wild life, some of which is protected.</p> <p>I understand that the development is for 750 new dwellings from the year 2026, with a further proposal of an additional 750 new dwelling after the year 2037.</p> <p>I do not feel that this massive development will be of benefit to our community because the area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is not in place prior to these being built Worksop currently has multiple property developments in progress at the moment, for example; the Gatefold estate is still not fully complete and houses remain unsold. The Shireoaks area has 3 building developments in progress, Carlton in Lindrick has another and the St Anne's estate development is set to start soon. There is a mass of development in progress and this proposal will add to many difficulties of the existing communities. Worksop does not have the capability to safely and adequately offer full Health Care and schooling to accommodate the massive number of extra people coming into the area. This proposal will also destroy habitat for the local wildlife living around us, such as foxes and hedgehogs (statistics show that they could be extinct in 10 years if their habitat is not protected), multiple species for bats (many of which are protected) would be driven out and deer would be prevented from using the wood as they do at present. This would be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been parts of Worksop's local character. Loss off prime local food growing land when councils should be investing in British grown produce now we are no longer in the European Union and helping to mitigate climate change. The increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster.</p> <p>The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission thith thousands more in the plan. for a population of 42,000. This saturation policy will increase the numbers in and out of worksop on already unsustainable road, and rail systems.</p> <p>Could you please respond with your comments and detailed confirmation how you intend to address all of the above points and fears, which I have raised, for the benefit and protection of all existing dwellers in the area and the existing natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF155	Resident	<p>1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction so this is not guaranteed. 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the waiting times at medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country-style roads. also, the train services are poor and unreliable. Finally, the Town Centre is poorly maintained with little incentive to attract shoppers to visit. 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsuitable road and rail systems, It's also unclear how the housing requirement in the plan has been determined i.e. has it considered the number of existing properties that naturally become available to purchase e.g. residents leaving Bassetlaw, going into permanent care, passing away etc... 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 8. There will be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and form part of Worksop's local character. The primary focus should be on locating brownfield site to develop on in Bassetlaw. 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment - birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 10. The proposal to build a road across this site to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will cause pollution from noise and fumes in this area, in addition to the increased pollution created by the huge number of houses that are planned to be built on this site. Councils are supposed to be helping to reduce the impact on Climate change (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with the approach. 11. Page 78 states "at least 750 houses in phase 1". Please confirm what the maximum number of houses that can be built on this site in phase 1 will be. 12. Para 7.2.8. This is very vague and required further clarification i.e. what exactly is being proposed and where on the site will this development be located. If this is located near existing housing it will increase the level of pollution (e.g. from noise, traffic and fumes etc). 13. Strategic Objectives Para 4.2. Point 1 states... Building at least 1,500 homes plus other development on agricultural land at High Peaks Farm is not in accordance with the vision outlined in the Strategic Objectives of the draft Local Plan. 14. There has been insufficient communication (or in some instances no communication) to the residents of Bassetlaw regarding the draft Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to Peaks Hill Farm this initially consisted of one notice attached to a lamp post on Westerdale which gave only a very short timescale to respond. It is highly likely that some residents who will be affected by this plan will still be unaware of the full ramifications of this proposal. There will also be a significant number of residents who haven't had time to thoroughly review the huge volume of information in this plan. I therefore request 1 month extension to the consultation period to enable residents to review this plan in more detail to help them make a more informed response to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced, accessible green infrastructure network (including retained woodland), new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The site is privately owned and currently there is no public right of way. Development will enable green infrastructure routes to become accessible to local residents. The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure partners to ensure any necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF155	Resident	<p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I would like to see:</p> <p>10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife</p> <p>11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor</p> <p>12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline</p> <p>13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)</p> <p>14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution</p> <p>15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses</p> <p>16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport</p> <p>17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook</p> <p>18. Build enough properties to cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings</p> <p>19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p> <p>20. If a road is built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm it needs to be located well away from existing homes behind the treeline.</p> <p>21. Any green technology that is developed needs to be located well away from existing homes behind the treeline.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF156	Resident	<p>1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction so this is not guaranteed. 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the waiting times at medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country-style roads. also, the train services are poor and unreliable. Finally, the Town Centre is poorly maintained with little incentive to attract shoppers to visit. 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsuitable road and rail systems, It's also unclear how the housing requirement in the plan has been determined i.e. has it considered the number of existing properties that naturally become available to purchase e.g. residents leaving Bassetlaw, going into permanent care, passing away etc... 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 8. There will be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and form part of Worksop's local character. The primary focus should be on locating brownfield site to develop on in Bassetlaw. 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment - birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 10. The proposal to build a road across this site to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will cause pollution from noise and fumes in this area, in addition to the increased pollution created by the huge number of houses that are planned to be built on this site. Councils are supposed to be helping to reduce the impact on Climate change (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with the approach. 11. Page 78 states "at least 750 houses in phase 1". Please confirm what the maximum number of houses that can be built on this site in phase 1 will be. 12. Para 7.2.8. This is very vague and required further clarification i.e. what exactly is being proposed and where on the site will this development be located. If this is located near existing housing it will increase the level of pollution (e.g. from noise, traffic and fumes etc). 13. Strategic Objectives Para 4.2. Point 1 states... Building at least 1,500 homes plus other development on agricultural land at High Peaks Farm is not in accordance with the vision outlined in the Strategic Objectives of the draft Local Plan. 14. There has been insufficient communication (or in some instances no communication) to the residents of Bassetlaw regarding the draft Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to Peaks Hill Farm this initially consisted of one notice attached to a lamp post on Westerdale which gave only a very short timescale to respond. It is highly likely that some residents who will be affected by this plan will still be unaware of the full ramifications of this proposal. There will also be a significant number of residents who haven't had time to thoroughly review the huge volume of information in this plan. I therefore request 1 month extension to the consultation period to enable residents to review this plan in more detail to help them make a more informed response to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF157	Resident	<p>1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction so this is not guaranteed. 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the waiting times at medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country-style roads. also, the train services are poor and unreliable. Finally, the Town Centre is poorly maintained with little incentive to attract shoppers to visit. 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsuitable road and rail systems, It's also unclear how the housing requirement in the plan has been determined i.e. has it considered the number of existing properties that naturally become available to purchase e.g. residents leaving Bassetlaw, going into permanent care, passing away etc... 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 8. There will be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and form part of Worksop's local character. The primary focus should be on locating brownfield site to develop on in Bassetlaw. 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment - birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 10. The proposal to build a road across this site to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will cause pollution from noise and fumes in this area, in addition to the increased pollution created by the huge number of houses that are planned to be built on this site. Councils are supposed to be helping to reduce the impact on Climate change (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with the approach. 11. Page 78 states "at least 750 houses in phase 1". Please confirm what the maximum number of houses that can be built on this site in phase 1 will be. 12. Para 7.2.8. This is very vague and required further clarification i.e. what exactly is being proposed and where on the site will this development be located. If this is located near existing housing it will increase the level of pollution (e.g. from noise, traffic and fumes etc). 13. Strategic Objectives Para 4.2. Point 1 states... Building at least 1,500 homes plus other development on agricultural land at High Peaks Farm is not in accordance with the vision outlined in the Strategic Objectives of the draft Local Plan. 14. There has been insufficient communication (or in some instances no communication) to the residents of Bassetlaw regarding the draft Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to Peaks Hill Farm this initially consisted of one notice attached to a lamp post on Westerdale which gave only a very short timescale to respond. It is highly likely that some residents who will be affected by this plan will still be unaware of the full ramifications of this proposal. There will also be a significant number of residents who haven't had time to thoroughly review the huge volume of information in this plan. I therefore request 1 month extension to the consultation period to enable residents to review this plan in more detail to help them make a more informed response to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF158	Resident	<p>1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. 2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings- such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction so this is not guaranteed. 4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the waiting times at medical centres to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country-style roads. also, the train services are poor and unreliable. Finally, the Town Centre is poorly maintained with little incentive to attract shoppers to visit. 5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsuitable road and rail systems, It's also unclear how the housing requirement in the plan has been determined i.e. has it considered the number of existing properties that naturally become available to purchase e.g. residents leaving Bassetlaw, going into permanent care, passing away etc... 6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 8. There will be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and form part of Worksop's local character. The primary focus should be on locating brownfield site to develop on in Bassetlaw. 9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment - birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 10. The proposal to build a road across this site to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will cause pollution from noise and fumes in this area, in addition to the increased pollution created by the huge number of houses that are planned to be built on this site. Councils are supposed to be helping to reduce the impact on Climate change (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with the approach. 11. Page 78 states "at least 750 houses in phase 1". Please confirm what the maximum number of houses that can be built on this site in phase 1 will be. 12. Para 7.2.8. This is very vague and required further clarification i.e. what exactly is being proposed and where on the site will this development be located. If this is located near existing housing it will increase the level of pollution (e.g. from noise, traffic and fumes etc). 13. Strategic Objectives Para 4.2. Point 1 states... Building at least 1,500 homes plus other development on agricultural land at High Peaks Farm is not in accordance with the vision outlined in the Strategic Objectives of the draft Local Plan. 14. There has been insufficient communication (or in some instances no communication) to the residents of Bassetlaw regarding the draft Bassetlaw Plan. In relation to Peaks Hill Farm this initially consisted of one notice attached to a lamp post on Westerdale which gave only a very short timescale to respond. It is highly likely that some residents who will be affected by this plan will still be unaware of the full ramifications of this proposal. There will also be a significant number of residents who haven't had time to thoroughly review the huge volume of information in this plan. I therefore request 1 month extension to the consultation period to enable residents to review this plan in more detail to help them make a more informed response to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF161	Resident	<p>We would first like to say that we are opposed to the plan to build 750+ (initial) houses on the fields around Peak Hill Farm, as we feel the size of the development is inappropriate for the housing needs of local people. A development of this scale would have a massive negative effect on the environment in a time when we need to be preserving the natural world, not destroy it. Any suggestion that building 750+ houses on one site, could be classed as 'green' by planting a few trees, is quite clearly ludicrous, not to mention the increase in air pollution from the 1000 + cars and home boilers a development of this scale would generate. Worksop is a small town with limited services, that are probably at breaking point, and any substantial increase in population would send these services into crisis. At the moment, it's practically impossible to get an appointment at the Larwood Surgery, given another 750+ houses, then who knows how long it would take to get an appointment. Worksop has two secondary schools both of which are at full capacity. Would a third school be built, or would we expect to cram in the extra pupils, thus lowering the standard of education received by our children. The only thing going for Worksop is the quality of education our children receive, building these extra unnecessay houses, put's that at risk for generations to come. The road and rail network is currently inadequate for the current population; with the addition of 750+ houses, road and rail will need considerable investment to keep Worksop 'moving'. These are just a few examples of why we are opposed to this development. However, if the council over-rules our concerns and the development goes ahead, then we would like to see the following. Running along the existing border between the fields and the houses on Westerdale etc. a green buffer of at lease 15 meters. This should contain a mixture of deciduous and ever-green trees and shrubs to a) reduce the amount of noise pollution, and b) to stop the existing residents from being over-looked by any new development, and c) to give the wild-life some refuge. It should also be designed not to encourage any form of criminal or anti-social behaviour. We would also expect that no properties be built that exceed 2 stories, preferably 1 along the boudary. Any 'community' developments, i.e. sports fields, community halls etc be built away from the existing border, preferably behind the line of trees in the middle of the fields. Street lighting be kept to a minimum, with anti-light pollution designs. Any builders to be kept in check about what they destroy, for example, bats (a protected species) are found all the way along Westerdale. Make sure that the builders respect the natural inhabitants, and make sure that punitive fines for any breaches are substantial. We would also want any walkways be enhancing to the environment, not a place where crime can thrive.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF162	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-1. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan2. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime3. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction4. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable5. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems6. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster7. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change8. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character9. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:10. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife11. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor12. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline13. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)14. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution15. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses16. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport17. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook18. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings19. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195356	Resident	<p>I am against Peaks Hill Farm development Policy 15 due to prime farmland and green spaces been destroyed for housing which is not in demand , over 600 empty homes in Worksop alone which then exceeds the required amount you have previously quoted as been needed for growth. The area will ne subject to excess noise , pollution and disruption for years to come and the impact environmentally is immense which is a horrific thought in these days of climate change and eco friendly environments which you are going to destroy with this huge development . There is already great pressure on the services and amenities which current Worksop residents are unhappy with . Commuting is going to become a bigger problem as many house buyers will be from out of the area and this will have a major negative impact on the local roads and also the A1, A57, A60 and M1 routes. The train services are minimal and unreliable and not conducive to commuters. The proposed link road will not ease congestion on our local roads , it will add to it considering you are looking at appox 3000 additional cars . This is not a solution road , this is a tick box . The amount of housing exceeds the government requirement by over 20% and by over 10% at local policy level . Gateford estate is left with undeveloped areas as the builders are finding they cant sell them so why propose a further 1500 with no supporting infrastructure and over saturated residential areas. Why use farm land to build upon.....this is loss of local crop growing land with exit from the EU this is going to become a real need in the UK and this area. In this time of climate change we should look at regenerating existing land areas and preserving green land if the farmer wants to sell then it should be used for green energy - solar panel and wind farms and the like. Once destroyed you will never recreate the established eco structure and natural habitats, wildlife , established trees needed for climate control will all be lost and gone forever . Adding new tress will not replace the existing established natural environment .</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1195356	Resident	<p>The council has conducted itself very poorly in this matter.... You have not followed the correct Community Consultation procedure. You are working against your own Strategic Objectives There has been a complete lack of transparency The staff at the local consultation events were unhelpful and arrogant and one member actually quoted "that's the way it is" when questioned about the Peaks Hill Proposal. The Plan consistently uses the term sustainable development . This is absolute greenwash..... how can by its very nature the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable ??? All national and international agendas are for concerns of global warming , locally sourced food , light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity, health and wellbeing will be eroded if the destruction of the countryside is allowed to happen for this excessive housing. To allow destruction on this scale is of the beautiful landscape and wildlife habitat at Peaks Hill Farm would be irresponsible and wrong</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195356	Resident	<p>We request and feel its only right to connect with all residents and surrounding areas to extend the deadline from the 26th February. In order to gather more information and have sufficient time to research our reading in more detail.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF164	Resident	<p>I would like a chance to be heard about my objections against the proposed development on the land at Peaks Hill farm.</p> <p>I feel extremely disappointed that Bassetlaw Council has failed to inform residents of the large scale, disruptive plans to build on the farming land associated with Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>If it wasn't for one resident who by chance noticed the single leaflet pinned to the lamppost and then photocopied and distributed a copy to every house hold on Westerdale, then none of us would have even been aware of these plans that will cause so much disruption, pollution and destruction of acres of greenbelt land.</p> <p>Not only that, these plans will put a huge strain on our health services, schools and roads which are already struggling to support the already growing population of Worksop. As most residents have lived here for over 20 years, I feel that it would have been only fair to inform us of these plans that were made back in 2018. We could then have had the opportunity to object to the plans. Instead the plans were kept very quiet until it was almost too late to oppose them.</p> <p>It doesn't seem right or fair that the countryside behind our gardens is going to be destroyed in order to allow 1450 house to be built over the next 15 years. This estate is full of families with young children and elderly residents who love to spend time in the privacy and safety of their gardens. These plans are not only going to affect our privacy, but the pollutants and toxins that come with the upcoming building site may jeopardise the health of residents. This will put even more strain on our health services that are already struggling.</p> <p>As a young woman interested in sustaining Britain's endangered wildlife and woodland areas, it saddens me to hear that as my local council you're planning to destroy a large woodland area, close to where I live. This is an area that contains an array of trees, plants and local wildlife. I've researched some of the core environmental values that you claim to support in a document entitled 'A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment'</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our 25 Year Environment Plan sets out our comprehensive and long-term approach to protect and enhance Britain's natural landscapes and habitats. 2. Its goals are simple: cleaner air and water; protect plants and animals. 3. Create new habitats for wildlife. 4. When the United Kingdom leaves the European Union, we will use this opportunity to strengthen, enhance and protect our countryside and wildlife habitats. 5. It is this Government's ambition to leave our environment in a better state than we found it. 6. The places dear to us we wish to protect and preserve. We value those landscapes 7. For this reason, we safeguard cherished landscapes from economic exploitation, protect the welfare of sentient animals and strive to preserve endangered woodland and plant life. 8. So, protecting and enhancing the environment, as this Plan lays out, is about more than respecting nature. It is critical if the next generation is to flourish. <p>From reading this document I'm left puzzled to why such a plan has been put into place as it seems to contradict so many of your core beliefs and values about the environment.</p> <p>Would it not make more sense to either abandon these plans or wait until the existing new houses in Worksop have been sold? Or perhaps find land that isn't going to disrupt residents' lives, destroy greenbelt land, endanger woodlands and endanger wildlife at a time when climate change is a serious issue.</p> <p>In conclusion I feel it would be sensible to extend the consultation process beyond the original date of February 26 to allow a full consultation of such a major project to take place</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF165	Resident	<p>I would like to request an extension to the consultation process for the draft Bassetlaw Plan that affects plans for the development of land known as Peaks Hill Farm. My request for this extension is on the basis of lack of appropriate consultation with local residents. Residents were 'informed' via a single A4 leaflet fastened to a lamp post at the end of our road prior to the consultation meeting on 4 -2 -20. Surely each individual household should have been informed of the plans and the meeting well in advance of the meeting date? Also the meeting was scheduled to be held at a time when most residents were at work and therefore unable to attend. I have already emailed my initial objections to such a huge development on the Peaks Hill site but I have since read the draft plan and now have further objections. Whilst I support the need for local regeneration plans, I fail to see the need to build such a huge housing estate on greenfield farming land. It's clear to see that the developers of the recently built houses on Gateford are struggling to sell them, hence they are now being offered at reduced prices. Therefore there is no guarantee that developers will be able to sell over 1, 500 houses on Peaks Hill Farm. The building of such a huge estate clearly contravenes Bassetlaw District Council's strategic objectives to preserve greenfield and farm land. It will lead to the destruction of acres of natural countryside and wildlife, it will increase increase pollution and contribute to the devastating impact of global warming. The negative implications of such massive scale house building for the infrastructure in Worksop is worrying as it will negatively effect all Bassetlaw residents. It appears that there is insufficient provision in the draft plan to increase school places, health services and road links to the level needed until these houses are built and sold. I would like to see a more realistic number of houses proposed to be built on Peaks Hill Farm which would not cause such devastation to the environment and infrastructure and would not exceed the market demand for new houses.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF167	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I do not believe that the consultation process for the Bassetlaw Local Plan has not been carried out adequately. It has been badly communicated and rushed 2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan 3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems 7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster 8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character 10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see: 11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 19. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) <p>Please keep me apprised of the outcome of the opposition to these proposals by myself and the local community</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF168	Resident	<p>I am totally opposed to these plans on the following grounds:-1. I do not believe that the consultation process for the Bassetlaw Local Plan has not been carried out adequately. It has been badly communicated and rushed.2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)Please keep me apprised of the outcome of the opposition to these proposals by myself and the local community</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1195520	Resident	<p>The plan as outlined removes substantial green areas and promotes an 'outer' ring road with potential significant traffic flow. Access to the new plan from the adjacent existing housing stock is unclear, potentially increasing traffic in the already congested roads.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced in green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF173	Resident	<p>I would like to request an extension to the consultation process for the draft Bassetlaw Plan that affects plans for the development of land known as Peaks Hill Farm. This request is due to the lack of appropriate consultation with local residents. Residents were 'informed' by means of a single A4 leaflet fastened to a lamp post at the end of our road prior to the consultation meeting on 4th February 2020. Surely, as a matter of courtesy and transparency, each individual household should have been informed of the plans and the meeting date well in advance? Also, the meeting was scheduled to be held at a time when most residents were at work and therefore unable to attend. There are currently several major new housing estates under construction around Worksop which seem to be saturating the market. The supply already seems to exceed demand and these estates are attracting residents from outside Bassetlaw, primarily Sheffield who are looking for more house for their money. The few people I know on the Gateford estate commute to Sheffield or the motorway, and they are also attracted back for social and leisure activities. Almost all are derogatory towards Worksop and most do not go anywhere near the Town Centre. The only businesses to benefit are the multi-national supermarket chains. The plan does not seem to recognise serious national and global issue of climate change. Worksop has only recently been devastated by serious flooding and the road out to Barlborough was blocked for some time after the water had receded in the town centre, with a lake forming under the bridge at Darfoulds. The destruction of the natural environment coupled with the building work and the eventual existence of another huge housing estate, with hundreds if not thousands of extra commuters will no doubt add to the problem of global warming. It appears that the council is lacking any social conscience and awareness of its responsibility towards this issue and the future of our children. It is obvious that the current infrastructure will not support such a large estate. It appears from the plan that improvements to roads and junctions will not take place until after the houses are built. What you will be creating is a traffic jam from Worksop to the M1 along the A57 and the A1 along Blyth Road. In essence this is therefore hardly a sustainable development. Finally, are there any plans to increase the size or number of schools, doctors' surgeries and hospital services in the area in line with these increased number of houses? Residents currently struggle to book doctors' appointments and the wait for hospital appointments is already a huge problem as the current facilities are struggling to cope with current demands.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
1195661	Resident	<p>I understand the need for housing development & as such am not opposed to the development of Peaks Hill Farm. However, I do strongly oppose any connecting road infrastructure with Winster Grove. This would be unnecessary for the build and in addition, due to the flow of Winster Grove and Ambleside Grange would lend itself to becoming a "rat run" and as such would not only disturb the peace for the residents, but would be very dangerous for drivers and residents.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1195688	Resident	Housing developments in area remain unsold. Worksop has nothing to offer in the town centre so new residents will be commuters who will spend their money elsewhere. The roads and current infrastructures are buckling under the current demand. Drs, dentists, Hospitals can't meet current needs so how can they meet the demand for at least 2,000 more populous. Schools are full also.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF178	Resident	I write to raise my objections to the proposed inclusion of the development of Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) site in the above document. Also, to the inclusion of such a large amount of green-space in The Plan. I also wish to express my objections regarding the manner and process of the Plans 'consultation'. Whilst I appreciate that local authorities have had to endure many austerity measures, I do not accept that "lack of resources" as quoted on a number of occasions at public meetings regarding the above, is a reason to hold these meetings in winter, half-term, during dark evenings and inclement weather, with at best, minimal publicity and more importantly, almost upon the feedback deadline of the 26th February. Retford, Carlton, Misterton and Ranby's meetings, for example, range from the 18th to 25th February. Ranby's meeting is the day before the deadline. The Plan has been heavily consulted upon with developers and other 'relevant' parties since 2018, without due consideration of local citizens and, therefore, it feels that we have been presented with a fait accompli. It is not inclusive or good enough to use the excuse that it has been on the Council's website or social media. How can people know what they don't know? Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) needed to have operated a high profile, robust and transparent district consultation programme from 2018, the date of the Plan, in order to give local people time to understand its impact. The Plan is almost 200 pages long, with over 70 additional accompanying documents further listed and most residents throughout the District are totally unaware of it and the magnitude of change that the proposals suggest (many areas having an increase in housing stock of 20%) and have been given scant time to read, absorb and comment on its contents. Irrespective of how little finance BDC has, the failure to adequately and proportionately resource timely and appropriate consultation for such, in many cases, life-changing proposals of this size, at best demonstrates a lack of operation under Best Practice and at worst, suggests that BDC have cynically kept the publicity and consultation to such a minimum and within such a short deadline in order to push through what would otherwise be a controversial document. Many residents are only now beginning to send in responses, proof that word has only just got around. There were many elderly residents at the second meeting in Worksop that I attended and which attracted many attendees - who would not have known about the meeting if we as residents, had not publicised it with a leaflet having discovered 1 small notice on a lamp-post, interestingly, we were told by an officer that we were "lucky to get that". Many have been simply bewildered and distressed by the Plan and many do not have access to the internet in order to see it and understand the content and formulate their own opinions. Indeed, many of us present, of all ages, had not previously known about this Plan, and I am on the Planning department's mailing list and had only received a letter the same time as the notice went up on the lamp-post. BDC Leader, Cllr Simon Greaves, was presumably asked by reporters at the Worksop Guardian 7th February 2020, for a reaction to the article by residents on the same day and information came too late for residents who did not know that meetings were taking place. Indeed, by the article's date of 7th February, many such meetings had already taken place. Cllr Greaves' article was, therefore, reactive; it would have been considered timely and proactive if it had been months ago whilst giving residents a list of meeting dates and basic information	The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>well in advance. The quotes of 'like it or not, as a district, Bassetlaw needs to create more opportunities for employment and more houses for people to live in' is absolutely justified and acceptable; that is not the issue. What is, is the enormity of the proposals and their impact. It is not helpful to further read 'I am happy to report that both Worksop events were well attended' when the first meeting had 10 attendees who complained about the lack of publicity (presumably prompting the same Cllrs to then leaflet the area a few days before the next meeting) which was publicised by residents, as above. The feedback forms that were handed out at meetings were highly inadequate and complex with a seeming need to equate comments to particular sections in the Plan. On contacting Planning, I was told that we could simply email or write to Planning with comments, as long as we included our contact details and made reference to the particular policy numbers, PHF being Policy 15. Why were we not told this collectively at meetings or in some appropriate BDC publicity? There is no suggestion that any forms are available, for example, in large print or different languages. It feels that the process for giving feedback/comments has been made as complex and un-inclusive as possible. I am incredulous that a district plan of this enormity and duration, did not have a reasonable, timely, well publicised, inclusive communications strategy allowing residents to make genuinely appropriate and timely contributions. That is proper consultation. Collecting comments at short notice meetings where for most people it was the first time they had any information about the Plan, can form part of a communications strategy. However, surely under the Councils legal obligations to operate under the Equality Act, Best Practice alone would require that citizens should have been given appropriate time to understand and respond to the proposals, given the range of capability, mobility, age, access to information etc that people have. For a document of this size, magnitude and impact, I feel that BDC has failed in its operation of Best Practice and in reasonably considering its residents and has even failed in the delivery of the wholly inadequate consultation process as outlined in Appendix 4 of the Plan below. None of us in the immediate vicinity have received a letter. Appendix 4: Community consultation In these cases all of the following must be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) An A4 laminated site notice should be displayed on the site's road/street frontage(s) for a minimum of 21 9hivThe notice should identify the site, provide a description of the proposal and where comments should be sent; • b) A letter should be sent to all properties notifying them of the proposal which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adjoin the site boundary; • on the street(s) the site is located on; • face the site I ask BDC to remedy this unreasonable, untimely and unjust approach and to extend the deadline from this Wednesday, 26th February, for a minimum of 1 month and operate a proactive publicity campaign, through a range of media, about the Plan in order to allow all citizens throughout the District an opportunity to respond. <p>My comments on the Plan are listed below, though I have had inadequate time to respond in further detail due to the reasons stated above: Strategic Objectives 4.2.1 This vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives: Page 21. OBJECTIVE 1. 'To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality agricultural land'. Page 265.1.17 'Worksop will deliver a minimum of 2180 new dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Since the start of the plan period Worksop has seen 230 housing completions and currently has 1404 commitments (at 30/11/2019). Combined, this equates to a supply of 1634 dwellings. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 546 dwellings in Worksop'. 5.1.18 'However, the level of housing identified by Policy ST1 in Worksop is broadly comparable with the promotion of successful economic growth and regeneration and to facilitate the infrastructure required in support'. Response to Strategic Objective 1 and sections 5 on page 26 as above: The proposed inclusion of farmland and countryside at PHF for a development of such disproportionate enormity, causing such a loss of green-space and with a lack of infrastructure, goes against every principle in this objective. According to the Office of National Statistics data, the populations of Worksop and Bassetlaw have increased by around 10% over the last 20 years. The proportion of development in the Plan throughout the district, however, is around 20% with a huge proportion of that on green-field sites at PHF and Bassetlaw Garden Village. The huge development at Gateford is already offering discounts on unsold plots and stamp duty paid. I am interested to know where the thousands of households for Bassetlaw, 9,087 homes, will come from, given the lack of facilities and supporting infrastructure. Commuters need good levels of connectivity, not currently evident in Worksop and surrounding villages. BDC Spatial Strategy quotes 'a minimum of 9,087 homes need to be built in Bassetlaw by 2037' yet 5.1.17 above, states that only 546 further dwellings are needed in Worksop in total. Yet Peaks Hill farm on its own, is to include at least 750 houses in phase 1 alone. If this much lower number, based on population projections for the District, is what is actually needed, say allowing for a continued population increase over 20 years again of 10%, why is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>the Plan to include so much destruction of green-space and with a 20% increase in housing stock? The developments on brown field sites would probably provide the level of housing affordability that local people can sustain in Worksop, with additional insistence on affordable homes being built at, for example, Gateford and the old Tesco site. I am a member of the RSPB, WW Fund For Nature and the National Trust. My concerns are not simply NIMBY, but national and global. My belief is that we are part of nature, not separate from it and we all, therefore, have a moral duty to protect what we are all currently custodians of. I am particularly horrified at the extent of destruction of local green-field sites especially that proposed for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) Policy 15. An urban sprawl of this size would have a catastrophic impact on wildlife habitats including for buzzards, owls, sparrow hawks, invertebrates, mammals (including bats) and pollinators, all of which inhabit the site. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site (The Lodge at The Edge) with the Plan adding 'at least 750' more in phase 1 on 54 hectares and '750' in phase 2, doubling the size. The impact on Worksop will be immense. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads, the A57 to Sheffield, GP surgeries (the waiting time for appointments at Newgate Medical Group for example, is already 6 weeks) dentists, the hospital, schools etc will be more intolerable when added to the huge sprawling developments currently in progress at Gateford and near Shireoaks and all the other sites around the Town. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over decades. For many members of the local community, this will mean the anxiety of continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution, and in the case of the elderly, literally for the rest of their lives. The proposal at PHF has very little, if any, concrete evidence of appropriate, new infrastructure support compared particularly to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village ST1 ST3 ST35 and ST36, which is to have a nursery and primary school, healthcare facilities, parks, enhanced transport networks, flood risk management and a new railway station etc demonstrating what is deemed necessary for a development of 750 homes. However, there is nothing specific for PHF, a development of the same size, other than for example, a road across the estate and a local bus service. The Plan clearly implies minimal infrastructure investment on and around this site and waives the Community Infrastructure Levy other than for that required to enable the development to take place. Connectivity in and out of Worksop is already inadequate and under stress. I now commute to Sheffield by train. It is a poor service:- often dirty, overcrowded, unreliable, infrequent and increasingly difficult to park at the station. I used to commute by car, a journey that used to take 35 minutes to the centre and now takes about an hour. According to the Planning section, income will need to be raised from the building of these huge developments - presumably via Council Tax and some developer contributions if evidence can be deemed to support need - in order to raise the income needed to build infrastructure, section 5.1.18 in the Plan. The level of Council Tax needed will not be raised until all properties are built and sold, this may take decades and how can we simply extend already land-locked facilities (the train station, schools and surgeries) to accommodate increases in population? Will this in turn, create the constant chicken and egg situation of increasing the destruction of further green-space? I accept the need for additional housing but not of this magnitude, especially on prime farming land that should provide locally produced food, and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial. National evidence shows that local authorities have limited power to enforce the provision of affordable housing on development sites and developers, who are interested in maximising their profits, do not appear to be voluntarily providing them. Worksop has a population of 42,000+. The housing currently being built and also proposed is largely 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached. The average house price in Worksop is £139,000. New developments - see Rippon Homes development off Blyth Road - are 'luxury homes' being marketed to commuters. Gateford site is selling their 'luxury homes' homes starting at £300,000. These are not what many local people can afford to buy and I cannot find evidence to support the concept that by building lots of houses - sustainable, local and professional (with salaries sufficient to fund large houses) employment will follow - in less affluent locations. It is more feasible, that the purchasers of large homes in less well off areas will be commuters who will be unlikely to work within and spend large amounts in the local economy, preferring other locations such as Meadowhall, Sheffield, Lincoln and Nottingham. The recent tragic flooding of Worksop Town Centre is unlikely to increase investor confidence to that location. One of Worksop's Unique Selling Points is it's rural location which is what attracted us to move here from Sheffield 23 years ago. It is now being turned into a sprawling commuter belt. The Plan consistently uses the term 'sustainable development'. This is absolute 'greenwash'. How can, by its very nature, the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable? All the national and international agendas and concerns of, for example, global warming, locally-sourced food, light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity,</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>health and wellbeing etc will continue to be eroded if destruction of the countryside is allowed at this housing saturation level. As our elected members, and as members of the public, it is our collective responsibility to protect and enhance our natural environment for current and future generations to appreciate, enjoy and benefit from. To allow destruction on this scale of this beautiful landscape and wildlife habitat at PHF, would simply be irresponsible and wrong. Please do not allow this to happen. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife • New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor • Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline • New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) • Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution • Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses • Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport • Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook • Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings • Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings. 	
1195884	Resident	<p>The proposed link between the A60 and Blyth Road, to me is going to produce a more dangerous road on A60 because of the hills and dips and bends on the hills. There have been many fatalities on that road including one at the Peak Hill farm Junction between a tractor and trailer and a motor cycle. Most people from Carlton who work towards Sheffield use Owdey Lane to get to the A57 and others going for the A1 use Hundred Acre Lane or Blyth Road through Oldcotes. I think a link road would be very dangerous with people impatient to join the main carriageways from such a link road</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered. This includes improvements to the public highway informed by a transport assessment and liaison with Notts County Council Highways.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF184	Resident	<p>We have grave concerns regarding the above plan just off Thievesdale. It will have severe impact on the road along Blyth Road and this is bad enough as it is, being on a bend. There is already lots of traffic on this road including lorries and slow moving farm traffic. As there is no infrastructure there will be an impact on the local services like schools and surgeries. Larwood surgery is already struggling to meet the needs of the local people and therefore adding over a 1000 more patients will be devastating. Newgate Street surgery also has the same problem. We feel that the development site will be too big and we will be losing valuable growing land. We need to ensure there is enough farm land to produce food for the area not take away from it. Also the wildlife will be severely disrupted. We have hedgehogs, squirrels, hares and rabbits, sparrow hawks, owls and other birds which we will lose at a time when this wildlife should be protected. If this plan must go ahead then the least the Council can do is create a green zone for at least some of our wildlife, at least 15 metres wide and this may protect our privacy especially if the gardens back onto our gardens. We do not want houses on top of each other, rather more open space. We do not want to be overlooking new properties nor have our gardens overlooked by new residents. Bungalows would be better to protect privacy also. These properties should be made so people can afford to buy them so they do not stay empty for long periods as this would end in squatting and criminal damage or places where drugs etc can be used. There should be lots of trees and shrubbery replanted to help the environment to survive and at least create a more attractive environment. Finally please create a proper infrastructure to support all these properties before the existing infrastructure collapses under the weight of demand. GP surgeries, dentists and schools are already overrun and staff leaving due to the stress of this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, including new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered. This includes improvements to the public highway informed by a transport assessment and liaison with Notts County Council Highways.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF185	Resident	<p>I am compelled to put forward my objections regarding the proposed Peaks Hill Farm Development in Worksop as it will directly affect our home, our enjoyment of life in the area, the surrounding homes and people and the existing wild life, some of which is protected. I understand that the development is for 750 new dwellings from the year 2026, with a further proposal of an additional 750 new dwelling after the year 2037. I do not feel that this massive development will be of benefit to our community because the area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is not in place prior to these being built Worksop currently has multiple property developments in progress at the moment, for example; the Gatefold estate is still not fully complete and houses remain unsold. The Shireoaks area has 3 building developments in progress, Carlton in Lindrick has another and the St Anne's estate development is set to start soon. There is a mass of development in progress and this proposal will add to many difficulties of the existing communities. Worksop does not have the capability to safely and adequately offer full Health Care and schooling to accommodate the massive number of extra people coming into the area. This proposal will also destroy habitat for the local wildlife living around us, such as foxes and hedgehogs (statistics show that they could be extinct in 10 years if their habitat is not protected), multiple species for bats (many of which are protected) would be driven out and deer would be prevented from using the wood as they do at present. This would be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been parts of Worksop's local character.</p> <p>Loss off prime local food growing land when councils should be investing in British grown produce now we are no longer in the European Union and helping to mitigate climate change. The increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission thith thousands more in the plan. for a population of 42,000. This saturation policy will increase the numbers in and out of worksop on already unsustainable road, and rail systems.</p> <p>Could you please respond with your comments and detailed confirmation how you intend to address all of the above points and fears, which I have raised, for the benefit and protection of all existing dwellers in the area and the existing natural habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF186	Resident	<p>I am compelled to put forward my objections regarding the proposed Peaks Hill Farm Development in Worksop as it will directly affect our home, our enjoyment of life in the area, the surrounding homes and people and the existing wild life, some of which is protected.I understand that the development is for 750 new dwellings from the year 2026, with a further proposal of an additional 750 new dwelling after the year 2037.I do not feel that this massive development will be of benefit to our community because the area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is not in place prior to these being built Worksop currently has multiple property developments in progress at the moment, for example; the Gatefold estate is still not fully complete and houses remain unsold. The Shireoaks area has 3 building developments in progress, Carlton in Lindrick has another and the St Anne's estate development is set to start soon. There is a mass of development in progress and this proposal will add to many difficulties of the existing communities. Worksop does not have the capability to safely and adequately offer full Health Care and schooling to accommodate the massive number of extra people coming into the area. This proposal will also destroy habitat for the local wildlife living around us, such as foxes and hedgehogs (statistics show that they could be extinct in 10 years if their habitat is not protected), multiple species for bats (many of which are protected) would be driven out and deer would be prevented from using the wood as they do at present. This would be a loss of invaluable green space that has always been parts of Worksop's local character. Loss off prime local food growing land when councils should be investing in British grown produce now we are no longer in the European Union and helping to mitigate climate change. The increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission thith thousands more in the plan. for a population of 42,000. This saturation policy will increase the numbers in and out of worksop on already unsustainable road, and rail systems.Could you please respond with your comments and detailed confirmation how you intend to address all of the above points and fears, which I have raised, for the benefit and protection of all existing dwellers in the area and the existing natural habitat.	
REF188	Resident	Current infrastructure doesn't support, more children not enough school places and Bassetlaw Hospital unable to cope with the rising population Threat to wildlife Loss of green land, Increased traffic and pollution	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF189	Resident	Comments against the above plan Current infrastructure doesn't support, more children not enough school places and Bassetlaw Hospital unable to cope with the ever increasing population as an experienced sister in a very busy ED Threat to wildlifeLoss of green land, Increased traffic and pollution	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF190	Resident	<p>Comments against the above plan</p> <p>Current infrastructure doesn't support, more children not enough school places and Bassetlaw Hospital unable to cope with the ever increasing population as an experienced sister in a very busy ED</p> <p>Threat to wildlife</p> <p>Loss of green land,</p> <p>Increased traffic and pollution</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF191	Resident	<p>Comments against the above plan</p> <p>Current infrastructure doesn't support, more children not enough school places and Bassetlaw Hospital unable to cope with the ever increasing population as an experienced sister in a very busy ED</p> <p>Threat to wildlife</p> <p>Loss of green land,</p> <p>Increased traffic and pollution</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF192	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF195	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
1196001	Resident	<p>I object as it will spoil the countryside and wildlife and I do not see the need for 750 houses. It will spoil the countryside and destroy the wildlife in the local area. I also do not see the need for 750 houses.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
			continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF196	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation).2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm.3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan).</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF197	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation).2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm.3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan).I am asking for you to stop this development from my view as the future generation. Worksop is overcrowded with too many people as it is without hundreds more. Stop this money making scheme now and think of our little town and the residents already living here. Please.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196005	Resident	<p>I wish to offer my strong support. Recognising that Worksop is relatively constrained in terms of deliverable land, notwithstanding the fact that this site falls within the parish are of Carlton-in- Lindrick, it represents the most logical option for a sustainable urban extension. With this in mind therefore, in spite of the proposal to exempt the site from CIL contributions, I would consider it prudent to amend the parish boundary to accurately portray this as an extension to Worksop.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the need for a comprehensive masterplan for the site, the proposed infrastructure provision, including a distributor road to link Carlton Road and Blyth Road is very much welcomed in an effort to enhance connectivity in the north of Worksop and alleviate the pressure that is already evident upon Cannon Crossroads. In addition to this, however, I would encourage a strong emphasis on connectivity in to and through the neighbouring estates. Current road connectivity within the Hemmingfields/ Wensleydale estates is poor, therefore consideration should be given to strategic linkages for north-south connection. One such example would be at the northern end of Hemmingfield Rise where I believe that the small portion of land originally put forward in the Land Availability Assessment was to be made accessible by the optioned-developer purchasing an existing dwelling that would 'make way' for an access point. This and numerous other points, such as Westerdale, Bransdale and Colsterdale should also be considered as vehicular links as part of the masterplan, in the interests of a truly 'connected' development. Similarly, at the design stage, a strong emphasis should be given to internal roads that connect people with destinations. Other infrastructure and community and recreation facilities provision is also welcomed. While I recognise that a good deal of this will be delivered later in the plan period or even beyond this plan period, I would advocate an 'infrastructure first' approach to development (i.e. as exemplified by other LPAs such as Blaby District Council in their Lubbesthorpe SUE). Prioritising delivery of key pieces of infrastructure (such as road links) early on in the development process can be critical in achieving a positive response from the existing local community. Although the need for affordable housing is recognised and, based on recent delivery rates, is always a challenge in Bassetlaw, consideration should be given to back-loading affordable housing in the phasing process to allow infrastructure delivery. With regard to the proposal for developer contributions towards extending the new Gateford Park Primary School, this is not the appropriate location for this investment relative to this site. As a local resident with children of primary school age, I can assure you that Gateford Park is NOT a realistic geographic option either on foot or by car/public transport. This option would not encourage sustainable forms of transport. Priority should be given to further expansion of Prospect Infant & Junior, along with St John's C of E Academy. Although, as a 'faith school' St John's does not necessarily have a catchment in the same way as others may, the east/west sides of this site are largely equidistant to these schools. Taking a crude 'as the crow flies' measurement indicates that the Gateford Park site would be three times as far to each of these schools. While there is an inevitable environmental impact associated with large scale greenfield development, I do not believe that this site is particularly high grade agricultural land (although the national dataset does not appear to give detailed information for this precise location). Nonetheless, the proposed measures for enhanced green infrastructure are considered extremely positive, in conjunction with the policy shift towards biodiversity net gains.</p>	Support noted and welcome
1196006	Resident	<p>This is ridiculous you cannot just keep building houses on all the green land there a plenty of area that need to be tidied up without building on all the fields you are not thinking about the wildlife in these areas. The schools, doctors and town centre need investment before increasing the population in the area and as for the hospital this needs to be fully functional again. Please stop building on the open fields we have issues with flooding this is only going to increase by keep building on the fields. Please see the response previous we currently have two development sites in Carlton this is more that enough 1500 house on the farm land is total unacceptable the doctors schools and hospital will not cope with the demand that are already stretched the traffic becomes worse making it impossible to get in and out of the village Before we know it there will be no fields left the wildlife needs to be protected. The town centre needs investment we need to support the local businesses and make the town centre worth visiting again.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
			continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF201	Severn Trent	As with the other policies within the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan, we are supportive of the inclusion of statements regarding an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional green space. However we felt it is important that specific points regarding the Drainage Hierarchy, SuDS, retention of open Watercourses for outfall continuity are included. We would also advise that a statement regarding Water efficiency and the promotion of the 110l/p/d are included. Some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village comments above. The Peaks Hill Farm site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Thank you for your comments. The Council will ensure these points are taken into consideration in the evolution of the Bassetlaw Plan.
REF204		Have you learnt nothing from all the floods in worksop or is money more important. You are allowing them to build on all these green belts that provide soak aways for heavy rain and at this rate it wont be long before estates up theivesdale are flooding. Not only are they building without any thought or provisions for schools doctors and roads but they give these houses brick and concrete gardens so the water has no where to go. Stop this greed and start thinking of the future and if we must build more houses then the developers should be made to provide the facilities for these extra people . I doubt you will take note of anyones concerns but we have to try	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF208	Resident	<p>I wish to make it known that we are totally against the SIGNIFICANT proposed development which is planned on the land at the rear of my property/land. My main objections are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents, traffic infrastructure and wildlife. 2) the amount of housing proposed exceeds local needs. It will inevitably attract people from the likes of Sheffield and Doncaster who will commute to third place of work outside Worksop. With the roads already congested this will cause traffic jams, added pollution and noise. Because of the location being accessible from the A1 and M1, currently if there is an accident on either of these extremely busy roads traffic naturally diverts along the A57 or Blyth Road and along Thievesdale Lane to get to the other (from M1 to the A1 and visa versa). This is already heavy traffic and with added volume there is a significant risk of accidents and god forbid injury or loss of life. 3) loss of prime arable farming land which is needed now but certainly will be needed in the future as populations increase. 4) loss of wildlife. In my back garden I get hedgehogs, sparrow hawks, there are buzzards nests in the woods a look onto and that's not to mention the insects, butterflies and a whole range of smaller birds. At night there are BATS flying around my garden. The development will have a detrimental affect on all of these and more. 5) the actual building work and length of time it will take will cause noise, dust etc and will not only impact on my health but there are many elderly people living alongside the planned development site - their health, breathing conditions etc needs to be considered. <p>Should my objections be considered insignificant and the building work gets the green light then I would like to make the following comments/suggestions:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) there has to be a buffer zone between the current homes of say a minimum of 15 metres to maintain privacy and wildlife. The zone should include a raised bank and or trees/shrubs to block out noise/dust/view from the construction and properties. This needs to be created BEFORE actual building work starts. 2) no direct onlookers between the current properties and the new (back gardens backing onto the buffer zone and the positioning and height of such new properties to be considered). My property as others on Westerdale stand proud and looks down onto the field. 3) minimal street lighting to minimise light pollution. 4) maximise tree and shrub planting to encourage wildlife. 5) build affordable low level properties for local people/ bungalows for the elderly and properties for first time buyers. 6) decent sized garden space for dwellings again to encourage outdoor activities and wildlife (do not allow developers to maximise profits and cram the maximum number of properties on the site). <p>I would welcome anyone, involved in the decision making, to visit my property so they could gain a useful insight as I the impact this would have on me personally and my neighbours.</p> <p>I do hope mine and my local friends and neighbours comments are read and seriously considered PLEASE.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF209	Resident	<p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF210	Resident	<p>I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Ripponhomes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see: 11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF211 (Map Included)	Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council	<p>Firstly it is disappointing to note that the site in question is identified as “Northern Worksop” and its location within the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick seems to have been “overlooked”. This inevitably has led to residents concluding that the proposed development site must be outside the boundary which is applicable to the Parish Neighbourhood Plan which is not the case. It is suggested therefore that whilst the site could be defined as being North of Worksop it should also include reference to its location which is within the Carlton in Lindrick Parish. Secondly, the Parish Council wishes to make representations on the site development plan included on page 76 and identified as “figure 14” Peaks Hill Farm. The site proposed for development comprises an area edged in red and located between Blyth Road and the “committed” housing development on the eastern boundary and the A60 highway on the western boundary. The Parish Council and community comment made to the Parish Council strongly represents the view that the open agricultural area opposite the property known as “Freshfields” and bordered on its eastern and southern edge by mature woodland and on its western edge by the A60 Highway be retained, protected and excluded from any form of development for the duration of the current local plan. It is felt that this measure would protect the existing natural boundary inbetween the Worksop “Urban” Environment and the “Rural” Environment of Carlton in Lindrick. The natural boundary is recognised through the existence of the woodland and the high ridge of land on the southern side of the agricultural area defined earlier in this paragraph. (see references 1 and 2 on enclosed map) This requested amendment is consistent with Policy 10 of the approved Neighbourhood Plan in that it protects the rural environment on the eastern side of the A60 Highway. Reference is also made to the northern red line site boundary of the proposed development area. The trees and woodland extending northwards from Peaks Hill Farm also define the rural environment within the Parish and will serve to define the rural landscape from the proposed development which extends the “urban” environment of Worksop. It is therefore requested that this woodland area which is outside the red development site boundary be preserved and protected. (see reference 3 on enclosed map). The proposals put forward by the Parish Council would effectively create a new western boundary for site development shown at 4 on the attached plan. Thirdly, the Parish Council wishes to make observations and representations on the proposed new “link” road inbetween Blyth Road and the A60 Highway. Whilst the exact “line” of the new road is not yet defined in the current draft plan the Parish Council requests that the following implications be considered:-a) land bordering the new road which is likely to be located north of the proposed housing development should remain “undeveloped” with existing woodland and agricultural landscapes being preserved. This measure once again would comply with existing policies in the Neighbourhood Plan applicable to the eastern side of the A60 Highway. b) the detailed location of the link road should be carefully considered not only for its links to the road network bordering the Gateford Area and accessing the new A57 roundabout but for the potential additional effects on highways within the Carlton in Lindrick Parish. At the current time increasing volumes of vehicular traffic travelling north on Blyth Road from Worksop uses Hundred Acre Lane for access to the village and for access to the A60 Highway at the junction of Greenway. The traffic volume will further increase when employment capacity is applied to the commercial aspects of “Peppers Site” on Blyth Road. The access to the A60 Highway from Greenway is becoming increasingly unsuitable and has an adverse effect on queuing traffic trying to gain access to the A60 from Long Lane. In addition the narrow roads and inadequate footways prevalent from where Hundred Acre Lane joins Tinkers Hill and Greenway are totally unsuitable for “through” traffic to the A60. The narrow roads and narrow footways also are located in the Conservation Area. It is therefore suggested that the proposed “link” road could provide a recommended route to the A60 for vehicular traffic travelling from Blyth Road to the village or travelling north on the A60. Such measures could give opportunity for appropriate highway restrictions to be applied on Hundred Acre Lane to allow access to businesses and residential premises in the conservation area and reduce the environmental and safety hazards created by traffic currently gaining access to the A60 Highway. In addition the draft plan does make reference to the practicalities of providing cycle routes on highway schemes. The Parish Council would support these measures for cyclists particularly in the light of environmental protection and the safety of increasing numbers on cyclists following routes in the Rural District of Bassetlaw. Finally, I would make the point that articulating in writing some of the above representations can at times need aspects of clarification and understanding. Please do not hesitate to contact me if this applies to any of the above content.</p>	<p>The Plan will be amended to clarify that the site sits with Carlton Parish. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF212	Resident	<p>I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)². I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm³. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime⁴. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction⁵. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable⁶. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems⁷. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster⁸. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change⁹. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character¹⁰. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:¹¹ A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife¹². New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor¹³. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline¹⁴. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)¹⁵. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution¹⁶. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses¹⁷. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport¹⁸. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook¹⁹. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings²⁰. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196338	Resident	<p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. Currently Outwood Academy Valley is oversubscribed and for the last 3 years some children have not been able to attend and this will be the closest secondary school to the development. The Post 16 centre is almost at maximum capacity and is the only place in Worksop to study A levels. This means residents of these new homes will have to be bussed out for both secondary school and further education thus adding to traffic and pollution. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 21. No access including pedestrian onto existing streets such as Wonster Grove which back onto the development.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196339	Resident	<p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. Currently Outwood Academy Valley is oversubscribed and for the last 3 years some children have not been able to attend and this will be the closest secondary school to the development. The Post 16 centre is almost at maximum capacity and is the only place in Worksop to study A levels. This means residents of these new homes will have to be bussed out for both secondary school and further education thus adding to traffic and pollution. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 21. No access including pedestrian onto existing streets such as Wonster Grove which back onto the development.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF216	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site.4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.11. No vehicle access through existing estates adjacent to the proposed. If my concerns are over-ruled, I would like to see:-12. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development.13. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to extend the green corridor14. Any communal areas, to be located away from any existing homes and behind the treeline15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Housing that local people can afford and cater for an elderly population with bungalows etc20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF219	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF220	Resident	<p>I wish to formally raise concerns regarding the proposed Bassetlaw Plan for the Peaks Hill Farm (Policy 15), page 78 onwards. I do not believe that the Council has met their obligation in ensuring that locally affected residents have been properly consulted in relation to the planning process as per appendix 4 of the Local Plan. I am against the inclusion of the prime farmland and current green space land at Peaks Hill Farm within the Bassetlaw Plan. The proposed development site is extremely large and will have a significant impact on local residents. Currently there are over 150 houses being developed already on existing green fields adjacent to this proposed use of land. The Bassetlaw Plan is proposing an additional 1500 homes. This will result in all existing local residents being exposed to significant levels of noise, pollution, transport disruption and inconvenience over at least 15 years. A large proportion of the bordering homes are resided in by older adults. This will have a significant impact on them. The dwellings are being built before any supporting infrastructure is in place (such as schools, GPs etc). There is already significant pressure on the existing infrastructure such as long waits for GP appointments. The railway station at Worksop is very small and already overcrowded, so new commuters are likely to travel by car and not use public transport. This proposed area will in essence be a commuter belt for neighbouring towns and cities. The current roads and infrastructure are already extremely busy and are small, single carriageway country style roads. The three main roads (A57, Carlton Road and Blyth Road) will see significant increased amounts of both construction traffic and commuting traffic. This will increase danger and pollution to all in the local area. The current roads systems are ill-equipped to deal with this increase of population. The town centre is in dire need of regeneration and I feel that this should be the priority for the town before trying to attract new residents. Although the council have stated a commitment to regeneration and rejuvenation to the town centre, this is not mirrored in the fact that new development of supermarkets / fast food areas are already being constructed out of the town centre which will not encourage residents into the centre. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. Bassetlaw is a District that has multiple green space and is rich with wildlife, flora and fauna. I have personally seen multiple species in the fields, such as deer, hare, foxes and buzzards to name a few. This development will have a devastating impact on the existing habits and ecology in this area. I remain perplexed as to why brownfield sites are not being utilised and that the Council are proposing to destroy the local greenfield site in favour of increasing the local human population. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) champions brownfield development over building on greenbelt areas. Also, that using existing sites helps to regenerate towns and cities and provides new homes in areas of high demand. As report 25/3/2019 – research found that England has enough derelict or vacant land to build more than 1 million new homes – two thirds of which are ready to start immediately. If my concerns are over-ruled, then I would expect to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 3. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 4. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 5. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 8. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 9. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF221	Resident	<p>1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Strategic Highways</p> <p>Part 4, a) it should state distributor road standard.</p> <p>Part 4, a), (iv)- should include reference to pedestrian and cycle links through the site linking the A60 and B6045.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>The Peaks Hill Farm allocation for mixed use development is adjacent to the mineral and waste site of Carlton Forest where previously sand and gravel was extracted, with the land restored through landfill. Importation of waste has now ceased, and the landfill area restored though a gas compound remains on site, which the County Council has an interest in. Mineral extraction has also now ceased at Carlton Forest however part of the site is still to be restored as per the conditions attached to the permission granted by the County Council. The operator is currently working with the County Council on a new restoration scheme for this area and so the site remains of interest to the County Council who will also monitor the aftercare progress. Considering the proposed allocation and the above, providing any proposed scheme at the allocation site does not conflict with the restoration or aftercare process or the gas compound, the County Council does not wish to raise any concern with development at this proposed allocation site in terms of minerals and waste.</p>	The policy will be amended to reflect the comments made.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF223	Resident	<p>I wish to formally raise concerns regarding the proposed Bassetlaw Plan for the Peaks Hill Farm (Policy 15), page 78 onwards. I do not believe that the Council has met their obligation in ensuring that locally affected residents have been properly consulted in relation to the planning process as per appendix 4 of the Local Plan. I am against the inclusion of the prime farmland and current green space land at Peaks Hill Farm within the Bassetlaw Plan. The proposed development site is extremely large and will have a significant impact on local residents. Currently there are over 150 houses being developed already on existing green fields adjacent to this proposed use of land. The Bassetlaw Plan is proposing an additional 1500 homes. This will result in all existing local residents being exposed to significant levels of noise, pollution, transport disruption and inconvenience over at least 15 years. A large proportion of the bordering homes are resided in by older adults. This will have a significant impact on them. The dwellings are being built before any supporting infrastructure is in place (such as schools, GPs etc). There is already significant pressure on the existing infrastructure such as long waits for GP appointments. The railway station at Worksop is very small and already overcrowded, so new commuters are likely to travel by car and not use public transport. This proposed area will in essence be a commuter belt for neighbouring towns and cities. The current roads and infrastructure are already extremely busy and are small, single carriageway country style roads. The three main roads (A57, Carlton Road and Blyth Road) will see significant increased amounts of both construction traffic and commuting traffic. This will increase danger and pollution to all in the local area. The current roads systems are ill-equipped to deal with this increase of population. The town centre is in dire need of regeneration and I feel that this should be the priority for the town before trying to attract new residents. Although the council have stated a commitment to regeneration and rejuvenation to the town centre, this is not mirrored in the fact that new development of supermarkets / fast food areas are already being constructed out of the town centre which will not encourage residents into the centre. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. Bassetlaw is a District that has multiple green space and is rich with wildlife, flora and fauna. I have personally seen multiple species in the fields, such as deer, hare, foxes and buzzards to name a few. This development will have a devastating impact on the existing habits and ecology in this area. I remain perplexed as to why brownfield sites are not being utilised and that the Council are proposing to destroy the local greenfield site in favour of increasing the local human population. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) champions brownfield development over building on greenbelt areas. Also, that using existing sites helps to regenerate towns and cities and provides new homes in areas of high demand. As report 25/3/2019 – research found that England has enough derelict or vacant land to build more than 1 million new homes – two thirds of which are ready to start immediately. If my concerns are over-ruled, then I would expect to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 3. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 4. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 5. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 8. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 9. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF225	Resident	<p>• Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF226	Resident	<p>• Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF227	Resident	<p>• Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196652	Resident	<p>I AM TOTALLY AGAINST THE ST15 HS1 DEVELOPMENT..... AS A FUTURE GENERATION OF THE AREA I AM HORRIFIED THAT YOU ARE EVEN CONSIDERING THE DESTRUCTION AND ALLOWING THE DECLINE OF RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL LAND BY ALLOWING UNNECESSARY HOUSING TO BE BUILT ON THIS LAND WHICH IS TIME IMMEMORIAL AND ESTABLISHED AS GREEN LAND WHICH CAN ONLY SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE WITH ITS BIO DIVERSITY OF TREES , WILDLIFE, AND EXISTING ECO SYSTEMS . I FEEL VERY ANNOYED AND UPSET THAT AT NO TIME HAVE I EVER BEEN CONSULTED OR INFORMED ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL WHICH HAVING READ MORE ACTUALLY DATES BACK BEYOND 2016 !!!!! THIS IS OUTRAGEOUS AND YOU HAVE NOT APPLIED THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROCESS CORRECTLY. THE DEVELOPMENT SITE IS TOO LARGE AND WILL HAVE A DETREMENTAL AFFECT ON LOCAL RESIDENTS, THE WILDLIFE AND ECO SYSTEMS THAT EXIST IN HARMONY WITH NATURE. YOU WANT TO BUILD HOMES WITH NO INFRASTRUCTURE UNTIL AFTER THEY ARE FINISHEDIT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO OBTAIN DOCTORS AND DENTAL APPOINTMENTS WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME FRAME , FOR EXAMPLE I WANTED A DENTAL CHECK UP FOR LAST WEEK AND AM UNABLE TO GET ONE FOR 6 WEEKS WHICH TAKES US INTO APRIL WHICH IS BEYOND BELIEF. THE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE IS STRUGGLING TO COPE AT THE PRESENT TIME AND THIEVESDALE LANE/BLYTH ROAD JUNCTION HAS HAD NUMEROUS ACCIDENTS AND NO PLANS TO IMPROVE THIS YET YOU WANT ADD A POTENTIAL 3000 CARS (AS MOST 3/4/5 BEDROOMED HOUSES WILL HAVE MORE THAN ONE CAR) TO THIS ALREADY CONGESTED SYSTEM - THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS FAR EXCEED THE NATIONAL QUOTE BY 20% AND LOCAL QUOTA BY 10%THIS SATURATION WILL ONLY BRING IN COMMUTERS WHICH WON'T ADD TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF WORKSOP TOWN OR ITS ROAD OR RAIL STRUCTURE. THE LOSS OF LOCAL PRIME FOOD GROWING LAND IS OUTRAGEOUS WHEN THE COUNCIL SHOULD BE LOOKING AT LOCAL SUSTAINABILITY ESPECIALLY IN THESE DAYS OF CLIMATE CHANGE - DO YOU ACTUALLY CARE ABOUT THE FUTURE GENERATIONS OR JUST LINING YOUR POCKETS FOR NOW WITH NO REGARD TO MY OR MY FUTURE CHILDREN'S LIFE. THE LOSS OF ESTABLISHED WILDLIFE SUCH AS BIRDS INCLUDING SPARROW HAWKS, BUZZARDS, OWLS, FROGS , TOADS, BATS, HARES , HEDGEHOGS, AND THE INSECT POPULATION WHICH THRIVES ON THE POLLINATION IN THIS GREEN AREA IS GOING TO BE TOTALLY DESTRUCTIVE TO THE PRESENT TIME AND EVEN MORE TO THE FUTURE AND THE FUTURE GENERATIONS . I WOULD LIKE YOU TO RECONSIDER YOUR PLANNING ACTIONS AND LOOK AT REGENERATING THE EYESORES THAT CURRENTLY EXIST AND MAKE THAT AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND BUILD ON BROWN LAND THAT IS ALREADY EMPTY AND CAN BE MADE SUSTAINABLE WHICH IS A FAR MORE PROACTIVE WAY TO GO TO PROMOTE CLIMATE CHANGE , ECO STRUCTURE AND REGENERATING AREAS THAT REALLY NEED IT RATHER THAN DESTROYING GREEN LAND THAT SERVES A MASSIVE PURPOSE FOR THE CLIMATE AND FUTURE SURVIVAL OF THE AREA . I TRUST YOU WILL TAKE THESE CONSIDERATIONS VERY SERIOUSLY AND RECONSIDER THIS WHOLE PLANNING PROCESS</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF229	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
REF230	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
1196658	Resident	As a Carlton resident I am dismayed by the proposal to build extensively on this beautiful site which gladdens the heart on the way home.	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF232	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF233	Resident	<p>against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at PeakHills Farm policy 15 within the Bassetlaw local planThe development is much to large and will have too much impact on ourselves and other local residents of Worksop The initial 750 dwellings plus the business and employment land as well as the 174 that areCurrently being built off Blyth road will mean all local residents in the wide vicinity will be subject toPollution, disruption and inconvenience for at least 15 years of this being a building site.For many of the elderly residents in this area this will probably be mean the rest of their lives.These dwellings will be built before any thoughts have gone into building much needed infrastructure such aSuch as Doctors surgeries, dentists and schools which are needed much more than more houseson green space We already under pressure in Bassetlaw infrastructure for the above essentials as we can no longer able to get doctors appointments without waiting weeks sometimes meaning this can be too late!Getting into town is getting more difficult by the day especially from the A57 all connecting roads to theA1are single lane country roads the trains are very unreliable and the car park for this is nowhere near big enough The planning far exceeds local need 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan.This 'saturation' policy for a population of 42,000 will seriously increase the amount of commuters.in and out of Worksop and we already have a unsustainable road and rail system this will increase pollution traffic and reliance on poor connective services to external areas of employee such as Doncaster /Sheffield.We will lose prime food growing land when what the council should be doing is encouraging climate change.Loss of our beautiful countryside very valuable green space.The sad loss of our established local wildlife including Owls Bats Sparrow Hawks & Buzzards all which frequent this area, and not forgetting the frogs toads newts hares hedgehogs and insects.I would like to see our objections upheld but in case the are overruled then -:1- A buffer zone of at least 15 metres between current homes for privacy and wildlife2- New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase distance between existing homes and new housing increasing the green corridor.3- Any communal areas such as youth facilities, playgroups/ playgrounds car parks and sports pitchesTo be located away from any existing homes in the centre of new development and behind the tree line.4- New development to have minimal car parking space to discourage multiple car ownership therefore reducing noise and pollution linked to climate change.5- Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6- Low level housing for example bungalows not high rise townhouses near to existing homes.7- Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connecting woodland inclusive cycle pathswalking routes to connecting public transport 8- Maximise tree and shrub planting to open spaces and verges to create a more attractive environment.and build more bungalows etc for our elderly not enormously overpriced homes that will encourage More city commuters and pollution from their vehicles.9- decent sized garden and space between homes so people can healthily benefit from the outdoors.10- do not allow developers to greedily profit from agreeing to the (At Least 750)dwellings as stated in the plan11- Do not allow the building of the recycling plant also rumoured?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF234	Resident	<p>Are against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at PeakHills Farm policy 15 within the Bassetlaw local planThe development is much to large and will have too much impact on ourselves and other local residents of Worksop The initial 750 dwellings plus the business and employment land as well as the 174 that areCurrently being built off Blyth road will mean all local residents in the wide vicinity will be subject toPollution, disruption and inconvenience for at least 15 years of this being a building site.For many of the elderly residents in this area this will probably be mean the rest of their lives.These dwellings will be built before any thoughts have gone into building much needed infrastructure such aSuch as Doctors surgeries, dentists and schools which are needed much more than more houseson green space We already under pressure in Bassetlaw infrastructure for the above essentials as we can no longer able to get doctors appointments without waiting weeks sometimes meaning this can be too late!Getting into town is getting more difficult by the day especially from the A57 all connecting roads to theA1are single lane country roads the trains are very unreliable and the car park for this is nowhere near big enough The planning far exceeds local need 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan.This 'saturation' policy for a population of 42,000 will seriously increase the amount of commuters.in and out of Worksop and we already have a unsustainable road and rail system this will increase pollution traffic and reliance on poor connective services to external areas of employee such as Doncaster /Sheffield.We will lose prime food growing land when what the council should be doing is encouraging climate change.Loss of our beautiful countryside very valuable green space.The sad loss of our established local wildlife including Owls Bats Sparrow Hawks & Buzzards all which frequent this area, and not forgetting the frogs toads newts hares hedgehogs and insects.I would like to see our objections upheld but in case the are overruled then -:1- A buffer zone of at least 15 metres between current homes for privacy and wildlife2- New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase distance between existing homes and new housing increasing the green corridor.3- Any communal areas such as youth facilities, playgroups/ playgrounds car parks and sports pitchesTo be located away from any existing homes in the centre of new development and behind the tree line.4- New development to have minimal car parking space to discourage multiple car ownership therefore reducing noise and pollution linked to climate change.5- Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6- Low level housing for example bungalows not high rise townhouses near to existing homes.7- Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connecting woodland inclusive cycle pathswalking routes to connecting public transport 8- Maximise tree and shrub planting to open spaces and verges to create a more attractive environment.and build more bungalows etc for our elderly not enormously overpriced homes that will encourage More city commuters and pollution from their vehicles.9- decent sized garden and space between homes so people can healthily benefit from the outdoors.10- do not allow developers to greedily profit from agreeing to the (At Least 750)dwellings as stated in the plan11- Do not allow the building of the recycling plant also rumoured?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF235	Resident	<p>After reading the proposal for Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm, could you inform me how the LPA have considered reasonable alternatives to the site? I have deep reservations about transport links, further school places and medical and social facilities for new and existing residents. If the plans go ahead then I would like you to write to me to guarantee the required infrastructure will be in place. Please find below further comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm 1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. This is in addition to delays in seeing medical staff at Larwood surgery. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF236	Resident	<p>I am against the building of anything on this rural landscape. I live only meters away from this proposed development land. It is regarded as a quiet and well-hidden area. This would be under threat by the thousands of people that would potentially be moving in right on my door step. Traffic congestion at rush hour along Carlton Road is already at unbearable levels, often backing up past Eddison Park Avenue and almost outside of the current Worksop boundary. The potential of hundreds more cars added on to the unbearable levels of congestion at peak times would cause misery to the people who live in the area. The added potential of a through road being added on to the end of Winster Grove and in to the new development is also very troubling as it would mean that a quiet residential street would become a cut-through to potentially hundreds of vehicles. I am yet to see any sort of congestion mitigation measures to be announced by Bassetlaw District Council and this is very worrying. It is also very troubling that I am yet to see any development plans for vital services such as schools and doctors surgeries that match the scale of the number of dwellings being proposed. Waiting lists for local GP surgeries are already weeks long and there is a struggle to find places at local schools for local children. Whilst building a primary school on this proposed site would ease the pressure on school places that would come with this development, it would only add further stress to those trying to find secondary school places for their children. I am also very concerned about the effect on wildlife and the environment that this development would have. I often see an array of wildlife in my garden including squirrels, hedgehogs and a wide species of birds, many of whom come from the Gateford Hill woods. The possibility of felling dozens of trees on the Gateford Hill woods and also the Long plantation will have a worrying effect on both wildlife and the environment, something which will be made worse by the thousands of homes, cars and people moving in to the area. The current land of this proposed development currently also acts as a very useful flood plain. This development will only worsen the current climate crisis and damage local habitat for generations to come. Instead of creating homes for the people of Worksop, I fear that all this development will do is invite people from other areas to come and live in Worksop, therefore doing very little to help local people. There are already thousands upon thousands of houses being built or planned across Bassetlaw including 151 homes at Hawfinch Place in Carlton in Lindrick, 1,600 homes at Simpson Park in Harworth, 71 houses on the Lidl site on Blyth Road, thousands more houses on Gateford Park and Gateford Common in Worksop as well as Shireoaks Common. This is only a small fraction of the homes currently planned or under construction in a small area of Bassetlaw. Whilst I am not against all of these developments, I am deeply concerned about the effect many of them will have on my current way of life and standard of living as I am only 22 years of age.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF238	Resident	<p>, I would like to request an extension to the consultation process for the draft Bassetlaw Plan that affects plans for the development of land known as Peaks Hill Farm. > > My request for this extension is on the basis of lack of appropriate consultation with local residents. Residents were 'informed' via a single A4 leaflet fastened to a lamp post at the end of our road prior to the consultation meeting on 4 -2 -20. Surely each individual household should have been informed of the plans and the meeting well in advance of the meeting date? Also the meeting was scheduled to be held at a time when most residents were at work and therefore unable to attend.> > I have already emailed my initial objections to such a huge development on the Peaks Hill site but I have since read the draft plan and now have further objections. Whilst I support the need for local regeneration plans, I fail to see the need to build such a huge housing estate on greenfield farming land. It's clear to see that the developers of the recently built houses on Gateford are struggling to sell them, hence they are now being offered at reduced prices. Therefore there is no guarantee that developers will be able to sell over 1, 500 houses on Peaks Hill Farm.> > The building of such a huge estate clearly contravenes Bassetlaw District Council's strategic objectives to preserve greenfield and farm land. It will lead to the destruction of acres of natural countryside and wildlife, it will increase increase pollution and contribute to the devastating impact of global warming. > > The negative implications of such massive scale house building for the infrastructure in Worksop is worrying as it will negatively effect all Bassetlaw residents. It appears that there is insufficient provision in the draft plan to increase school places, health services and road links to the level needed until these houses are built and sold. > > I would like to see a more realistic number of houses proposed to be built on Peaks Hill Farm which would not cause such devastation to the environment and infrastructure and would not exceed the market demand for new houses.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF240	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF241	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF242	Resident	<p>Please find attached a form with comments regarding the peaks hill farm proposed development. These comments sum up both mine and many other people's opinions I have spoken with in the local area on the proposed development, which I feel we have not even been properly informed of at which I am extremely disappointed of. Please consider these comments and think of the impact this development would have on the current residents of Worksop, especially young adults like myself. Myself and many others would be tempted to move away from the area if projects like this go ahead, due reasons mentioned in the attached document. In addition to this, Worksop town centre to me feels like it is dying a slow painful death, which leaves myself and many people my age going to places like Doncaster and Sheffield just for something to do, as there are only so many times we can go to the pub!! I'm all for supporting the town I have lived in all my life, but only if investment goes into actually making the town better, not just by building houses! Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF243	Resident	<p>I have to say after reviewing the plans I'm a little disappointed. I understand the pressure to build the extra housing has come from the housing secretary but nowhere in the plans does it mention the fact that Bassetlaw is a ex miner's community and with this sadly in 10-15 years' time many elderly's who own miners housing will be sadly passing away and leaving them to their heirs . Presently Worksop has 1500 empty homes. I think since the average life expectancy is approximately 80 years old it would be good to consider how many people are now 65 and owning their homes and basing the figures from there. Whilst considering this, I can see that there are plans to build on many of Worksop's Greenland but no consideration for expansion of bereavement and cemeteries. I'd like this to be reviewed and considered because this effects all families. In relation to the actual plans. I'm in two minds regarding this but also a little frustrated. Myself and my fiancé bought our first home on October 2018 and specially asked our solicitor regarding the belt of land behind our home and we were advised it would be very difficult for planning permission to be obtained to build. With this we "overpaid" for our home by an extra thousand pounds and since then have invested an extra ten thousand pounds into making our house a home. The reason we had chosen ... as our forever home was because of the peace and serenity the views and the bench at the bottom of the garden gave us. My fiancé suffers badly with anxiety and depression and the idea of possibly up to 4000 people living behind us is upsetting him tremendously. I wish along with these plans of yours you could also invent a time machine so we could turn back time and have never made this mistake of purchasing this property. You state that you want to build affordable housing, but I can confirm the prices that the Gateford properties were going for (£150,000.00 for a 2 bedroom house) was never going to be affordable for a young working couple starting out in life. Living in our home has meant we have been close to family and with my Grandma Vera, being seriously ill I can be close to her supporting her as she does not have a carer and still able to commute to work. I worry with the expansion of the housing the increase this will have on traffic I need to be able to get out of Worksop quickly and be with my grandma some days in less the 30 minutes but I highly doubt with affected road closures whilst disruptions occur for the next 15 years this would happen. I also worry about the infrastructure of Worksop, in recent months there has been mass flooding. This flooding also affected Theievesdale. Luckily, I don't believe anyone's home were flooded the drains simply were over flowing and the field which you're planning to build on also flooded. If more houses and drains were added to the already strained drainage system, I think this would cause more harm then good. Another thing which also concerns me is that it has been clearly stated the houses need to be built first before any support can be given to local schools and GP's. I'd like to raise right now that I am aware of a couple of children who have had to be schooled from home as there were no placements for them. So, with further increased population how do you plan to allocate education for these children without the funding? Living so close to Sherwood Forest and Clumber Park I'm disappointed that the green spaces which form part of Worksop's charm will be taken away for more breeze blocked homes. I wouldn't class Worksop as a desirable place to live but I would say it attracts tourism from the national parks with them being so close to Worksop. Taking away Worksop's inner community and extending it and changing the road system seems like an unwise decision and I fail to see the benefits to the town centre which needs attention and funding, as its beginning to look like a ghost town. I'd also like to mention regarding the wildlife. Although this will be the last of your concerns the last summer was beautiful, we saw owls, hedgehogs, butterflies and have built a bee hotel for the creatures. Its already up there that the bees and butterflies are declining again I'm unsure why you would want to destroy more Greenland for housing where as stated in my first paragraph I don't think has been well thought out. Ultimately despite all my negatives against these new housing if you can ensure that housing will be affordable to young couples (2 bedroom house for £100,000.00, 3 for £125,000.00 ect) I think it would be great but we had no support like this when we moved into our home. And as mentioned before paid over the odds. If the plans were to go ahead despite my above concerns I'd like to request the following terms if the plans were to go ahead.-A Green tree lined buffer between our homes and the new properties. -Any communal areas to be moved away from the green tree line buffer and placed centrally or at the other side of the development away from our existing properties. -We'd like compensation for the disruption the new development will have on our lives. We already are beginning to get extremely frustrated with the existing development happening at the bottom of our road near Blyth road despite being 500 yards away from it. -We'd like for the new development to be a safe haven for the wildlife we have presently with this we want to see open spaces with wild flower seeds sown each year like near the hospital and we'd like more trees and shrubs to be planted and incorporated into the plans. -We'd like minimal lighting near our properties. Many of us have built summerhomes/glorified sheds overlooking onto the field and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	have conservatories which to us are our relaxation rooms and we don't want blinding lights disturbing our routines. I'd like to highlight that the new plans are going to affect all of the residents in our day to day lives. I do worry what the increased traffic on A57 will mean for me commuting to work and getting to my grandma's home. But at the end of the day this decision will be decided by the council I just hope that the decision is for the greater need and to not just tick a box to say you did the thing the home secretary asked.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196693	Resident	<p>I AM TOTALLY AGAINST THE ST15 HS1 DEVELOPMENT..... AS A FUTURE GENERATION OF THE AREA I AM HORRIFIED THAT YOU ARE EVEN CONSIDERING THE DESTRUCTION AND ALLOWING THE DECLINE OF RURAL AND AGRICULTURAL LAND BY ALLOWING UNNECESSARY HOUSING TO BE BUILT ON THIS LAND WHICH IS TIME IMMEMORIAL AND ESTABLISHED AS GREEN LAND WHICH CAN ONLY SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE WITH ITS BIO DIVERSITY OF TREES , WILDLIFE, AND EXISTING ECO SYSTEMS . I FEEL VERY ANNOYED AND UPSET THAT AT NO TIME HAVE I EVER BEEN CONSULTED OR INFORMED ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL WHICH HAVING READ MORE ACTUALLY DATES BACK BEYOND 2016 !!!!! THIS IS OUTRAGEOUS AND YOU HAVE NOT APPLIED THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROCESS CORRECTLY. THE DEVELOPMENT SITE IS TOO LARGE AND WILL HAVE A DETREMENTAL AFFECT ON LOCAL RESIDENTS, THE WILDLIFE AND ECO SYSTEMS THAT EXIST IN HARMONY WITH NATURE. YOU WANT TO BUILD HOMES WITH NO INFRASTRUCTURE UNTIL AFTER THEY ARE FINISHEDIT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO OBTAIN DOCTORS AND DENTAL APPOINTMENTS WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME FRAME , FOR EXAMPLE I WANTED A DENTAL CHECK UP FOR LAST WEEK AND AM UNABLE TO GET ONE FOR 6 WEEKS WHICH TAKES US INTO APRIL WHICH IS BEYOND BELIEF. HOW CAN YOU PLAN ON BUILDING 1500 HOUSES PLUS ALL THE OTHER PROPOSED AREAS AND YET NOT PROVIDE THE SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE UNTIL ITS COMPLETED AND SOLD..... 1500 3/4/5/ BEDROOMED HOUSES WILL HAVE CHILDREN IN THEM SO HOW DO YOU PROPOSE TO SCHOOL THEM SEEN AS THE LOCAL ESTABLISHMENTS ARE ALREADY AT CAPACITY WITH PORTLAND ACTUALLY BEEN OVERSUBSCRIBED THIS YEAR. THE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE IS STRUGGLING TO COPE AT THE PRESENT TIME AND THIEVESDALE LANE/BLYTH ROAD JUNCTION HAS HAD NUMEROUS ACCIDENTS AND NO PLANS TO IMPROVE THIS YET YOU WANT ADD A POTENTIAL 3000 CARS (AS MOST 3/4/5 BEDROOMED HOUSES WILL HAVE MORE THAN ONE CAR) TO THIS ALREADY CONGESTED SYSTEM - THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. YOU QUOTE THAT THIS LINK ROAD WILL TAKE PRESSURE OFF WORKSOP TOWN TRAFFIC , THIS IS A COMPLETE FALSEHOOD AS IT WILL INCREASE TRAFFIC FLOW AND CREATE MORE CONGESTION ON CARLTON ROAD, BLYTH ROAD, KILTON HILL WHICH ALL LINK INTO TOWN THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS FAR EXCEED THE NATIONAL QUOTE BY 20% AND LOCAL QUOTA BY 10%THIS SATURATION WILL ONLY BRING IN COMMUTERS WHICH WON'T ADD TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF WORKSOP TOWN OR ITS ROAD OR RAIL STRUCTURE. THE LOSS OF LOCAL PRIME FOOD GROWING LAND IS OUTRAGEOUS WHEN THE COUNCIL SHOULD BE LOOKING AT LOCAL SUSTAINABILITY ESPECIALLY IN THESE DAYS OF CLIMATE CHANGE - DO YOU ACTUALLY CARE ABOUT THE FUTURE GENERATIONS OR JUST LINING YOUR POCKETS FOR NOW WITH NO REGARD TO MY OR MY FUTURE CHILDREN'S LIFE. THE LOSS OF ESTABLISHED WILDLIFE SUCH AS BIRDS INCLUDING SPARROW HAWKS, BUZZARDS, OWLS, FROGS , TOADS, BATS, HARES , HEDGEHOGS, AND THE INSECT POPULATION WHICH THRIVES ON THE POLLINATION IN THIS GREEN AREA IS GOING TO BE TOTALLY DESTRUCTIVE TO THE PRESENT TIME AND EVEN MORE TO THE FUTURE AND THE FUTURE GENERATIONS . I WOULD LIKE YOU TO RECONSIDER YOUR PLANNING ACTIONS AND LOOK AT REGENERATING THE EYESORES THAT CURRENTLY EXIST AND MAKE THAT AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND BUILD ON BROWN LAND THAT IS ALREADY EMPTY AND CAN BE MADE SUSTAINABLE WHICH IS A FAR MORE PROACTIVE WAY TO GO TO PROMOTE CLIMATE CHANGE , ECO STRUCTURE AND REGENERATING AREAS THAT REALLY NEED IT RATHER THAN DESTROYING GREEN LAND THAT SERVES A MASSIVE PURPOSE FOR THE CLIMATE AND FUTURE SURVIVAL OF THE Item Details AREA . I TRUST YOU WILL TAKE THESE CONSIDERATIONS VERY SERIOUSLY AND RECONSIDER THIS WHOLE PLANNING PROCESS I DO NOT WANT ST15 / HS1 TO PROCEED AND DEMAND AN EXTENSION IN ORDER TO GATHER FURTHER EVIDENCE WHICH IT APPEARS THE COUNCIL ARE CONCEALING IN THIS PLAN IN ORDER TO PURSUE THEIR OWN GOALS WHICH ARE NOT OF BENEFIT TO THE RESIDENTS OF WORKSOP</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF244	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. The development site is rather large and will surely have a great an impact on local residents. ‘At least 750 dwellings’ plus business/employment land , in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime2. All the connections to the main roads are poor - the A1 North involves travelling through the centre of Blyth, the A1 & A57 South via Manton, the M1 & A57 North for Sheffield, etc. via Gateford on a road that already has speed restricting humps and the M1 South through the centre of town ! Additionally both main roads into the town centre are constantly overloaded (plus one route also having a level crossing !). 3. Therefore I would suggest that an alternative development should be located on the piece of land bounded by the Retford Road and the railway line and the Osberton Nurseries (with access provided from the A57 via a road running between the buildings associated with Greencore and Wilko). This would remove pressure from these narrow overloaded roads – in particular providing better access to Sheffield and the M1 (plus Retford, etc.) via the A57 and likewise for Doncaster , Manton, etc. via the A1. Additionally of course if a railway station was built in that area it could provide passengers with direct access to Sheffield (and Retford for access to Doncaster and/or London).4. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This ‘saturation’ policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop utilising already unsustainable road and rail systems (see alternative solution described above !).5. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster (see the better solution described above in entry 3 !).6. Provision of appropriately priced properties would make this alternative development very suitable to some workers who are/will be employed by those local businesses (plus those planned to occur in the new business area which has been created on the other side of the A57).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1196694	Resident	<p>I oppose the plan to build at Peaks Hill. This is a huge expansion to Worksop, unnecessary, it will not address the local housing need which is for small units, it will create congestion, increased traffic and increased commuting. Building 1500 houses will bring huge disruption to existing roads and neighbourhoods. This is an area of pristine countryside which should be preserved, not given over to unnecessary construction. 4.1.3 and 5.1.40 - The vision of Bassetlawattracting highly paid work, new business and growth in business, is based on an assumption that providing more business land will achieve this. I am not aware that there is a shortage of such land at present. Bassetlaw already has the locational advantages of proximity to road links and Doncaster airport, yet these businesses are not attracted to locate here.I oppose the proposal for the major expansion of Worksop at Peaks Hill. Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that of the new developments: 81% are greenfield and 19% are brownfield. This is an appalling scenario for our environment. Bassetlaw is ahead of schedule to meet its targets for housebuilding by 2037. It should not be approving plans to build on so much greenfield land. It should continue to review what brownfield sites become available in the decades to come. There will be new brownfield sites available before (and after) 2037 which can be considered for residential building. 5.1.49 refers to building more quality housing than is required – this cannot be justified: once greenfield land is built on, it is lost forever; there is nothing sustainable about this approach. Building on greenfield sites to such a level as is proposed, especially at Peaks Hill, does not meet the definition of “sustainable development”. The ability of future generations to meet their own needs for enjoyment of the natural environment, clean air, space and nature will be adversely impacted by this huge development and the consequent growth in traffic. The Draft Plan ignores the benefit to health and wellbeing of existing open spaces and the proven benefit to mental health of open vistas and scenery. Building on open country reduces the space available for wildlife and plants, has an adverse effect on natural drainage and, as such, does nothing to mitigate against the effects of the climate emergency. The development which recently began at the junction of Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road has shocked many by its impact on the landscape and the views when leaving Worksop. This corner abuts the proposed development at Peaks Hill. The negative impact on the wellbeing of the local community and the negative impact on the views of Worksop approaching and leaving on Blyth Road have not, in my opinion , been given sufficient weight.Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that 20% of the greenfield units and 10% of the brownfield units will be affordable, ie 80% of greenfield and 90% of brownfield units will not be affordable housing. How is this meeting the local demand identified at 3.13: the huge percentage increase in over 65s and over 80s and the percentage</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>decrease in the numbers aged 16-65? There is a need for smaller houses and for bungalows, not for large houses.7.2.3 – whatever the design of the development, this is not a sustainable development – the ability of future generations to meet their own needs for health and wellbeing, enjoyment of nature, landscape and the natural environment will be compromised.7.2.13 Why is it necessary for the site to be exempt from a CIL? If the developer contribution is to be provided through Section 106 contributions, there is no guarantee there will be any contribution given these are negotiable and can be waived (2.4 CIL Draft Charging Schedule)? “...infrastructure requirementscan be sought through on site provision” – what does that mean? Who will pay for the infrastructure and how could that be enforced?Policy 15 refers to a mix of housing types but gives no figures for smaller units which would meet the demand from the changing and older demographic mix in the area. 4 and 5 bedroom houses will simply be bought by those currently living in more expensive areas such as Sheffield, who will then commute to work outside Bassetlaw, thus increasing traffic. The Plan cannot control who buys these houses and their travel to work distance. The Climate Emergency is obvious. The Plan should prioritise protecting the environment, not simply pay lip service to it. The council will have little control over the developers once this plan is agreed. Once building is underway, the developer will have the upper hand if they decide they do not want to adhere to whatever high standards of construction and design the council may prefer. The Plan is for 1500 houses at Peaks Hill. This should be made clear. Many reading this will only see 750 (phase 1) and not realise the extent of what is proposed. The country as a whole needs more housing, but of a type to meet local need. Housing demand in London and the South East exceeds supply. There is no shortage of property to buy in Worksop, certainly no shortage of 4 and 5 bedroom houses. There is no argument for building yet more estates of such luxury housing. I oppose the plans to build at Peaks Hill</p>	
1196694	Resident	<p>I oppose the proposed link road between Peaks Hill and Blyth Road. This will mean increased commuting between Worksop and Sheffield, increased traffic, poorer air quality, adverse effects on health, more congestion.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1196694	Resident	<p>The Draft Plan ignores the benefit to health and wellbeing of existing open spaces and the proven benefit to mental health of open vistas and scenery. Building on open country reduces the space available for wildlife and plants, has an adverse effect on natural drainage and, as such, does nothing to mitigate against the effects of the climate emergency. The development which recently began at the junction of Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road has shocked many by its impact on the landscape and the views when leaving Worksop. This corner abuts the proposed development at Peaks Hill. The negative impact on the wellbeing of the local community and the negative impact on the views of Worksop approaching and leaving on Blyth Road have not, in my opinion, been given sufficient weight.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF245	Resident	<p>FORM Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm 1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation) 2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm 3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems 7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster 8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character 10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.</p> <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <p>11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF250	Resident	<p>I have been in contact regularly with Planning, including being on your mailing list regarding the Peaks Hill Farm site (Policy 15). Despite this contact, no information was given about progress on the plan to develop the site being in an advanced stage. Since attending consultation meetings, I have been informed that the Council has been working with an agent regarding the development for two years. However, Planning officers were not allowed to disclose this. The fact that the Council has withheld this information to residents in the immediate vicinity, has prevented us from making informed and timely decisions to where we now want to live. I conclude that the Council have withheld this information due to its controversial nature. I also feel I have been deliberately misled by the Council as I have consistently asked about development to the rear of our property. This and the short consultation framework for the Plan, do not engender my trust in the Council</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF264	Resident	<p>I list below my objections to the above mentioned development</p> <p>1 I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local plan.</p> <p>2 The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop The number of dwellings proposed and already under construction will cause noise pollution disruption and inconvenience for possibly the rest of my lifetime.</p> <p>3 I understand that the supporting infrastructure will only commence after the completion of the development which can only cause harm to the existing infrastructure which is struggling to provide services already. Existing transport systems are under pressure now, roads and rail links will be unable to cope with the increase this development will have on them New rail and road links must be in place prior to and development commencing if the development proceeds.</p> <p>5 The number of dwellings exceeds local needs This will only increase the number of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems</p> <p>6 Increased commuting will add to pollution Traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment such as Sheffield and Doncaster At this time of climate change we should be trying to reduce commuting not increase it. Better to place new development near to the center of employment hubs thus shortening the commute.</p> <p>7 Loss of prime local farm land is in the light of climate change is also to be deplored.</p> <p>8 The loss to the established local wildlife and green environment is also to be deplored The Council should be the Guardians for the future generations of Worksop residents and should not side step those issues by allowing developers to maximise their profits by over development of the area.</p> <p>Should my concerns be over-ruled I would like to see:-</p> <p>1 A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. A little like farmers wildlife margins around their fields</p> <p>2 Sympathetic development arrangements planning gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing and new homes.</p> <p>3 Any communal area to be centrally located in the new development and away from the existing homes.</p> <p>4 Provision of Low level housing near any existing homes such as bungalows not higher-rise town houses.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF265	Resident	<p>I am writing to make objections to the proposed planning application behind Westerdale Worksop. The plans are for 750 houses stretching from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that this is not in the public interest as the demand is not there for the proposed houses and it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my home are a hub for wildlife, foxes, rabbits, birds and bats these animal live in the fields and adjacent woods. I also believe that the local amenities are not sufficient to take on the extra people that this proposed development will bring. In the local area there is already a lot of housing currently being built therefore I do not believe that there is a market in which to sell these houses. Inam writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF266	Resident	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity. I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF267	Resident	I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF268	Resident	I am writing to object to the proposed planning application to the land behind my house on Westerdale, which will stretch from Blythe Road to Carlton Road. I believe that there is not the demand for the 750 extra houses that this development will bring and that it will have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife. The fields behind my house are home to foxes, rabbit, birds of prey and bats to name a few and this development will destroy their habitat. In the local area there are currently projects underway to provide extra housing therefore I believe this development will take away rather than add to the local economy as the amenities are already under funded and stretched to capacity.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1197012	Resident	<p>1. The development site is rather large and will surely have a great an impact on local residents. ‘At least 750 dwellings’ plus business/employment land , in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime</p> <p>2. All the connections to the main roads are poor - the A1 North involves travelling through the centre of Blyth, the A1 & A57 South via Manton, the M1 & A57 North for Sheffield, etc. via Gateford on a road that already has speed restricting humps and the M1 South through the centre of town ! Additionally both main roads into the town centre are constantly overloaded (plus one route also having a level crossing !).</p> <p>3. Therefore I would suggest that an alternative development should be located on the piece of land bounded by the Retford Road and the railway line and the Osberton Nurseries (with access provided from the A57 via a road running between the buildings associated with Greencore and Wilko). This would remove pressure from these narrow overloaded roads – in particular providing better access to Sheffield and the M1 (plus Retford, etc.) via the A57 and likewise for Doncaster , Manton, etc. via the A1. Additionally of course if a railway station was built in that area it could provide passengers with direct access to Sheffield (and Retford for access to Doncaster and/or London).</p> <p>4. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This ‘saturation’ policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop utilising already unsustainable road and rail systems (see alternative solution described above !).</p> <p>5. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster (see the better solution described above in entry 3 !).</p> <p>6. Provision of appropriately priced properties would make this alternative development very suitable to some workers who are/will be employed by those local businesses (plus those planned to occur in the new business area which has been created on the other side of the A57).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1197077	Resident	<p>The development of land adjoining Carlton Road (known locally as the Sandhills) will remove the natural break between the settlements of Worksop & Carlton in Lindrick. This will eventually lead to there being no break in development from Worksop all the way to Oldcotes. This will damage the character of Carlton in Lindrick especially as you approach the village from the south and enter the old part of the village; as well as destroy the natural landscape. This in turn will affect wildlife, reduce the amount of farm land and increase the likelihood of flooding in the local area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
1197090	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Response to draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, January 2020 (With particular concerns re Peaks Hill Farm site, ST15, p.78)</p> <p>Overall, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (BLP) has aspects that are commendable, including innovative ideas, such as the garden villages, green energy site and welcome references to the need for cycling and walking connectivity and green infrastructure. However, I have serious objections to the inclusion of a special area of countryside on the western fringe of the large proposed Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) housing development site. I also have concerns about the overall sustainability of this large Greenfield site. If you travel north from Worksop towards Carlton on the A60, on the edge of the town, you pass the G4S offices on the right in woodland. This mature wood on the right covers a hill and ridge that curves round north-eastwards to Peaks Hill farm enclosing a sloping, triangular shaped field on the right/front, bordered by the A60 (circled blue on the map below). This field is included in the plans for residential development. As you carry on north you pass Freshfields house on the left and down the hill, extensive and beautiful views of the rural landscape open out across the horizon towards Carlton direction. This landscape, the views, the mature woods and fields to the right and front, is one of the most beautiful I know. Often, as I travel back from Worksop this view will lift my spirits. It is unique and precious landscape. Once it's built on, it will be spoilt and lost for ever. It is current and future generations that will lose the enjoyment of this landscape. The 'public good', 'amenity value' or wildlife value of that landscape is priceless and is not reflected in the cost-benefit of commercial development decisions. I was shocked when I saw the plans to build on this field (just a few days before it went public). It is out of sight from Worksop, on land sloping down to Carlton and enclosed by woods. From this site is a beautiful and extensive view to the North West – the site is visible from Owdale lane, over a mile away. This would be building in pristine countryside clearly separated from the town envelope. The plan states the need for a green buffer between Worksop and Carlton. I would argue that this field and its surrounding trees and ridge must be included in that green buffer zone (it's visible from the Carlton direction but not from Worksop). To build on it would set a precedent and surely other fields and woods will be built over until Worksop merges with Carlton. I would urge all councillors and relevant officers to visit the site to see with their own eyes. On p.59 of BDC's commissioned report Site Allocations: Landscape Study, is their conclusion on the Peaks Hill Farm (site 12H in the report) site: 'A combination of topography, the landscape value of existing woodlands and the extent to which the site extends north into open countryside, suggest that only a limited development in the middle and southern sections of the site could be achieved without an overall adverse landscape impact. However, care should be taken to respect topography, retain woodlands and if possible improving connectivity.' https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5295/bassetlaw-draftlandscape-study-2019.pdf That means, it is the western, A60 side of the site that will be most adversely affected and the boundary of the green buffer should therefore follow the line of the topography - i.e. follow the ridge that separates this field and Peaks Hill farm from the rest of the development site and from Worksop. Not only is this a beautiful landscape - between Worksop and Carlton/Blyth – but it is also a designed heritage landscape. The rolling fields and wooded ridges and copses were designed and planted by estate managers in the 18th and 19th centuries to be attractive and create an impact. Some of the older, 'veteran' trees found on this Peaks Hill site might pre-date this period. I do not object quite as strongly about the other parts of the proposed Peaks Hill development, as the largest part is to the East of the Peaks Hill woods, stretching over to Blyth Rd – backing on to Thievesdale, and joined on to Worksop. It is a concerning, serious loss of countryside - the site gives extensive views towards the Trent in the NE direction - but the development will be less visible from the roads running into Worksop from the North. Therefore, like the Landscape Study Report, I think development on the south and middle sections of the site can be managed better in terms of acceptable landscape impact than any development near the A60 on the west side of the site. However, in this, my amendment to my original submission, I have reflected on other submissions made on this site and thought through concerns of others re the sustainability of the PHF site. Although I'm most concerned about the landscape impact on the western part of the site, I now think the sustainability of the whole PHF site is questionable. The proposal for PHF is for 1500, mainly 3 or 4 bed 'executive' homes, probably to be occupied by commuters working in South Yorks (a reasonable expectation, given what's happened at similar recent developments such as Gateford). This will put more traffic on the roads and more strain on local health and education services for decades to come. There will be the irrevocable loss of a large wildlife resource. There are still areas of Brownfield sites, possibly in Bassetlaw, (more will become available in the future) certainly in South Yorks, - that could be developed for housing (but are less attractive to developers). Instead, large proposed Greenfield sites, such as PHF, in the Draft Plan are in danger of eroding the clear asset that Bassetlaw has – beautiful landscape and quiet roads. Government, at all</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>levels, should take in the wider regional and national picture of sustainability – and that needs to be factored into this District Local Plan. Developing Greenfield sites is clearly profitable for landowners, developers and builders (and car manufacturers) but is damaging the environment, quality of life (and the planet) for future generations in Bassetlaw by removing the amenity value of this attractive countryside.</p> <p>Another aspect of the proposed development is a relief road running through the site from Blyth road and coming out on the A60 near the Peaks Hill farm (though this location is not confirmed). Highway matters are clearly for the County Highways to consider but I have serious concerns as it a dangerous stretch of fast road, on a bend and a hill, and it has had several fatalities in recent years. If there has to be a new road – and I'm not convinced there is a need for one – it should be at the south end of the proposed site and come out onto the A60 closer to G4S offices. I also believe the consultation period should be extended. From talking to residents in Carlton and in Worksop, it seems few members of the public are aware of the Draft Local Plan, let alone that this piece of land is affected. Such an important plan with huge changes for Bassetlaw needs extensive publicity and consultation. Yes, consultation on the Local Plan in its various guises seems to have been going on years but there have been such drastic changes to the LP in the last few months - such as the PHF site coming forward, and abandoning the previously proposed garden village sites – changes that even many BDC cllrs were not aware of (until just before it went public). The PHF site is within the Carlton in Lindrick Parish boundary but even ward District cllrs were not consulted on full details of this site until early January 2020 and Parish Cllrs learned about it only when public consultation started. The village developed its own Neighbourhood Plan, finalised last year, with assistance from BDC planners and the PHF site is not mentioned because it had not been brought forward at that time. It is fair to say that the concerns I am expressing here in my submission</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF294	Resident	<p>I believe that further panning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.</p> <p>1. In support of other residents I forward the following objections and information. The Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)</p> <p>2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm and anywhere else in Bassetlaw. There has simply been enough already.</p> <p>3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime</p> <p>4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction</p> <p>5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable</p> <p>6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems</p> <p>7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster</p> <p>8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change</p> <p>9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character</p> <p>10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <p>11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife</p> <p>12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor</p> <p>13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline</p> <p>14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)</p> <p>15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution</p> <p>16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses</p> <p>17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport</p> <p>18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook</p> <p>19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings</p> <p>20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF296	Resident	<p>I am aware that this submission will reach you by the deadline of Wednesday 26th February and unfortunately will not be the comprehensive response that I would have submitted given more time. I feel strongly that the Consultation process has been inadequate and untimely. The guidelines that appear in Appendix 4 of the Draft Plan have NOT been followed. 1. Appendix 4 (a) states 'An A4 laminated site notice should be displayed on the site's road/street frontage(s) for a minimum of 21 days...' Only one notice was displayed on Westerdale and when I asked the planners about this, I was informed that we were 'lucky' to have one notice as they were not obliged to put them up. I don't believe one was sufficient and object to the comment made by the planner. 2. Appendix 4 (b) states that 'A letter should be sent to all properties notifying them of the proposal...' I did not receive a letter notifying me of the proposal. When I asked why I hadn't received a letter I was informed the Council do not have the resources. And yet the tables in the Consultation meeting were full of impressive, quality, colour printed A3 and A5 leaflets for me to take away. I was also told that if I had been on the Council's mailing list I would have been notified. One of my neighbours is on the mailing list and keeps in regular contact with the Council and still did not receive a letter. 3. The consultation meetings were poorly organised. Council staff gave conflicting answers to questions and were not always polite. 4. Foreword page 2: 'Following on from our successful consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan....this is the next stage of our conversation with local people, businesses and communities' I was completely unaware that there had been a consultation early in 2019. I only discovered this while talking to a planning officer at the Consultation meeting held on 29th January in the Ceres Suite. His response was that they had publicised this consultation and there had been '500 comments to prove it'. Looking into this the comments were predominantly made by developers so I would question the integrity of the publication process. 5. One of our resident was informed at one of the Consultation meetings that the Council have been working with an agent for two years, but officers were not allowed to disclose this. I question whether that is an allowable procedure? It certainly creates a level of distrust between the Council and residents. There is a worrying lack of transparency here. 6. The Draft Plan is approximately 200 pages long and there are more than 70 further documents that are referred to. This is a massive resource to digest and make sense of. It is unreasonable to expect that the few weeks we have been aware of this are sufficient to have made sense of this document and to have formulated a comprehensive response. Indeed the final Consultation at Ranby only took place on 25th February, the day before the deadline. The Council have put people in an impossible situation. 7. The feedback forms that were handed out at meetings were highly inadequate and complex with a need to equate comments to particular sections in the Plan. On contacting Planning, I was told that we could simply email or write to Planning with comments, as long as we included our contact details and made reference to the particular policy numbers, PHF being Policy 15. Why were we not told this collectively at meetings or in some appropriate BDC publicity? It feels that the process for giving feedback/comments has been made as complex and un-inclusive as possible. 8. I have attended two consultation meetings. The first one (29/1/2020 Ceres Suite) was very poorly attended. There were 9 of us in attendance and we decided to work together to publicise these proposals and raise local awareness. We produced our own flyers which we delivered locally and, as I am sure you are already aware, the subsequent Consultation meeting on 4/2/2020 at Thievesdale Community Centre was extremely well attended. It was the Council's responsibility to ensure that local residents were aware. We have worked as a group tirelessly since 29th January. We have produced and delivered 2 flyers, had several group meetings and a meeting with Brendan Clarke-Smith MP. We have used social media to reach out to people and raise awareness. Apparently the planners have commented that response to this Draft Plan is 'unprecedented'. More evidence that it was imperative to inform people so they could 'have their say'. Indeed, in her Foreword on page 2 of the Draft Plan Councillor Jo White's final sentence reads "It is absolutely vital that people take a look at what is being proposed and have their say." I absolutely agree with her and it is surely the duty and responsibility of the Council to make every effort, in line with their Community Consultation policy, to facilitate this process. Sadly, the Council haven't. 9. I ask the Council to consider objectively their handling of this Consultation process and ask that you grant an extension of the deadline. I would suggest a period of at least one month in order to allow people to do the reading and research necessary and to complete their comments for submission.</p> <p>Strategic Objectives 4.2.1 This vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives: Page 21. OBJECTIVE 1. 'To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>agricultural land'.Page 265.1.17 'Workshop will deliver a minimum of 2180 new dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Since the start of the plan period Workshop has seen 230 housing completions and currently has 1404 commitments (at 30/11/2019). Combined, this equates to a supply of 1634 dwellings. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 546 dwellings in Workshop'. 5.1.18 'However, the level of housing identified by Policy ST1 in Workshop is broadly comparable with the promotion of successful economic growth and regeneration and to facilitate the infrastructure required in support'. Response to Strategic Objective 1 and sections 5 on page 26 as above:The proposed inclusion of farmland and countryside at PHF for a development of such disproportionate enormity, causing such a loss of green-space and with a lack of infrastructure, goes against every principle in this objective.According to the Office of National Statistics data, the populations of Workshop and Bassetlaw have increased by around 10% over the last 20 years. The proportion of development in the Plan throughout the district, however, is around 20% with a huge proportion of that on green-field sites at PHF and Bassetlaw Garden Village. The huge development at Gateford is already offering discounts on unsold plots and stamp duty paid. I am interested to know where the thousands of households for Bassetlaw, 9,087 homes, will come from, given the lack of facilities and supporting infrastructure. Commuters need good levels of connectivity, not currently evident in Workshop and surrounding villages.BDC Spatial Strategy quotes 'a minimum of 9,087 homes need to be built in Bassetlaw by 2037' yet 5.1.17 above, states that only 546 further dwellings are needed in Workshop in total. Yet Peaks Hill farm on its own, is to include at least 750 houses in phase 1 alone. If this much lower number, based on population projections for the District, is what is actually needed, say allowing for a continued population increase over 20 years again of 10%, why is the Plan to include so much destruction of green-space and with a 20% increase in housing stock? The developments on brown field sites would probably provide the level of housing affordability that local people can sustain in Workshop, with additional insistence on affordable homes being built at, for example, Gateford and the old Tesco site. I am particularly horrified at the extent of destruction of local green-field sites especially that proposed for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) Policy 15. An urban sprawl of this size would have a catastrophic impact on wildlife habitats including for buzzards, owls, sparrow hawks, invertebrates, mammals (including bats) and pollinators, all of which inhabit the site. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site (The Lodge at The Edge) with the Plan adding 'at least 750' more in phase 1 on 54 hectares and '750' in phase 2, doubling the size. The impact on Workshop will be immense. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads, the A57 to Sheffield, GP surgeries (the waiting time for appointments at Newgate Medical Group for example, is already 6 weeks) dentists, the hospital, schools etc will be more intolerable when added to the huge sprawling developments currently in progress at Gateford and near Shireoaks and all the other sites around the Town. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over decades. For many members of the local community, this will mean the anxiety of continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution, and in the case of the elderly, literally for the rest of their lives. The proposal at PHF has very little, if any, concrete evidence of appropriate, new infrastructure support compared particularly to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village ST1 ST3 ST35 and ST36, which is to have a nursery and primary school, healthcare facilities, parks, enhanced transport networks, flood risk management and a new railway station etc demonstrating what is deemed necessary for a development of 750 homes. However, there is nothing specific for PHF, a development of the same size, other than for example, a road across the estate and a local bus service. The Plan clearly implies minimal infrastructure investment on and around this site and waives the Community Infrastructure Levy other than for that required to enable the development to take place.Connectivity in and out of Workshop is already inadequate and under stress. I now commute to Sheffield by train. It is a poor service:- often dirty, overcrowded, unreliable, infrequent and increasingly difficult to park at the station. I used to commute by car, a journey that used to take 35 minutes to the centre and now takes about an hour. According to the Planning section, income will need to be raised from the building of these huge developments - presumably via Council Tax and some developer contributions if evidence can be deemed to support need - in order to raise the income needed to build infrastructure, section 5.1.18 in the Plan. The level of Council Tax needed will not be raised until all properties are built and sold, this may take decades and how can we simply extend already land-locked facilities (the train station, schools and surgeries) to accommodate increases in population? Will this in turn, create the constant chicken and egg situation of increasing the destruction of further green-space?I accept the need for additional housing but not of this magnitude, especially on prime farming land that should provide locally produced food, and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial.National evidence shows that local authorities have limited power to enforce the provision of affordable housing on development sites and developers, who are interested in maximising their profits, do not appear to be voluntarily providing them.Workshop has a population of 42,000+. The housing currently being built and also proposed is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>largely 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached. The average house price in Worksop is £139,000. New developments - see Rippon Homes development off Blyth Road - are 'luxury homes' being marketed to commuters. Gateford site is selling their 'luxury homes' homes starting at £300,000. These are not what many local people can afford to buy and I cannot find evidence to support the concept that by building lots of houses - sustainable, local and professional (with salaries sufficient to fund large houses) employment will follow - in less affluent locations. It is more feasible, that the purchasers of large homes in less well off areas will be commuters who will be unlikely to work within and spend large amounts in the local economy, preferring other locations such as Meadowhall, Sheffield, Lincoln and Nottingham. The recent tragic flooding of Worksop Town Centre is unlikely to increase investor confidence to that location. The Plan consistently uses the term 'sustainable development'. This is absolute 'greenwash'. How can, by it's very nature, the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable? All the national and international agendas and concerns of, for example, global warming, locally-sourced food, light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity, health and wellbeing etc will continue to be eroded if destruction of the countryside is allowed at this housing saturation level. As our elected members, and as members of the public, it is our collective responsibility to protect and enhance our natural environment for current and future generations to appreciate, enjoy and benefit from. To allow destruction on this scale of this beautiful landscape and wildlife habitat at PHF, would simply be irresponsible and wrong. I implore this Council to reconsider their plans. We live in a changing world but let's work together and change it for the better. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife • New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor • Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline • New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) • Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution • Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses • Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport • Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook • Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings • Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF297	Resident	<p>I am aware that this submission will reach you by the deadline of Wednesday 26th February and unfortunately will not be the comprehensive response that I would have submitted given more time. I feel strongly that the Consultation process has been inadequate and untimely. The guidelines that appear in Appendix 4 of the Draft Plan have NOT been followed. 1. Appendix 4 (a) states 'An A4 laminated site notice should be displayed on the site's road/street frontage(s) for a minimum of 21 days...' Only one notice was displayed on Westerdale and when I asked the planners about this, I was informed that we were 'lucky' to have one notice as they were not obliged to put them up. I don't believe one was sufficient and object to the comment made by the planner. 2. Appendix 4 (b) states that 'A letter should be sent to all properties notifying them of the proposal...' I did not receive a letter notifying me of the proposal. When I asked why I hadn't received a letter I was informed the Council do not have the resources. And yet the tables in the Consultation meeting were full of impressive, quality, colour printed A3 and A5 leaflets for me to take away. I was also told that if I had been on the Council's mailing list I would have been notified. One of my neighbours is on the mailing list and keeps in regular contact with the Council and still did not receive a letter. 3. The consultation meetings were poorly organised. Council staff gave conflicting answers to questions and were not always polite. 4. Foreword page 2: 'Following on from our successful consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan....this is the next stage of our conversation with local people, businesses and communities' I was completely unaware that there had been a consultation early in 2019. I only discovered this while talking to a planning officer at the Consultation meeting held on 29th January in the Ceres Suite. His response was that they had publicised this consultation and there had been '500 comments to prove it'. Looking into this the comments were predominantly made by developers so I would question the integrity of the publication process. 5. One of our resident was informed at one of the Consultation meetings that the Council have been working with an agent for two years, but officers were not allowed to disclose this. I question whether that is an allowable procedure? It certainly creates a level of distrust between the Council and residents. There is a worrying lack of transparency here. 6. The Draft Plan is approximately 200 pages long and there are more than 70 further documents that are referred to. This is a massive resource to digest and make sense of. It is unreasonable to expect that the few weeks we have been aware of this are sufficient to have made sense of this document and to have formulated a comprehensive response. Indeed the final Consultation at Ranby only took place on 25th February, the day before the deadline. The Council have put people in an impossible situation. 7. The feedback forms that were handed out at meetings were highly inadequate and complex with a need to equate comments to particular sections in the Plan. On contacting Planning, I was told that we could simply email or write to Planning with comments, as long as we included our contact details and made reference to the particular policy numbers, PHF being Policy 15. Why were we not told this collectively at meetings or in some appropriate BDC publicity? It feels that the process for giving feedback/comments has been made as complex and un-inclusive as possible. 8. I have attended two consultation meetings. The first one (29/1/2020 Ceres Suite) was very poorly attended. There were 9 of us in attendance and we decided to work together to publicise these proposals and raise local awareness. We produced our own flyers which we delivered locally and, as I am sure you are already aware, the subsequent Consultation meeting on 4/2/2020 at Thievesdale Community Centre was extremely well attended. It was the Council's responsibility to ensure that local residents were aware. We have worked as a group tirelessly since 29th January. We have produced and delivered 2 flyers, had several group meetings and a meeting with Brendan Clarke-Smith MP. We have used social media to reach out to people and raise awareness. Apparently the planners have commented that response to this Draft Plan is 'unprecedented'. More evidence that it was imperative to inform people so they could 'have their say'. Indeed, in her Foreword on page 2 of the Draft Plan Councillor Jo White's final sentence reads "It is absolutely vital that people take a look at what is being proposed and have their say." I absolutely agree with her and it is surely the duty and responsibility of the Council to make every effort, in line with their Community Consultation policy, to facilitate this process. Sadly, the Council haven't. 9. I ask the Council to consider objectively their handling of this Consultation process and ask that you grant an extension of the deadline. I would suggest a period of at least one month in order to allow people to do the reading and research necessary and to complete their comments for submission.</p> <p>Strategic Objectives 4.2.1 This vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives: Page 21. OBJECTIVE 1. 'To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>agricultural land'.Page 265.1.17 'Workshop will deliver a minimum of 2180 new dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Since the start of the plan period Workshop has seen 230 housing completions and currently has 1404 commitments (at 30/11/2019). Combined, this equates to a supply of 1634 dwellings. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 546 dwellings in Workshop'. 5.1.18 'However, the level of housing identified by Policy ST1 in Workshop is broadly comparable with the promotion of successful economic growth and regeneration and to facilitate the infrastructure required in support'. Response to Strategic Objective 1 and sections 5 on page 26 as above:The proposed inclusion of farmland and countryside at PHF for a development of such disproportionate enormity, causing such a loss of green-space and with a lack of infrastructure, goes against every principle in this objective.According to the Office of National Statistics data, the populations of Workshop and Bassetlaw have increased by around 10% over the last 20 years. The proportion of development in the Plan throughout the district, however, is around 20% with a huge proportion of that on green-field sites at PHF and Bassetlaw Garden Village. The huge development at Gateford is already offering discounts on unsold plots and stamp duty paid. I am interested to know where the thousands of households for Bassetlaw, 9,087 homes, will come from, given the lack of facilities and supporting infrastructure. Commuters need good levels of connectivity, not currently evident in Workshop and surrounding villages.BDC Spatial Strategy quotes 'a minimum of 9,087 homes need to be built in Bassetlaw by 2037' yet 5.1.17 above, states that only 546 further dwellings are needed in Workshop in total. Yet Peaks Hill farm on its own, is to include at least 750 houses in phase 1 alone. If this much lower number, based on population projections for the District, is what is actually needed, say allowing for a continued population increase over 20 years again of 10%, why is the Plan to include so much destruction of green-space and with a 20% increase in housing stock? The developments on brown field sites would probably provide the level of housing affordability that local people can sustain in Workshop, with additional insistence on affordable homes being built at, for example, Gateford and the old Tesco site. I am particularly horrified at the extent of destruction of local green-field sites especially that proposed for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) Policy 15. An urban sprawl of this size would have a catastrophic impact on wildlife habitats including for buzzards, owls, sparrow hawks, invertebrates, mammals (including bats) and pollinators, all of which inhabit the site. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site (The Lodge at The Edge) with the Plan adding 'at least 750' more in phase 1 on 54 hectares and '750' in phase 2, doubling the size. The impact on Workshop will be immense. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads, the A57 to Sheffield, GP surgeries (the waiting time for appointments at Newgate Medical Group for example, is already 6 weeks) dentists, the hospital, schools etc will be more intolerable when added to the huge sprawling developments currently in progress at Gateford and near Shireoaks and all the other sites around the Town. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over decades. For many members of the local community, this will mean the anxiety of continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution, and in the case of the elderly, literally for the rest of their lives. The proposal at PHF has very little, if any, concrete evidence of appropriate, new infrastructure support compared particularly to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village ST1 ST3 ST35 and ST36, which is to have a nursery and primary school, healthcare facilities, parks, enhanced transport networks, flood risk management and a new railway station etc demonstrating what is deemed necessary for a development of 750 homes. However, there is nothing specific for PHF, a development of the same size, other than for example, a road across the estate and a local bus service. The Plan clearly implies minimal infrastructure investment on and around this site and waives the Community Infrastructure Levy other than for that required to enable the development to take place.Connectivity in and out of Workshop is already inadequate and under stress. I now commute to Sheffield by train. It is a poor service:- often dirty, overcrowded, unreliable, infrequent and increasingly difficult to park at the station. I used to commute by car, a journey that used to take 35 minutes to the centre and now takes about an hour. According to the Planning section, income will need to be raised from the building of these huge developments - presumably via Council Tax and some developer contributions if evidence can be deemed to support need - in order to raise the income needed to build infrastructure, section 5.1.18 in the Plan. The level of Council Tax needed will not be raised until all properties are built and sold, this may take decades and how can we simply extend already land-locked facilities (the train station, schools and surgeries) to accommodate increases in population? Will this in turn, create the constant chicken and egg situation of increasing the destruction of further green-space?I accept the need for additional housing but not of this magnitude, especially on prime farming land that should provide locally produced food, and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial.National evidence shows that local authorities have limited power to enforce the provision of affordable housing on development sites and developers, who are interested in maximising their profits, do not appear to be voluntarily providing them.Workshop has a population of 42,000+. The housing currently being built and also proposed is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>largely 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached. The average house price in Worksop is £139,000. New developments - see Rippon Homes development off Blyth Road - are 'luxury homes' being marketed to commuters. Gateford site is selling their 'luxury homes' homes starting at £300,000. These are not what many local people can afford to buy and I cannot find evidence to support the concept that by building lots of houses - sustainable, local and professional (with salaries sufficient to fund large houses) employment will follow - in less affluent locations. It is more feasible, that the purchasers of large homes in less well off areas will be commuters who will be unlikely to work within and spend large amounts in the local economy, preferring other locations such as Meadowhall, Sheffield, Lincoln and Nottingham. The recent tragic flooding of Worksop Town Centre is unlikely to increase investor confidence to that location. The Plan consistently uses the term 'sustainable development'. This is absolute 'greenwash'. How can, by it's very nature, the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable? All the national and international agendas and concerns of, for example, global warming, locally-sourced food, light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity, health and wellbeing etc will continue to be eroded if destruction of the countryside is allowed at this housing saturation level. As our elected members, and as members of the public, it is our collective responsibility to protect and enhance our natural environment for current and future generations to appreciate, enjoy and benefit from. To allow destruction on this scale of this beautiful landscape and wildlife habitat at PHF, would simply be irresponsible and wrong. I implore this Council to reconsider their plans. We live in a changing world but let's work together and change it for the better. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife • New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor • Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline • New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) • Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution • Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses • Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport • Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook • Build enough housing that local people can actually afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings • Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'. 	
REF300 -	Natural England	<p>This site includes areas of deciduous woodland some of which is priority habitat. We are therefore pleased to note that this has been recognised in 5b of the policy wording. We suggest that there is potential for net gain to enhance these woodland areas and link them with the proposed community woodland and the wider ecological habitat network.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF301 Peaks Hill Farm (LAA)	Freeths	<p>Firstly, we are in full support of Policy 15: HS1 Peaks Hill Farm and ST51 which acknowledges an east-west link distributor road between Blyth Road (B6045) and Carlton Road (A60) at HS1 Peaks Hill Farm in accordance with Policy 15. The representations are in respect of Policy 15: HS1: Peaks Hill Farm (page 78); Policy ST51: Safeguarded Land (page 168) and Policy ST34: Landscape Character (Page 121). This representation is in relation to a significant opportunity to expand on this allocation to the west of Carlton Road to incorporate an extension to the distributor road to link with the roundabout at Ashes Park Avenue. The potential to link the proposed distributor road (ST51) to Ashes Park Avenue would significantly improve the flow and movement of traffic in and around Worksop, including the town centre. This letter sets out our client's representations in accordance with the Regulation 18 Public Consultation; and takes into account a number of other documents comprising part of the Local Plan's Evidence Base (Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, January 2020 – Appendix 2: References). National Planning Policy Context – NPPF The NPPF sets out the planning context for the preparation of the Local Plan. In this respect paragraph 11 establishes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', which for planmaking requires local planning authorities to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area; and for Local Plans provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas. Part 5 of the NPPF sets out advice on 'Delivering a sufficient supply of homes'. As such paragraph 60 requires local planning authorities to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. Paragraph 61 goes on to state that within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policy. Paragraph 65 requires strategic policy-making authorities to establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified need can be met over the plan period. The NPPF therefore makes it clear that Local Plans should provide for and deliver their full Objectively Assessed Need for Housing. The consequences of not doing so include a lack of housing supply to meet needs; economic and social inequalities; a lack of workforce mobility; inability to match jobs with housing; and, poor overall economic performance.</p>	Support noted and welcome

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF302	Resident	<p>I believe that further planning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.</p> <p>1. In support of other residents I forward the following objections and information. The Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation) 2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm and anywhere else in Bassetlaw. There has simply been enough already. 3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems 7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster 8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character 10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see: 11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
REF303	Resident	<p>I believe that further planning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted three suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes, the Old Firbeck Colliery site, and in addition to the Thievesdale site which is in the boundary of Carlton in Lindrick but will not be counted towards their allocation of housing. To allow further housing development within the Parish boundary breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
			existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
1197218	Resident	A local centre is to be provided at proposed HS1 Peaks Hill Farm but my objection is any development of this agricultural land site The north side of Worksop has already seen significant housing development at Gateford Park and Kilton/ Thievesdale areas.A large proportion on agricultural land. These are all large modern housing developments which are commuter estates.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF308 -	Resident	<p>Page 26</p> <p>5.1.17 'Worksop will deliver a minimum of 2180 new dwellings over the plan period (2018 to 2037). Since the start of the plan period Worksop has seen 230 housing completions and currently has 1404 commitments (at 30/11/2019). Combined, this equates to a supply of 1634 dwellings. Consequently, there is a requirement to allocate land for a minimum of 546 dwellings in Worksop'.</p> <p>5.1.18 'However, the level of housing identified by Policy ST1 in Worksop is broadly comparable with the promotion of successful economic growth and regeneration and to facilitate the infrastructure required in support'.</p> <p>If only 546 further dwellings are required in Worksop, a considerable part of Peaks Hill Farm site will not be required. However, the Council's plans for housing volume, which are clearly, ambitious, appear to go well beyond that which is required by government directive or some of the objective assessments carried out on behalf of the Council - eg the Economic Development Need Assessment, which has partly informed the proposed level of houses to be built.</p> <p>This concluded that around 390 dwellings per annum would be needed but that this could be less as 'Growth rates projected forward to 2035 don't reflect any structural changes to the economy taking regard of macro-economic factors - most notably issues relating to Brexit'. Even with 390 dwellings a year for the period of the plan, this falls far short of BDC's figures of over 9,000 dwellings required - which seems to equate to a huge 20% increase.</p> <p>Further, as reported on page 29, national planning practice guidance states that the minimum number of homes needed should use the NPPF Standardised Methodology, using DCLG 2014-based Household Projections. This results in a minimum housing need of only 307 dwellings per annum for the plan period (2018 to 2037).</p> <p>This figure is then bumped up hugely by taking into consideration the Economic Development Needs Assessment, 2019 which identifies that the housing requirement be increased to a minimum of 478 dwellings per annum to support economic growth in the District. Yet how certain is the Council that this figure is accurate? Has the BDC got it's assessment and justifications right on this issue? I would challenge this.</p> <p>This is a critical issue as the majority of development is proposed for greenfield sites - ie many hectares of high grade agricultural land - a diminishing resource both locally and nationally. It would appear that BDC is taking a cavalier approach to the permanent destruction of many hectares of this high grade land, by calculating housing numbers on some ideal scenario which may never materialise. Is this just pie in the sky? So much is at stake.</p> <p>This approach is contrary to Strategic Objective 1 of the Draft Plan - 'To locate new development in sustainable locations and through new settlements that respect the environmental capacity of the District, support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of the District's highest quality agricultural land'.</p> <p>Whatever happens, the Council should try and ensure as far as practicable that all brownfield sites are developed before any greenfield sites.</p> <p>Many small rural communities will be devastated by a 20% increase to Housing. Even residents who are not directly affected by development on adjoining land are likely to be be horrified by such a radical change to the places where they live and often, where they were born and brought up.</p> <p>I fully accept the need for additional housing (and am aware that the Council finds itself in an onerous position in some respects) - but not on this magnitude, especially on prime farming land (that should be retained to provide locally produced food - which falls in with the urgent need to reduce our carbon footprints) and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial.</p> <p>Surely, it would be more appropriate to keep the target down to around 10% and any additional development needs could be considered as 'windfall' as and when it arises, particularly because of the uncertain economic situation? Already there would seem to be oversupply at Gateford in Worksop, where houses are not selling well. There are also over 600 empty properties in Worksop.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF308 -	Resident	<p>Peak Farm is a huge site with 750 (minimum) dwellings proposed for Phase 1 and a further 750 for phase 2. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site - The Lodge. The impact on the north of Worksop will be considerable. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads and these will become clogged by traffic, as will other nearby roads. Already there are traffic issues at certain junctions. A good example is the Cannon crossroad which already during the rush hour has long tail-backs. No amount of modifications will significantly improve this. With an average of 1.4 cars per household in the East Midlands (2017-8), the new estate will probably spawn around 2,300 additional cars - massively adding to the local congestion. The proposed new road within the estate, may facilitate development on the site but it will do little to help local congestion. Reference is made in the Report to improvements to the town's infrastructure including road, schools and medical facilities but they are invariably vague and ill-defined and retrospective and not guaranteed. This seems to be a sop, designed to avoid close scrutiny and mask the fact that the Council has very limited powers to demand appropriate infrastructure spend in relation to development volume. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads will extend right out of Worksop along the A57 and other commuter roads where journey times are already substantially longer. For example, it now takes literally twice as long (over 1 hour) to drive to Sheffield than it did 20 years ago. The Plan does not offer any real answer to the additional pressures on the Town's infrastructure, and inevitably, therefore will be to the detriment of existing residents. Commuting is contrary to the Plan's objectives and ethos but perversely, this will be increased because of the type and location of proposed new housebuilding. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over years. For many members of the local community, this will mean decades of anxiety, continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution. It will be particularly bad for the elderly living close by, who will be forced to suffer from this, literally until they die. Focusing the bulk (75%) of Worksop's development onto one site might be easier for the Planning services to deal with but it will be a living nightmare for residents in the immediate vicinity and will overwhelm local infrastructure, including schools, doctors' and dentists' surgeries and amenities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF311	Resident	<p>I believe that further planning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.</p> <p>This is not what i signed for when i read the Carlton development plan, i would ask the council to re consider any future developments outside the above mentioned plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF312	Resident	<p>Please find below my comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF313	Resident	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development shown in the Bassetlaw local plan, Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15.</p> <p>I had not been informed of this development despite owning the property for 8 years.</p> <p>I have found out about this development from a friend this week.</p> <p>The council has a duty to inform property owners of such plans with time for them to comment.</p> <p>I trust, therefore that my objections arrive in time (and are acknowledged) for consideration.</p> <p>The proposal for at least 750 dwellings is excessive and combined with other proposed developments well outnumbers the housing need outlined in the Bassetlaw plan.</p> <p>There will be huge detriment to the quality of life of residents in the Thievesdale area in terms of noise, pollution and loss of amenities. The green environment will be severely impacted in terms of habitat of wildlife and destruction of a natural area well loved by the people of Worksop.. The council will, I trust, publish as legally required the environmental impact study for this large development.</p> <p>As I am already retired I expect this building work will last and disrupt the remainder of my life, causing me unnecessary stress.</p> <p>Please keep me advised of any further developments regarding Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
1197260	Resident	<p>Peaks Hill Farm is within the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick, not Worksop. Carlton has produced a Neighbourhood Plan, accepted by BDC and approved by the Independent Examiner. This Plan set out the approved sites for housing, and more than covered the number required. The Peak's Hill Farm site was not introduced in the land availability assessment and the construction of 750 homes, with another 750 in the following Plan period is excessive and not required in the village. Insufficient thought seems to have been given to the provision of health care and education. If the developer is to provide funding for an extension to the new, as yet unbuilt Gateford School, why not build a larger school to start with. Health and social care services are struggling already, so surely these should be provided before even considering building so many more dwellings.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF317	Resident	<p>I am emailing to object to the planned development at Peaks Hill Farm.</p> <p>The disruption caused by the construction alone will be considerable. There are neither the amenities nor the infrastructure to support further growth. There are not the employment opportunities locally for so many additional residents.</p> <p>In addition, the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan, which was voted upon only last year, highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon: fields surrounding the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.</p> <p>Please do not mar our countryside any further by building on more farmland.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
			continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
1197267	Resident	<p>Large rural villages number of dwellings 1764. Carlton-in-Lindrick Parish has supplied 600 houses which is more than 20%. Now a further 1500 at Peaks Hill. The Parish Neighbourhood plan 'made' last year has the same status as this Local Plan in making decisions about planning applications' and as such should not be deemed Worksop. Rather than 'support existing facilities' the exceeded development in Carlton In Lindrick Parish would strain existing facilities. Peaks Hill development roads and junctions capacity will not support traffic. How will new roads take traffic is unclear. Green gap ignores the Parish boundary as detailed in Carlton in Lindrick neighbourhood plan. Clear encroachment. The report for the Green gap was produced to support the plan. Thus different on East side of A60 to the West. Flooding in Carlton in Lindrick over the last 10 years in various parts of the village. As much up hill planning needs to be done. Can this be ensured by housing on green field areas.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF321 (owners of the Carlton Forest Distribution Centre and surrounding land adjoining the existing Worksop settlement boundary)	IBA Planning	<p>Similarly, the proposed housing allocation at Peaks Hill Farm (HS1 – in accordance with Policy15) is also supported. The above housing and employment land allocation at Peaks Hill Farm is considered to comprise an extremely logical and sustainable urban extension to this part of Worksop and is of sufficient size to facilitate a much needed and long overdue new distributor road1 linking Blyth Road (B6045) to Carlton Road (A60). It is noted that further benefits of the development of this land and the provision of the new distributor road (aside from supporting a green corridor with complementary pedestrian and cycle links and public transport connections) will be seen elsewhere within Worksop, including significantly improving the flow and movement of traffic in and around Worksop (including the town centre – and necessarily improving a number of strategic and local junctions around the town which are already at capacity and already serving to constrain sustainable housing, economic and regeneration growth initiatives moving forward). Indeed, it is considered that without the proposed housing and employment allocation, the new distributor road is not achievable (either in terms of the land required to facilitate it, or the development required to help fund and deliver it) – and this will inevitably have important and detrimental knock-on effects in terms of the Council's Vision and Strategic Objectives for 2037 and Worksop's regeneration aspirations for the town centre which are vital for attracting new homes, businesses and strategic investment as required. Clearly, the overall allocation is a large one and a great deal of work will be required to coordinate all various stakeholders in order to achieve overall delivery within the timescale envisaged. On my client's part, they remain happy and willing to collaborate closely with the Council, the local Highway Authority and the developers with the interest in the balance of the land subject of the overall allocation to achieve the above. Dialogue is already under way with Hallam Land and my client and their own development team will continue to be willing to attend all developer meetings alongside the Council and local Highway Authority (and all other relevant stakeholders) between now and the Examination in Public to offer all and every support necessary in demonstrating full confidence in the delivery of the site and the new distributor road within the Plan period (with the balance of the housing provision beyond). In the above connection, the Council will be aware that my client is a longstanding significant local employer and has a strong record in housing delivery – having secured local housebuilder, Rippon Homes, immediately following the grant of outline consent for 182 dwellings, who themselves submitted their own reserved matters very early within the life of the outline (and have since already made a start on site). Continuing this theme of early delivery, my clients are already in discussions with an innovative housing provider2 (who is keen to establish a presence within the town) who has indicated a strong interest in building out the housing element on my client's land as the first phase of development from the Blyth Road direction as part of an agreed Comprehensive Masterplan Framework which will include an independent design review, community consultation and, of course, Council approval. As required, this masterplan framework will be prepared to enable it to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document. The same housing provider has also expressed interest in building the already-consented data centre and my client's landmark office HQ as the first of the clean-tech/green-tech B1 office development approved under LPA reference 15/01477/OUT. Notwithstanding the above, as per our previous representations to the Council, the commercial element of the overall mixed-use outline consent has yet to be finalised via reserved matters approval and therefore it continues to make great sense for this element to be incorporated within the overall housing and employment allocation for Peak Hills Farm to allow complete flexibility over the alignment of the new distributor road and the Comprehensive Masterplan Framework in general. This being the case, the Council can be comforted that nothing will be agreed between my clients and any developer in the short-term that could influence the efficient or most appropriate layout of the Comprehensive Masterplan Framework and/or delivery of the overall site moving forward. In the above connection, whilst the extent of the overall mixed-use allocation at Peak Hills Farm shown on the draft Policies Map is supported, my client is concerned that the indicative line of the proposed new distributor road (identified on the same map as safeguarded land) does not unwittingly fix the alignment through the site or its access points onto either Carlton Road or Blyth Road in advance of the detailed design work being carried out by the local Highway Authority and all other relevant stakeholders including my client's design team and that of Hallam Land. My client welcomes the Council's policies that seek to introduce a suitable mix of housing types and tenures3 (including affordable homes, starter homes, specialist accommodation and self-build/custom homes), quality employment and education provision, a local centre and community hub including for sports pitches, quality green space and development that fosters healthy, active lifestyles4 and is resilient to climatic change5. Indeed, the proposed allocation at Peak Hills Farm offers the opportunity to integrate significant new</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>woodland/strategic planting to tie in with existing green infrastructure (whilst also securing carbon sequestration)6 and provide a logical buffer between the new settlement edge of Worksop and Carlton to the north (which is it noted will be further reinforced by the proposed Green Gap (Policy ST34)). In this connection, it is anticipated that, if allocated, the new settlement boundary for Worksop would be most logically drawn around (i.e. to include) the existing Carlton Forest Distribution Centre – providing a long term and easily recognisable northern limit to the town. With this in mind, my client has asked me to convey to you as part of these formal representations that they might also be willing to consider re-locating their existing logistics (big shed) development to an alternative location within the District as part of any measures to improve the gateway into this part of the town and to provide further flexibility for the alignment of the new distributor road and its entry point onto Blyth Road. Finally, the proximity of the already-consented waste-to-energy facility on my client's land at Carlton Forest Distribution Centre also presents a locationally unique opportunity to provide some or all of the housing and employment development with clean/green heating and power. In summary, the Draft Plan is supported in its current guise (subject to ensuring sufficient flexibility regarding the alignment of the new distributor road on the Worksop Policies Map and associated Policy ST51) and is considered sufficiently aspirational yet appropriately realistic to achieve the Council's Vision and Strategic Objectives for the District up to 2037 and beyond. As above and before, my client remains a willing, able and active participant in their role to support the Council in the identification and timely delivery of the development of the Peak Hills Farm mixed-use allocation and will look forward to meeting the Council's representatives and the local Highway Authority and Hallam Land shortly to programme the necessary strategic/design meetings. I trust the above is of assistance in confirming my client's wholehearted support for the proposed allocation and reaffirming my client's appetite and willingness to bring this site forward, in collaboration with the adjoining landowner/developer within the timescales anticipated by the Draft Plan.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF329	Resident	<p>After reading the proposal for Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm, could you inform me how the LPA have considered reasonable alternatives to the site? I have deep reservations about transport links, further school places and medical and social facilities for new and existing residents. If the plans go ahead then I would like you to write to me to guarantee the required infrastructure will be in place. Please find below further comments regarding the Bassetlaw Local Plan; Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm 1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. This is in addition to delays in seeing medical staff at Larwood surgery. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station carpark is often full and the train services poor and unreliable6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster8. Loss of prime local food-growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline14. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change)15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF340	Resident	I believe that further planning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF341	Resident	I believe that further planning consents in the Parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton Neighbourhood Plan which was agreed upon only last year. This plan highlighted two suitable sites that were agreed upon ... the Riddell, currently being built on by Avant Homes and the Old Firbeck Colliery site. To allow further housing development breaks this agreement between the council and the people of Carlton.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF342	Resident	I believe that planning consents in the parish of Carlton in Lindrick is in contravention of the Carlton neighbourhood plan which was Agreed upon only last year This plan highlighted two suitable sites That were agreed upon.. the Riddle and the old Firbeck colliery site To allow further housing development breaks this agreement breaks This agreement between the council and the people of Carlton	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
			continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF348	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Overall, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (BLP) has aspects that are commendable, including innovative ideas, such as the garden villages, green energy site and welcome references to the need for cycling and walking connectivity and green infrastructure. However, I have serious objections to the inclusion of a special area of countryside on the western fringe of the large proposed Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) housing development site. I also have concerns about the overall sustainability of this large Greenfield site. If you travel north from Worksop towards Carlton on the A60, on the edge of the town, you pass the G4S offices on the right in woodland. This mature wood on the right covers a hill and ridge that curves round north-eastwards to Peaks Hill farm enclosing a sloping, triangular shaped field on the right/front, bordered by the A60 (circled blue on the map below). This field is included in the plans for residential development. As you carry on north you pass Freshfields house on the left and down the hill, extensive and beautiful views of the rural landscape open out across the horizon towards Carlton direction. This landscape, the views, the mature woods and fields to the right and front, is one of the most beautiful I know. Often, as I travel back from Worksop this view will lift my spirits. It is unique and precious landscape. Once it's built on, it will be spoilt and lost for ever. It is current and future generations that will lose the enjoyment of this landscape. The 'public good', 'amenity value' or wildlife value of that landscape is priceless and is not reflected in the cost-benefit of commercial development decisions. I was shocked when I saw the plans to build on this field (just a few days before it went public). It is out of sight from Worksop, on land sloping down to Carlton and enclosed by woods. From this site is a beautiful and extensive view to the North West – the site is visible from Owday lane, over a mile away. This would be building in pristine countryside clearly separated from the town envelope. The plan states the need for a green buffer between Worksop and Carlton. I would argue that this field and its surrounding trees and ridge must be included in that green buffer zone (it's visible from the Carlton direction but not from Worksop). To build on it would set a precedent and surely other fields and woods will be built over until Worksop merges with Carlton. I would urge all councillors and relevant officers to visit the site to see with their own eyes. On p.59 of BDC's commissioned report Site Allocations: Landscape Study, is their conclusion on the Peaks Hill Farm (site 12H in the report) site: 'A combination of topography, the landscape value of existing woodlands and the extent to which the site extends north into open countryside, suggest that only a limited development in the middle and southern sections of the site could be achieved without an overall adverse landscape impact. However, care should be taken to respect topography, retain woodlands and if possible improving connectivity.' https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5295/bassetlaw-draft-landscape-study-2019.pdf That means, it is the western, A60 side of the site that will be most adversely affected and the boundary of the green buffer should therefore follow the line of the topography - i.e. follow the ridge that separates this field and Peaks Hill farm from the rest of the development site and from Worksop. Not only is this a beautiful landscape - between Worksop and Carlton/Blyth – but it is also a designed heritage landscape. The rolling fields and wooded ridges and copses were designed and planted by estate managers in the 18th and 19th centuries to be attractive and create an impact. Some of the older, 'veteran' trees found on this Peaks Hill site might pre-date this period. I do not object quite as strongly about the other parts of the proposed Peaks Hill development, as the largest part is to the East of the Peaks Hill woods, stretching over to Blyth Rd – backing on to Thievesdale, and joined on to Worksop. It is a concerning, serious loss of countryside - the site gives extensive views towards the Trent in the NE direction - but the development will be less visible from the roads running into Worksop from the North. Therefore, like the Landscape Study Report, I think development on the south and middle sections of the site can be managed better in terms of acceptable landscape impact than any development near the A60 on the west side of the site. However, in this, my amendment to my original submission, I have reflected on other submissions made on this site and thought through concerns of others re the sustainability of the PHF site. Although I'm most concerned about the landscape impact on the western part of the site, I now think the sustainability of the whole PHF site is questionable. The proposal for PHF is for 1500, mainly 3 or 4 bed 'executive' homes, probably to be occupied by commuters working in South Yorks (a reasonable expectation, given what's happened at similar recent developments such as Gateford). This will put more traffic on the roads and more strain on local health and education services for decades to come. There will be the irrevocable loss of a large wildlife resource. There are still areas of Brownfield sites, possibly in Bassetlaw, (more will become available in the future) certainly in South Yorks, - that could be developed for housing (but are less attractive to developers). Instead, large proposed Greenfield</p>	The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. Any trees lost will be replaced on site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm	<p>sites, such as PHF, in the Draft Plan are in danger of eroding the clear asset that Bassetlaw has – beautiful landscape and quiet roads. Government, at all levels, should take in the wider regional and national picture of sustainability – and that needs to be factored into this District Local Plan. Developing Greenfield sites is clearly profitable for landowners, developers and builders (and car manufacturers) but is damaging the environment, quality of life (and the planet) for future generations in Bassetlaw by removing the amenity value of this attractive countryside. Another aspect of the proposed development is a relief road running through the site from Blyth road and coming out on the A60 near the Peaks Hill farm (though this location is not confirmed). Highway matters are clearly for the County Highways to consider but I have serious concerns as it a dangerous stretch of fast road, on a bend and a hill, and it has had several fatalities in recent years. If there has to be a new road – and I’m not convinced there is a need for one – it should be at the south end of the proposed site and come out onto the A60 closer to G4S offices. I also believe the consultation period should be extended. From talking to residents in Carlton and in Worksop, it seems few members of the public are aware of the Draft Local Plan, let alone that this piece of land is affected. Such an important plan with huge changes for Bassetlaw needs extensive publicity and consultation. Yes, consultation on the Local Plan in its various guises seems to have been going on years but there have been such drastic changes to the LP in the last few months - such as the PHF site coming forward, and abandoning the previously proposed garden village sites – changes that even many BDC cllrs were not aware of (until just before it went public). The PHF site is within the Carlton in Lindrick Parish boundary but even ward District cllrs were not consulted on full details of this site until early January 2020 and Parish Cllrs learned about it only when public consultation started. The village developed its own Neighbourhood Plan, finalised last year, with assistance from BDC planners and the PHF site is not mentioned because it had not been brought forward at that time. It is fair to say that the concerns I am expressing here in my submission are shared by most of the Parish Council. BDC planning officers can confirm that, as they attended the PC meeting on 11th February 2020, (that I attended as a resident) that discussed the PHF site, the Draft LP and concerns around that. I do recognise the pressures on the council from government to find space for more housing to allow Worksop to grow and prosper but Bassetlaw is well ahead of government targets in that respect. I also note there are opportunities to develop much needed safe cycle links between PHF, Worksop and Carlton, as referenced in the Plan. In Conclusion, if PHF site is to go forward, despite doubts about its sustainability, I believe the particular field, woods and views alongside the A60, are precious to local people, to wildlife (deer, buzzards and many other species are regularly seen here) and to future generations, and therefore, the boundary of Green buffer zone should be redrawn to follow the natural boundary of the wooded ridge between Worksop and the open country to the north, to include and protect this relatively small but special piece of land (and remove it from the PHF site). Policy ST15 – Peaks Hill Farm Specifically I object to the inclusion of a triangular field to the east of the A60, between G4S and Peaks Hill Farm. The view, the aspect of this field, surrounded by mature trees on a woodland ridge is really beautiful. It is also separated from Worksop, and from the rest of development by this woodland ridge. To build in this field would be urban intrusion into pristine countryside. It will set a precedent – moving Worksop down the hill towards Worksop. (rest of the development, east of the ridge is on the Worksop side of the ridge and adjoining thievesdale and therefore less damaging. The quality of life (and wildlife) will be damaged for everyone who walks, cycles or drives along this route – losing such a wonderful vista/aspect. Damage to woods and its wildlife – deer, buzzards etc... will be considerable. In conclusion, any buffer zone between Carlton and Worksop should follow the topography – follow the wooded ridge line from G4S to Peaks Hill Farm and the field in question should be removed from the residential designation. I am also concerned at the safety implications of a link road joining the A60 near Peaks Hill. It is a fast, busy road and there have been several fatal accidents on the hill/bend at Peaks Hill – visibility is very poor.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF369	Resident	<p>We are writing to you to raise awareness and express our deep concern at the inclusion of large amounts of farmland and countryside, designated for housing development in the above Plan. We are members of the RSPB, WW Fund For Nature and the National Trust. Our concerns are not simply NIMBY, but national and global. Our belief is that we are part of nature, not separate from it and we all, therefore, have a moral duty to protect what we are all currently custodians of. We are particularly horrified at the extent of destruction of local greenfield sites especially that proposed for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) Policy 15. An urban sprawl of this size would have a catastrophic impact on wildlife habitats including for buzzards, owls, sparrow hawks, invertebrates, mammals (including bats) and pollinators, all of which inhabit the site. There are already 174 houses being built adjacent to this site (The Edge) with The Plan adding 'at least 750' more in phase 1 on 54 hectares and '750' in phase 2. The impact on Worksop will be immense. The roads surrounding the site are single lane, country-style roads. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure, including local roads, the A57 to Sheffield, GP surgeries (the waiting time for appointments at Newgate Medical Group for example, is already 6 weeks) dentists, the hospital, schools etc will be more intolerable when added to the huge sprawling developments currently in progress at Gateford and near Shireoaks and all the other sites. The size of the PHF site means its development will be spread over decades. For many members of the local community, this will mean the anxiety of continued disruption, inconvenience, noise, heavy plant, dust and other pollution, and in the case of the elderly, literally for the rest of their lives. The proposal at PHF has very little, if any, concrete evidence of appropriate, new infrastructure support compared particularly to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village ST1 ST3 ST35 and ST36, which is to have a nursery and primary school, healthcare facilities, parks, enhanced transport networks, flood risk management and a new railway station etc demonstrating what is deemed necessary for a development of 750 homes. However, there is nothing specific for PHF, a development of the same size, other than a road across the estate and a local bus service. The Plan clearly implies minimal infrastructure investment on and around this site and waives the Community Infrastructure Levy other than for that required to enable the development to take place. Connectivity in and out of Worksop is already inadequate and under stress. We now commute to Sheffield by train. It is a poor service:- dirty, overcrowded, unreliable, infrequent and increasingly difficult to park at the station. We used to commute by car, a journey that used to take 35 minutes to the centre and now takes about an hour. We accept the need for additional housing but not of this magnitude, especially on prime farming land that should provide locally produced food, and the surrounding green-space which has been countryside since time immemorial. National evidence shows that local authorities have limited power to enforce the provision of affordable housing on development sites and developers, who are interested in maximising their profits, do not appear to be voluntarily providing them. Worksop has a population of 42,000+. The housing currently being built and also proposed is largely 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached. The average house price in Worksop is £139,000. New developments - see Rippon Homes development off Blyth Road - are 'luxury homes' being marketed to commuters. These are not what many local people can afford to buy and we cannot find evidence to support the concept that by building lots of houses - sustainable, local employment will follow - in less affluent locations. It is more feasible, that the purchasers of large homes in less well off areas will be commuters who will be unlikely to work within and spend in the local economy. One of Worksop's Unique Selling Points is its rural location which is what attracted us to move here from Sheffield 23 years ago. It is now being turned into a sprawling commuter belt. The Plan consistently uses the term 'sustainable development'. This is absolute 'greenwash'. How can, by its very nature, the irrevocable loss of farmland and countryside be deemed sustainable? All the national and international agendas and concerns of, for example, global warming, locally-sourced food, light/noise/traffic pollution, urban drainage, local infrastructure capacity, health and wellbeing etc will continue to be eroded if destruction of the countryside is allowed at this housing saturation level.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF370	Resident	<p>Are houses definitely being built between Worksop/ Carlton on Blyth Road side I object to further development of housing near to Carlton.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF376	Resident	<p>We write to you with grave concern over the proposed planning development at the above site. We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the proposed development of 174 houses on the open space to the side of Thievesdale Lane. As an immediate neighbour to the site or a resident of Worksop, we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living, our community and environment. Our specific objections are as follows: Worksop is identified as a service centre. While Worksop does have schools, GP surgeries, train station, shop and local bus services, these facilities, particularly the schools and surgeries, are already at capacity. The train line is an artery in to the town, the station car park is usually full, and in addition to this there are plans to encourage drivers to use public transport.1. "A development should not set an undesirable precedent for other sites where equity development would be difficult to resist and where cumulatively the resultant scale of development would erode the character and environment of the area". We believe this proposal would do exactly that. To add more than this number of houses to Worksop would significantly erode the character and community of the Town.2. "Proposals which would generate significant levels of traffic will not be permitted in location where travel by means other than a private car is not a realistic alternative". This is certainly the case here. The proposed development is over two miles from the station, so people are unlikely to walk, especially if commuting. People are likely to choose to drive, especially as:3. Buses along Thievesdale Lane are infrequent, unreliable and stop running before 7pm. There are no bus shelters or real time bus timetable information points. Buses are not timed to coincide with trains at Worksop Station. The bicycle lanes are inadequate and dangerous, putting cyclists in conflict with pedestrians if they ride on the bike lanes, and with drivers if they do not. Roads between the site and centre of town are dangerous to cycle on in the dark. There are no bike racks at bus stops, and inadequate bike racks at the station. This development is therefore likely to increase cars on the village roads significantly. The Council is proposing to increase the overall target for new housing on this site to at least 1634 homes on Peaks Hill Farm. The majority of this housing to be built in the near future. (As a matter of interest, the amount of added vehicles to our undeveloped roads would be over 1000 from this one site alone!). The town and outlying district roads would not be able to cope with this amount, not to mention other housing building sites in the district. Also with this amount of dwellings in place and the number of people involved, has the Council put any thought into our already over subscribed GP surgeries, where we have to wait up to six weeks for an appointment to see our own doctor? Our schools are also oversubscribed so much so that children are having to spend considerable time and distance travelling back and forth. It's not rocket science to see there will be more school runs for more vehicles to make. There was no mention in the consultation of what the council has planned for the disruption to the wild life in this area. There is proof that buzzards nest in the plantation wooded area, but consideration needs to be given to a variety of animal, insect and bird species that live and breed in the surrounding fields and hedges.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF391	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Bassetlaw Local Plan – Peaks Farm policy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are against the inclusion of prime farmland and green belt land at Peaks Hill Farm, Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Plan. 2. The development site is too large it will have a great an impact on local residents of Worksop. At least 750 dwellings and business and employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all the local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of a least a 15 year building site. 3. Areas of prime local food-growing land when councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. 4. Loss of invaluable green phase at has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. 5. Effect loss of our established local wildlife and green environment (birds, sparrowhawk, owls, buzzards) frogs, toad, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF392	Resident	<p>Worksop is a pretty market town which we are all proud of the stretch of countryside on Carlton Road down to Carlton village is an example of lovely countryside with fields and woodlands is all this to be spoilt plundering woodlands and wildlife. We are being told about the importance of climate change this seems to be doing the opposite plus the traffic problems which according to the planners will be improved seems to be unbelievable. On a personal level I have lived on Winster Grove 22 years and my property is on the boundary of the site, through the years we have suffered quad bikes, motor cycles leaving the site as a race track and if the plan for a footpath comes about have we now to suffer people using our street as a short cut to all the amenities we are told about. Great, we will have to look forward to all and sundry passing our bungalows owned mostly by over 80's on there way back and forward to the local public houses and houses looking down on our gardens taking our hard earned privacy. A suggestion at one of the meetings was that the site be made into smaller sites housing a retirement village and sites for first time occupants and one for young families. Could something on these lines be considered. We realise more houses have to be available but can't we try to live together in harmony and think more carefully when planning.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF393	Resident	<p>Housing requirement is shown by settlement Worksop 2180 Large Rural Villages 1764 (includes Carlton in Lindrick) Site HS1 Peaks Hill Farm Peaks Farm is in Carlton in Lindrick people clarify who is administrating this site. The first line reads "the type and mix....ensures the needs of local people are met". This is not Carlton Parish Council experience.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF395	Resident	<p>My opposition for the proposed planning of 2X 750 houses. I am against the Peaks Hill Farm policy 15, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. With the loss of prime farmland and green belt land. It will have a great impact on the local residents as the development proposed is too far too large. It will mean that the noise, pollution from heavy ground working vehicles, disruption and the inconvenience of at least 15 years of building work. Why does Worksop need another 1500 houses? Especially on green belt land with ancient woodland and wildlife. What happened to the plan to build on the brownfield site at the back of the Kilton Golf Club? It seems to be a re-occurrence of the Firbeck pit site and the new builds adjacent to the Riddle Arms. The roads in and out of Worksop are really congested and couldn't cope with the extra influx of traffic. The railway is insufficient and the road off Thievesdale Lane/ Blyth Road is an accident waiting to happen. At certain times it's like dicing with death, it's so unbelievable. Worksop has a newish built hospital which is only running at half capacity! i.e. the children's ward. This means Worksop people have to go to Doncaster Royal (another county) which is in dire need of a good deep clean. The children are shipped out to other hospitals. What would the effect be with more homes being built? Also waiting time to see doctor (6 weeks) at any one of the surgeries in the area, how will they cope? Also the loss of prime food growing land and the green space that's always been there that helps form the character of Worksop. It will effect the loss of established local wildlife i.e. (pheasants, owls, buzzards, jays, sparrowhawks etc, plus the beautiful skylark that makes its nest on the ground. It will also take its toll on the hedgehogs, hares, bats, toads, frogs, newts and the different species of insects. At the end of the wood on Long Plantation there is a public footpath. It seems that someone has removed the said sign, probably the farmer that's been renting this land! What will you do about this?How did the farmer irrigate his crops on the Long Plantation and surrounding fields? Through the dry spells I've seen this done on a number of occasions! I know that there is a post with the letters S.V. on it (Service Value) does this mean that there is a lake or reservoir beneath the land? If this is so we the residents could be prone to flooding when all the concrete and tarmac roads are put down.An extension to deadline 26/02/2020Because of the failings of the consultation process. Appendix 4 (page 193) of the Bassetlaw Local Plan document outlines the community consultation process. Concerns if over-ruled We need to see:1. A green buffer zone between current resident's homes and the new development with a minimum of 15 metres to provide a green corridor for privacy. 2. The new homes to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between the existing homes and the new buildings to extend the green corridor. 3. Low level housing near to the bungalows and existing homes (no high rise town houses).4. Pathways to connect to existing woodland and access to public transport.5. Any communal areas to be behind the treeline and away from any existing homes. i.e. sports field, youth facilities, playgrounds, shops etc....I had my bungalow valued on the 19/2/20 because of what's going on with this said policy 15 plan, only to be told that the value would depreciate as the outlook from my home is a big selling point. Does this mean I can get compensation from the Bassetlaw District Council if the said policy 15 goes ahead??</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF396	Resident	<p>Already 174 new homes being built at Thievesdale/ Blyth Road. New housing near the Innings. Plan proposes at least 750 more houses and businesses units and other retail and commercial use. Then after 2026 – 750 more houses! I disagree with these numbers, far too many in the same location with unfair adverse effect on the local community. This will cause congestion to the area, more traffic, more free parking on roads near hospital which already causes difficult driving on Blyth Road. Also put extra pressure on an already stretched hospital, A&E department and the Doctors surgery At Larwood. The plan states retail and commercial uses – surely the retail shops at the Innings (a good mixture post office, chemist, sainsburys express) Morrisons supermarket, the new ASDA store all within easy reach, a corner shop would be more in-keeping, no need for yet another supermarket. I like to shop locally and in the town, and want Worksop to flourish, but have noticed many empty houses and premises could some of these premises be utilised into dwellings which would lower the need for such a large development off Blyth Road. I wish to keep the countryside approach to Worksop and keep existing hedges, trees, woods will remain and new development will be in-keeping with the area, having low rise, bungalows, two storey houses and no flats.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF397	Resident	<p>1. The proposed pathway linking Winster Grove with the new development is of concern. A similar path of Ambleside Grange had to be closed due to vandalism and noise. 2. The effect on the local wildlife could be devastating. Owls, Buzzards, Woodpeckers and foxes to name a few. The fields are also home to numerous butterflies most of which are in danger of extinction. 3. The impact on the local community and its services is also of concern, where most of the new householders will be commuters who will invest little into the locality in particular a dying town centre.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF398	Resident	<p>Peaks Hill Farm Development The notice for proposed allocation in the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2018 - 2037 posted around the Thievesdale Area on the lamp posts stated proposed 750 houses 5 ha employment land, supporting road infrastructure shop and community facilities. Location land at Peaks Hill Farm Gateford Worksop S81 04N. I read the one posted on the lamp post on Kingsdale Thievesdale S81 0JX. At first glance I thought why is this proposed development at Gateford anything to do with our area Thievesdale. Most people would not have given it a second glance, but of course that was not the case and maybe done deliberately to keep people away from the proposed meetings? If the announcement about this development had been made before the general election, I wonder if people may have voted differently, and what is the views of our new Member of Parliament about the proposed development. The Long Plantation I do believe you will destroy the Long Plantation and all the wildlife in this area, it will be lost forever, you say for every house built 5 trees will be planted this does not compensate for the loss of the wildlife habitat and ancient woodland. Bridleway The bridleway sign at the end of the Long Plantation has gone missing, it is said the farmer removed the sign, and what are you proposing to do about this bridleway? The local amenities i.e. hospitals, doctors, police, bus services, school and roads cannot cope now without the populations as it is, so how will it cope with an influx of more housing and all that comes with it. The brownfield sites around Bassetlaw area could and should have been used for housing instead of more supermarkets and fast food outlets. As for Worksop Town Centre it is a ghost tow, it is time to develop this and not the greenfield sites. Save our greenfields for future generations This development will destroy the visual aspects of the northern end of Worksop. Bassetlaw should look at the brownfield sites with Government grants, clearing these sites and developing them for housing and not using the greenfield sites saving them for future generations to enjoy. It is said the landowner wants to sell the land at Peaks Hill Farm, whoever buys it should not be allowed to use the site for anything else but farming land</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF399	Resident	Disagree with building on farmlandDisagree with building of roads cycle routes and pathways. Not only will building on this land strip valuable farmland and will also impact on wildlife and plant life and woodland.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF405	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation) 2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks at Peaks Hill Farm 3. The development site is too large and will have too great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction. 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. 7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 8. Loss of prime local-food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. 10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including Sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife. 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses to extend the green corridor. 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line. 	The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
		<p>14. New developments to have a minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change).</p> <p>15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution</p> <p>16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher rise town houses</p> <p>17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.</p> <p>18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook</p> <p>19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings</p> <p>20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)</p> <p>21. Any square meter of ground built upon means it's one less square meter of earth to soak away rain water.</p>	
REF410	Resident	<p>Policy HS1 Proposed development at Worksop Peaks Hill Farm, between Carlton Road and Blyth Road. My concern is the congestion this will potentially cause on Blyth Road. Particularly if the proposed plan for a Lidl store at the end of Blyth Road goes ahead. During peak times it is very difficult of the end of Westfield Drive trying to get onto Blyth Road. Whilst any development must be good for the town we do need it – hopefully new residents will want to shop in the town centre – here I think this needs developing, bringing in new shops, high street names if possible. How will the hospital cope with all these extra residents? Many of the facilities have been transferred to DRI. Bassetlaw Hospital should be for people of the area and patients not be sent further afield for treatment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF413	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation) 2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks at Peaks Hill Farm 3. The development site is too large and will have too great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction. 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. 7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 8. Loss of prime local-food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change 9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. 10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including Sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population. <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife. 12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses to extend the green corridor. 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line. 14. New developments to have a minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change). 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher rise town houses 17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport. 18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 21. Any square meter of ground built upon means it's one less square meter of earth to soak away rain water. 	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF414	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction. 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 8. Loss of prime local-food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including Sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses to extend the green corridor. 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line.14. New developments to have a minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change). 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)21. Any square meter of ground built upon means it's one less square meter of earth to soak away rain water.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF415	Resident	<p>Policy 15 Peaks Hill Farm1. I believe that the Council have not met their obligations in ensuring that affected residents were properly consulted about the Bassetlaw Local Plan (Appendix 4: Community Consultation)2. I am against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks at Peaks Hill Farm3. The development site is too large and will have too great impact on local residents. 'At least 750 dwellings' plus business/employment land in addition to the 174 dwellings currently being built by Rippon Homes off Blyth Road, will mean that all local residents in a wide vicinity will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption and inconvenience of at least a 15 year building site. For many elderly residents, that will be their lifetime. 4. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. The finance to build these facilities has to come from the money raised by the new dwellings – such as via Council Tax and developer contribution following construction. 5. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the 6 week wait at Newgate medical centre to see any GP. Getting in and out of town on the A57 is often difficult. All our connecting roads to the A1 and M1 are single lane, country-style roads. The train station car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. 6. The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.7. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. 8. Loss of prime local-food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change9. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character.10. Effect and loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including Sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs and insect population.If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:11. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife.12. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses to extend the green corridor. 13. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgrounds, car parks and sports pitches to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the tree line.14. New developments to have a minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change). 15. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution16. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher rise town houses17. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport.18. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook19. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings20. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)21. Any square meter of ground built upon means it's one less square meter of earth to soak away rain water.</p>	<p>The consultation for the Local Plan was communicated appropriately in accordance with national legislation and local guidance. Two consultations events were held in the day and early evening to ensure as many residents as possible could attend. A4 site notices were put up around the site and all neighbouring residents had flyers distributed to their address notifying them of the proposal. Media and social media coverage was additional. A 6 weeks consultation is the standard timeframe in legislation for a Plan consultation. Appendix 4 relates to Policy ST2 not the Local Plan. The development must address its impacts on the community and infrastructure. Details develop as the Plan evolves and will be agreed for health, education etc. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes.</p>
REF419	Resident	<p>Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop Brooks Farm, Fresh Fields. I am opposed to the volume of properties to be built on this site. I am also opposed to the proposed building on open countryside adjacent to the A60 Worksop – Carlton Road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
			continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF420	Resident	Please do not plan for a walk through into Winster Grove. We moved into the grove in 1996 are front gardens are across the road (it is a banking now full of shrubs etc...). The first years was used by teenagers jumping over the new fences as a short cut to Hemmingfield Rise. It took nearly a year to convince them to stop using it as a short cut. We also had people bring their dog and letting their dog use it as a toilet. A path between to houses on Ambleside from Lodore Road had to be closed because of vandalism.	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF421	Resident	<p>Policy ST15</p> <p>1. Concerned for the overall impact on the community where services are already over stretched.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>Health care facilities, Doctor's surgeries, hospitals and schools.</p> <p>2. Increase in traffic and pollution to the environment.</p> <p>3. Adverse effects on our wildlife to name a few birds, butterflies and hedgehogs.</p> <p>4. The pathway proposed linking the new development with Winster Grove is also a concern especially when a similar pathway on Ambleside Grange had to be closed off due to noise and vandalism.</p>	Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF427	Resident	<p>I am writing in connection with the above potential development. I oppose this development due to many factors. I moved into my house nearly 25 years ago as it was on the verge of the countryside, being the last road in Worksop. Once these fields are built on the countryside is lost forever, what about the wildlife? Also how are the Doctors surgeries going to cope, we have problems getting appointments now. Schools will be another problem, I understand they are already full. There is already enough upheaval with the smaller development in Thievesdale Lane, multiply that by many times and one can only imagine the noise and pollution. I wish the Council to think long and hard before going ahead with the disastrous plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>
REF461	Resident	<p>Re the above development, I have noted all your ideas for housing and business and of course tree planting. I note you have said upto (4 trees per house). Excellent but? You will have to stipulate that the trees must not be moved or removed by the householder. I also note that we do have a couple of well developed woods towards the Farm and Carlton Road areas. Any amount of tree planting will not remove Carltonlindrick like these extensive woods do at present. Any plans to remove any of these trees is misguided and downright criminal? Given the outcry it would have both locally and nationally. Houses can be built sympathetically around them with a bit of thought. I didn't see anything on the plans re-the junction at the bottom of the hill- surely a roundabout is needed. It is a (blackspot) and increased traffic there would make things worse. I do understand that people need homes but given the needs of the planet. I think much thought is needed for forward planning. Which also must take note from people already living here, who have to live with it if you got it wrong!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As the main town within Bassetlaw, Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement. As such, it must continue to evolve and grow to meet the needs of the community and the District. The Council is required to allocate enough land to deliver new employment/new jobs and new housing, both market, affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly and disabled. This site is capable of delivering new employment/jobs, new housing and wider benefits in terms of highway improvements, community facilities, an enhanced green infrastructure network, retention of existing woodland, new open space and improvements to walking and cycling routes. The gap between Carlton and Worksop is proposed to be maintained. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 HS1	Peaks Hill Farm		
REF481	Carlton Ward Members, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>As members for Carlton, we wish to represent the views heard from residents about the proposed Peaks Hill Farm development. There were a group of comments summarised by the phrase – this is Carlton not Worksop. Residents wanted to know how the site can go ahead if it's not in the neighbourhood plan and, correspondingly, why it wasn't included in the Neighbourhood Plan, given that the plan is so young. Likewise, residents feel that Carlton should be involved in the site's development. It is noted that the site is CIL exempt, a site that would have seen 25% go to the Parish. Residents want to be compensated for that loss and ask that some 106 monies benefit Carlton; a cycle-way linking Red Lane/Wigthorpe across the estate to Peppers was suggested. Protecting the green buffer or Greenbelt as it's colloquially known. Residents see this site eroding the existing buffer between Worksop and Carlton. For some this means no building at all, for others, it means siting all development behind the natural buffers of existing woodland and escarpment. This second group would not want to see houses along the A60 and some residents report that such assurances were given by officers at consultation meetings. Our sense is that this is the main concern of Carlton residents: namely that the existing feeling of separation along the A60 remains intact. During the consultation we have visited the site on three occasions and it's a route used by pedestrians and cyclists in some numbers. Maintaining this natural green barrier is in accordance with advice of the landscape consultant and would protect the character of the non-designated heritage site in the immediate vicinity. The proposed link road is problematic in this regard. Residents do not want the road to 'tear' through the woodland. This would uproot many existing established trees and given the topography, leave a wide scar in the woodland that would take years to green over. In this regard we would support the opinion of the tree consultant who identifies a less intrusive route in the extreme south of the site. This takes out less established trees and would provide a shorter straighter and, being a right angles to the A69 as well as to the escarpment, less intrusive route to A60 road users. It would also come out opposite or close to the road through Gateford and so, give the feel that this is a continuous ring-road link. Finally, landscape. Some residents noted that the draft plan protects land to the north of Red Lance, land to the west of the A60 towards the Rotherham boundary as well as land to the east of the A60 through Costhorpe towards Blyth Road. In effect residents believe this will stop the current Avant homes development from creeping northwards. This is to be welcomed and gives added weight to the protection of village views identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The Plan will be amended to clarify that the site sits with Carlton Parish. Should it be evidenced that impacts from the development affect Carlton Parish then developer contributions will be sought. The Local Plan will require for example a contribution to the civic centre/youth facilities in Carlton. A green gap has been designated between Carlton and Worksop. This restricts development. There are no plans for Worksop to grow further north. The field adjacent to the A60 will be protected as green infrastructure so will remain open. However the road is considered to be necessary to manage traffic flow in Worksop so will remain part of the scheme. Any trees lost will be replaced on site.</p>
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The link road through Peaks Hill Farm site</p> <p>Is the case for this road made water-tight against potential developer challenge when planning applications come in? I read that such a link road will reduce congestion in and around Worksop. Which incoming traffic flows will it divert from Worksop? I can't think of any flows it will divert away from Victoria Square, Carlton and Gateford Roads, Watson Road or on any of the junctions identified as requiring upgrades on the A57.</p> <p>Presumably, the hope is, that it will reduce flows along Raymouth and Thievesdale Lane and the Cannon Crossroads junction by providing an alternative route from the A57 through Gateford and Peaks Hill. Yet, I can find no evidence in the supporting documentation which quantifies how much traffic this will divert. I accept there is traffic on the Gateford/A1 route which would happily divert but what proportion of the lanes total is that? Maybe some Kilton/A57 traffic will divert also but given that it will require cars to travel 2 KM's north up Blyth Road past Farmers Branch before looping around to join the B6041 it is unlikely to prove the route of choice for many. That journey would be even more unattractive if the link road exits onto the A60 and not directly opposite the existing entrance to Gateford Park, requiring motorists to negotiate an extra two junctions on the busy A60.</p> <p>An assessment of the traffic flows from within the development is made. No mention is made of its impact on Cannon cross roads, as far as I can see. Yet, traffic from the site will use the crossroads, traffic to Worksop centre, to the station, to Celtic point, to Valley schools and the leisure centre and even to Claylands industrial factories. It is assumed that the £1.2 m set aside for improvements there will be sufficient to cope with this increase?</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment shows that this road will aid traffic slow and movement around the town. The development will have impacts on various junctions including Cannon Crossroads and Kilton Road roundabout. These will be reference in future policies.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST16 HS2 Pupil Referral Centre			
REF201	Severn Trent	As the site is a proposed redevelopment site it is important that the drainage and sewerage systems are designed in accordance with current industry best practice, looking to identify separate systems for surface water and foul water, so that the drainage Hierarchy and SuDS, can be used to provide a sustainable development and improve resilience to flooding and climate change. New developments should also be designed with water efficiency in mind. Development should also consider the need to incorporate Water efficiency and Water re-use within the development to ensure that it is delivered in a sustainable way. Severn Trent would therefore recommend that Policy 16 incorporates specific statements to require the development to consider design principles outline above, some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village comments above. The Former Pupil Referral Centre site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Thank you for your comment. Appropriate changes have been made to the relevant parts of the Plan.
REF222	Notts CC	Figure 15 - should the access and frontage car park be included in the site area? There does not appear to be access from the public highway without it.	Agreed. Site area will need amending to reflect this.
REF116	Network Rail	Although there are no direct planned allocations adjacent or close to railway lines at Worksop, as is the case in Retford we presume a strategic look at road vehicle traffic patterns has been or will be undertaken and the effects of increased traffic over Worksop station LC will be considered as part of that strategic exercise.	Noted. Thank you for comment.
REF023	Water Management Consortium	'This site is outside of the Board's district'.	Noted. Thank you for comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST18 HS4 Former Manton Primary School			
REF026	Resident	i wish to raise some concerns about the proposed new plans for the buildings that are planned for manton school site i live on kingston road straight across from were its looks likes thats were the access is going to be for the new houses its already heavy with the traffic from cars and vans parking both side of the road i have to park my car outside my house as i dont have a drive and i have my car damaged on more than one occasion i am concerned about the noise and extra traffic and all the disruption were i live its also going to spoil the view i have to were all i see his the houses im also concerned about what kind of people its going to bring as on phelham street and shrusbury road all the antisocial behaviour and drug related crimes its going to be chaotic. its alright proposing these new plans but the people who live there already have just got to put up with what will come its lovely at the moment love getting up to the view also i think it will cause parking problems on our street because if the plans go a head people will just park outside our houses and i need to park outside our house as my husband is disabled and also to let you know that someone has taken the one sign down with the proposed plans if you could please put these concerns forward and keep me informed about how things are going i will try and email so photos so you have an insight on how it will in pack we i live many thanks	The upcoming Design SPD for the site will address access into the site and will make sure that the scale, density and design of the site is location appropriate. The SPD will also detail suitable open space provision on site so the lanscape of the site can be retained. The design SPD will detail the request for off road parking, which will address any concerns regarding parking capacity as well.
REF137	Resident	There is no school in the area nearest 2 mls away. NO bus service to get children to school. Where the entrance appeare to be there is an electric sub-station in the middle. Road cannot substain an influx of traffic. There has all ready been skink holes in the area. One of which was on Kingston Road. No access for H.G.V.	In order to make the development of the site sustainable, a design SPD will be created to set out development principles. This will also include the establishment of appropriate access into the site. The provision of schools falls under Notts County Council, however large development sites are required to make monetary contributions towards additional school spaces/upgrading infrastructure as appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST18 HS4 Former Manton Primary School			
REF201	Severn Trent	There are surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Severn Trent note that Section 1 of Policy 18 details the development of a Design Quality SPD, we would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is either covered specifically within policy 18 or covered by the Design Quality SPD. It is noted that Section 5 of policy 18 also refers to the re-location of existing open space within the site boundary to provide a multifunctional open space, we would also recommend that specific reference to SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy are made either within this policy or the SPD. The Former Manton Primary School Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	The principle of water efficiency design are covered by the Policies ST46 and ST48. The upcoming Design Quality SPD will however, make specific reference to water efficiency design. The development of this site will be sensitive to available open space in the area and will require contribution towards the provision/improvement of open space in the District. Please see the policy edited as requested as well.
REF379	Resident	Agree with the need for social and affordable new build. Stress both social ad affordable, not provide housing. Concerns about access roads and infrastructure. For example, local services, GPs, Hospitals, schools already struggle due to cuts and demand. Are have plans to look at this as well. Also Retford Road – old knitwear site – absolutely needs to be re-developed but already it struggles to cope with traffic plans for this need to be alongside new builds. Also same at the old Manton School.	The upcoming Design SPD for the site will address access into the site and will make sure that the scale, density and design of the site is location appropriate. HS6 The Old Knitwear Site has planning permission (20/00183/FUL). Any upgrades to road infrastructure would have been considered through the planning process.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST19 HS5 Talbot Road			
REF201	Severn Trent	There are surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Severn Trent note that Section 1 of Policy 19 details the development of a Design Quality SPD, we would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is either covered specifically within Policy 19 or covered by the Design Quality SPD. It is noted that Section 5 of Policy 19 indicates that open space will not be provided by the development directly. Severn Trent would therefore note that SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy are key design considerations for this development. Whilst we appreciate that due to the scale of the development there is limited space available for green features, it is still important that any surface water leaving the site is discharged in a sustainable way, and is of suitable quality that it would not cause harm to the water environment to water resources within the underlying Principle Aquifer. We would therefore recommend that a specific statement is made regarding SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy within Policy 19 some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village comments above. The Talbot Street Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	The principle of water efficiency design are covered by the Policies ST46 and ST48. The upcoming Design Quality SPD will however, make specific reference to water efficiency design. The development of this site will be sensitive to available open space in the area and will require contribution towards the provision/improvement of open space in the District. Site HS4 Former Manton Primary School will also provide new accessible open space in close proximity to the site. Furthermore, please see policy amended the refer to SuDS.
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways There is a problem with the formatting in section 4 'Lincoln Street' and there are two 4, a)	Thank you for your comments, please see policy amended as suggested.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST20 Former Knitwear Factory			
1189777	Resident	Welcome this development, but regret that the adjacent derelict site facing directly onto the Chesterfield Canal that includes the fabulous Bracebridge Pumping Station, is not mentioned anywhere in the Local Plan.	The Bracebridge Pumping Station has not been submitted for consideration as a site allocation in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST20 Former Knitwear Factory			
REF115	Canal and River Trust	The site lies in proximity to a watercourse to the north, which interacts with the Chesterfield Canal. As the site has been historically utilised for industrial use, there is a risk that contamination is present on site. To prevent pollution towards the local waterway environment, opportunities could be taken to expand the policy to require the submission of relevant geoenvironmental surveys to categorise the risk and to recommend appropriate mitigation measures to limit any risk to the river Ryton and canal. The site is in proximity to an access point to the Chesterfield canal (150m north of the site), which would provide pedestrian and cycle access to the town centre and to the wider Green infrastructure network. Recommend that the policy include the inclusion of measures to promote wayfinding to the canal, which could be of benefit to new residents.	A criteria will be added to ensure remediation forms part of the development proposal, where appropriate. Connectivity to the pedestrian and cycle network is identified by Policy 20. A requirement for directional signage to the network will be added to Policy 20.
1195884	Resident	Support regeneration of old factory sites and derelict sites.	Support welcome and noted.
REF201	Severn Trent	The northern Boundary of the site is the River Ryton and a Canal Feeder, there are also surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Whilst Severn Trent appreciate that this is a brownfield site and that there will be additional challenges to overcome as part of development it is essential that development is still designed in accordance with current best practice as much as possible, this will include ensuring the surface water is discharge sustainably in accordance with the Drainage Hierarchy, and that a presumed outfall to existing connection points is not automatically used. Development should also look to incorporate SuDS within the development looking to enhance water quality, amenity and biodiversity within the area as well as providing surface water storage. Recommend that Policy 20 specifically details these elements, some example wording that we feel would assist with this is provided under the Bassetlaw Garden village. Water efficiency and water re-use should be considered for this development. This could be covered by Policy 20 directly or within the Design Quality SPD. The Former Knitwear Factory Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Policy ST47 requires major development to incorporate SuDS. Criteria will be added to Policy ST48: Water Quality to ensure all development follows the drainage hierarchy. Both are strategic policies so apply to all relevant development. There is no need to repeat the requirements in Policy 20. Water efficiency is covered by Policy ST45: Climate Change and further detail will be provided in the Design Quality SPD.
REF213	Pegasus Group	As a housing developer with involvement in the site, Dukeries Homes Ltd have interest in supporting Policy 20. Dukeries Homes' land interest is contained within the allocation boundary identified in the draft Local Plan. Pegasus Group have submitted a planning application on behalf of Dukeries Homes Ltd for 54 no. affordable residential units and associated works which is currently pending validation. It is proposed that the development site forms an affordable scheme, including an element of shared ownership housing. As stated within paragraph 7.7.3 the Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the Former Knitwear Factory site as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Worksop and consider it deliverable in the early part of the plan period. Policy 20 sets out that the Council have confirmed they will support the delivery of mixed-use development at the site, including at least 40 dwellings. Dukeries Homes Ltd support the wording of draft Policy 20 as it represents an appropriate housing allocation site within a sustainable location for residential development, which is also supported by National and Local Planning Policy. This site fulfils the requirements of paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to identifying a supply of deliverable and developable sites within the plan period. Dukeries Homes Ltd are committed to delivering the site in the short term and the proposed allocation at Site HS6: Former Knitwear Factory, Worksop is supported.	Support welcome and noted.
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways Part 4, a) should include a through route between Retford Road and High Hoe Road.	Through access added to Policy 20 as requested.
REF116	Network Rail	Although there are no direct planned allocations adjacent or close to railway lines at Worksop, as is the case in Retford we presume a strategic look at road vehicle traffic patterns has been or will be undertaken and the effects of increased traffic over Worksop station LC will be considered as part of that strategic exercise.	The Transport Study 3 will identify if there are any potential impacts associated with level crossings in the District.
REF300	Natural England	In section 5 of the policy note the provision for the protection and enhancement of River Ryton Green Corridor, which is welcome.	Support welcome and noted.
REF023	Water Management Consortium	This site is outside of the Board's district.	Noted. Thank you for comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
1177432	Resident	Seems sensible, good local infrastructure.	Thank you for your comment.
		<p>We would like to state our objections to the The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to the Trinity Farm development on North Road, Retford and detail our main concerns. Road capacity - North Road to Hallcroft roundabout: serious concerns regarding the volume of cars who could potentially be using North Road due to the current proposal to build 440 houses and 3 ha of employment units. The current road infrastructure already struggles and during peak times it backs up from Hallcroft roundabout, sometimes all the way to Randall Way (opposite the new development site) and it is often difficult to join from the existing side roads. With potentially another 800 cars and lorries using an already busy road and no proposals as to how the current road layout can be adapted to help with the flow of traffic, this building scheme will contribute towards major hold-ups. This could also increase the number of road traffic accidents. The majority of the people purchasing the proposed houses will already have jobs and will not work in the proposed employment areas and will require the road structure to travel to their places of work. So far, there have been very few new jobs created from the new employment sites as the majority of firms have re-located from other areas in and around Retford. When the original plans for the 196 houses were passed, the concerns regarding the road capacity weren't taken seriously. The report to quell any objections stated that the people who would buy the new houses would work in the local industrial area, use the local facilities and if they needed to travel, they would either use their bike or walk if the journey was less than 3 miles. In reality, this response was just to get the plans passed and no solution was given as to how the road structure could be improved to cope with the additional cars or who would be paying for the changes i.e. council or developers. Additional cycle routes and footpaths are welcome in addition to the existing, as we already use these whenever possible. The Hallcroft estate could also see an increase in cars as drivers seek alternative routes to cut their journey times. Hallcroft Road also backs up from Hallcroft roundabout at peak times.</p> <p>Drainage / flooding risks - currently rain water drains into the fields. Concerns about the ground level height of new area and the risk of water running off the new estate and flooding existing properties as in the original plans there is only a water attenuation area proposed at the opposite end of the site (stage 2). The footpaths to the front and rear of our property do not have any drainage (no road to our property). We would like assurances that this development will not cause flooding to existing properties especially as the Environmental agency had concerns regarding flooding and whether enough provision had been built into the plans. There has been little information as to whether the new drains will lead into the drains on the existing estate and if the current drainage system will struggle to cope with the additional water. Agricultural 'Greenfield' land – some agricultural land has already been lost for business development with very few employment opportunities being created. When our house was purchased, the proposed area was outside the town boundary and highly unlikely to be built on as it was Greenbelt land (now Greenfield land). The boundary, as we understand, has since been extended without consultation so that proposals for housing and employment development could be pushed through. The land is currently rented to farmers and has been in constant use for over 40 years including sheep grazing on winter feed. Idle Valley is already accessible to the public and therefore the green areas are being reduced. Environmental effect - habitats and hedges will be lost and the wildlife who utilise this area i.e. birds (including swallows and hawks), hedgehogs, butterflies, bees, foxes and deer will lose their homes / hunting grounds. The proposed area is larger than the existing North Road housing estate and this must surely have a big impact on wildlife. We believe there are other areas around Retford which could be utilised without the environmental impact such a large development would make. Visual effect and other impacts – There is no mention of buffers (i.e. green spaces) between existing housing and new housing and visual impact on existing residents due to density and mass of buildings. Additional concerns - noise, smell, being overlooked (narrow walkway at back of our house and currently no road either to front or rear of property), loss of privacy and possibly reduced signal strength for television aerials. The range of houses is very generalised with no clear guide as to how many of each style will be built i.e. 3 story town houses, 2 story houses or bungalows or location of any proposed roads around the new estate. The Trinity Farm field contains overhead electricity cables, gas pipe (not mentioned), sewage pipes and flooding risk which would all contribute to additional problems whilst developing the area. Does the current sewage works and pipe work have the capacity to deal with the additional huge influx? Will the current infrastructure such as schools, hospitals and doctors surgeries cope with approximately 1000 more people from the additional 440 houses that will occupy this land, let alone all the other developments going on around Retford?</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment have taken place to assess the impact on existing infrastructure. Appropriate mitigation is proposed where required. This assessments can be found on the Council's website.</p>
REF070	Resident		

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
REF160	Resident	<p>I have the following comments on the draft Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>1, My main area of concern is major potential development which will increase traffic on Tilt Lane and the junction with Moorgate, with particular concern over the effect of traffic passing Carr Hill School. There have been two children killed on Tilt Lane in the past ten years or so and in the last fortnight a delivery driver lost control and damaged a number of cars - fortunately just before the children were due to come out of school. Any development will increase traffic and the potential hazard.</p> <p>2, I welcome the proposal to create a cordon round Retford with no development permitted outside it but am concerned that until the Plan is formally Implemented (2022?) further development may get through.</p> <p>3, Any further development will increase the congestion at the Moorgate junction unless lights or a roundabout are installed - this should be at developers expense.</p> <p>4, I understand that the proposed development for over 100 houses beyond the end of Bigsby Road is likely to require major infrastructure upgrad</p> <p>In any case this proposal is outside the draft development boundary of the town.</p> <p>I have no objection to my comments being public</p>	A Transport Assessment have taken place to assess the impact on existing infrastructure. Appropriate mitigation is proposed where required. This assessments can be found on the Council's website.
REF198	Consultant	<p>In general, housing allocation is to be welcomed here but the scale, page 93 the proximity of this allocation to the railway and also to the industrial allocation on Randall Way is somewhat concerning. Firstly, the railway line in question is the main East Coast route, very fast and busy and should get busier with the rail network improvements suggested by the government and operators. Being this close to the railway will have a detrimental effect on living conditions for future inhabitants. There should be a clear planted and screened area between the residences and the railway line. In hindsight, the industrial/employment site may well have been better located on this site. Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist – February 2020 Page 5 The fact that a large swathe of Randall Way Industrial Site is now to be houses is somewhat worrying. Expansion of this industrial estate northward is limited due to the presence of Idle Valley Nature Reserve and to the east by the River Idle and existing developments. There is the industrial allocation on the ready mix concrete site just north of Idle Valley but this is limited and will increase vehicular traffic flow in and out of the current junction which is shared by the nature reserve.</p>	The Council has consulted a number of organisations such as Network Rail and Environmentla health to see whether a development in this location would be impacts from or impact existing infrastructure and development in the area. The Council is comfortable that a residential led development at Trinity Farm will not be impacted from existing developments and infrastructure nearby.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent note that section 1 of Policy 22 detailed the need to develop green infrastructure and sustainable design that will be in keeping with the nearby Nature Reserve. We would therefore recommend that a specific reference to SuDS and the drainage hierarchy are made to ensure that design considered the need to convey water through the development and return it to the natural water system. The policy should also look to highlight the need to design SuDS to delivery against all 4 objectives as highlighted by the SuDS best practice (The SuDS Manual Ciria C753). Some example wording is provided above as part of the Bassetlaw Garden Village section. There are surface water sewers detailed within the vicinity of the site, it is therefore not anticipated that any surface water connection to the foul sewer will be permitted. The site is indicated to be intersected by an existing rising main, it is important that development does not have an adverse impact on this asset. Whilst the physical asset will be covered by easements to ensure rights of access for maintenance, it is recommended that the need to protect existing assets is still detailed within Policy 22. We would recommend that wording to the effect of: The development boundary for (Site name) is identified to contain an existing sewer(s) / water main(s) within the ownership of Severn Trent. Development layouts should account for the alignment of these assets and the associated easements, ensuring that access for maintenance is not impeded. The policy should then be supported by additional information including text to the effect of: "The existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewer/water main should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Severn Trent existing assets may be required." Severn Trent note that Section 1 of Policy 22 details the development of a Design Quality SPD, we would recommend that Water Efficient design and Water re-use is either covered specifically within Policy 21 or covered by the Design Quality SPD.</p> <p>The Trinity Farm Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	Agreed. Amendments made to the revised policy for Trinity Farm in line with STW recommendations

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>Policy 22: HS8, Trinity Farm site as mentioned above falls within the MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. As per Policy SP7, any applications will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development and where this is shown, the applicant should consider the feasibility of prior extraction and so prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource. A mineral operator has indicated interest in extracting sand and gravel 240m to the west of the allocated mixed-use site. The Draft Minerals Local Plan (July 2018) did include this promoted site, called Botany Bay, as an allocation within the plan to help meet the required demand throughout the plan period under Policy MP2r. However, this site has now been removed from the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and is no longer allocated. This is due to changes to the mix of site-specific allocations identified by the County Council across the County and not due to the site being withdrawn by the operator. The County Council would therefore recommend that Policy 22 highlight the presence of the MSA/MCA and that any future application will need to demonstrate the need for non-mineral development in this area and if this can be demonstrated, consider prior extraction so to prevent the sterilisation of the resource.</p>	Thank you for your comments
REF253	Fisher German	<p>The land, illustrated by the redline, benefits from an outline planning permission (ref: 15/00493/OUT) for up to 196 dwellings and 11.11ha of employment land, with all matters reserved except for access on part of the site. The site is currently being marketed for disposal to a housebuilder and commercial users. These representations fully support the proposed allocation of the site under Site HS8: Trinity Farm, Retford. As demonstrated through the planning consent, the site is available, deliverable and developable. The site is optimally located for residential development, adjoining the Retford urban fringe and in close proximity to employment and other services and facilities. Trinity Hospital support the proposed allocation of the wider site and is committed to bringing forward a planning application for the remaining housing numbers on the site. For ease of reference, these representations follow the order the Policies appear in the Plan.</p>	Thank you for your comments
REF253	Fisher German	<p>The proposed allocation land at Trinity Farm, North Road for 440 dwellings and 8 hectares of employment land is fully supported. As demonstrated through the outline planning consent, the site is available, deliverable and developable. The consented site is currently being marketed to housebuilders and commercial users; it is anticipated that development on site should commence in late 2020/early 2021. Trinity Hospital is committed to the delivery of the wider site, as identified by HS8, and will bring forward a planning application as early as possible in order to support the Council deliver its housing needs early in the Plan period. Trinity Hospital also support reference within paragraph 7.9.11 which states that the site should be exempt from a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge. It is considered that this text should be included within the policy wording of HS8, as well as the supporting text. Whilst Trinity Hospital support the allocation of Trinity Farm, some amendments are required to the policy wording, as set out below:</p> <p>B. This new neighbourhood will be developed in accordance with a masterplan framework, to be agreed with the Council and informed by an independent design review and community consultation. Trinity Hospital have no objections to the principle of an independent design review and will seek to ensure a comprehensive, well designed scheme is delivered across the site (Phase 1 which has already been consented, and Phase 2 comprising the remaining part of the proposed allocation). However, it needs to be recognised that Phase 1 will have been progressed ahead of Phase 2 being brought forward; the need for an independent design review at that stage is questioned. Furthermore, it is not clear who is expected to fund such a review. It is requested that reference to an independent design review is removed from the policy wording. This does not prevent one from happening, but provides flexibility given the progression of Phase 1 of the site. Trinity Hospital understand the need and importance for community consultation, and as they did for the outline planning application for Phase 1, will ensure full community consultation for Phase 2 going forward. Trinity Hospital are content for this reference to remain within the policy text.</p> <p>1. Good Quality Design and Local Character) Green Infrastructure – led high quality design that integrates the new development with Phase 1 of the scheme, that enhances ecological value and endures over time. Trinity Hospital support the delivery of a high-quality design across the site and as set out above will seek to ensure that a comprehensive well-designed scheme will be delivered across Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the site. High quality design can however impact scheme costs; this does not appear to have been reflected within the Councils Viability Assessment. Trinity Hospital's aspirations will always be to seek to ensure high quality design however caution needs to be exercised in adopting such terminology within the Plan without sufficient evidence sites can deliver this, as doing so may artificially raise expectations.</p> <p>2. Housing types, sizes and tenures) At least 440 dwellings during the Plan period to 2037. As set out above, the allocation of the site for 440 dwellings is fully supported. Phase 1 has outline planning permission for 196 dwellings. This is currently being marketed to housebuilders and it is anticipated</p>	<p>The Council is preparing an evidence that includes the viability of proposed developments in relation to their required contributions. In addition, the Council is working closely with the site promoter to make sure that the site is considered deliverable and sustainable and that all reasonable impacts can be appropriately mitigated.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
		<p>that development on site should commence in late 2020/early 2021.b) A mix of housing types, including affordable and specialist housing, and serviced plots for self-build and custom homes as appropriateAs discussed under Policy ST27: Housing Mix, Type and Density is it requested that reference to serviced plots for self-build and custom homes is deleted from Policy 22: HS8.c) Housing Standards to promote climate resilience in accordance with Policy ST45Trinity Hospital has concerns with Policy ST45, as set out later in these representations. The requested amendments to Policy ST45 need to be reflected within Policy 22: HS8 and the supporting text.d) At least 11.11ha for commercial and employment (B1, B2, B8) development, with 3.0ha of employment land provided in this Plan period and 5.0ha thereafter. The Policy wording requires amendment to reflect the updated quantum of employment land to be provided on the site, as set out in Policy ST6. The reference to 11.11 hectares of land needs to be replaced with 8 hectares. Trinity Hospital are comfortable that at least 3.0 hectares of employment generating uses will be brought forward within the Plan period.It is also requested that the wording seeking “commercial and employment (B1, B2, B8) development” is deleted and amended to “employment generating uses”. Reference to “employment generating uses” provides far greater flexibility in securing end users for the site, encouraging economic growth and jobs, rather than being overly restrictive to particular uses. The proposed amendment would also ensure that the policy better reflects the outline planning permission for Phase 1 which provides for employment generating uses beyond the traditional B uses. It is also requested that the Council give consideration to some retail uses at the site to provide for local day to day needs. 5. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure b) A multifunctional green infrastructure network that connects to the existing, including publicly accessible open space and at least 0.5ha for community woodland. The future management and maintenance shall be agreed through a planning application. The importance of tree planting for the environment and in respect of place making is fully recognised however the proposed policy requirement to deliver a 0.5ha community woodland is not supported. There is no evidence to justify this requirement. Even if justification for this policy requirement can be evidence there is a wholly inconsistent approach to its application. For example, the Bassetlaw Garden Village, which is to deliver 750 dwellings over the Plan period, with a further 3,250 dwellings in the next Plan period and 15ha of employment land in total, is only required to deliver 0.5ha of community woodland during the Plan period and 2ha in total for the site over its lifetime; disproportionately less than at Trinity Farm. Furthermore, the Plan is unclear on how the community woodland functions in conjunction with Policy ST45: Climate Change and Mitigation. Does the 0.5ha of woodland negate the requirement to deliver 5 tree’s per dwelling or is it in addition to it (assuming there is even justification for a requirement of 5 trees per dwelling)? Finally, it must also be recognised that a large area of the site already has outline planning permission, therefore whilst a comprehensive scheme will be progressed, any requirements such as this, should consider the Phase 2 land only. This is consistent with the approach adopted with the Council’s other committed sites.It is considered that the requirement for a community woodland of 0.5ha lacks justification and is not sound. It is requested that the reference to delivery of a community woodland is deleted from the policy. Additional comments in respect of tree planting are provided in response to Policy ST45, which should be read alongside the above. c) The relocation of Leaffields allotment site: fenced, with a water supply with appropriate access and parking arrangements. As set out above in response to Policy 21: HS7: Leaffields, it is considered that this allocation should be deleted and in so doing, the reference to the relocation of the allotments deleted from Policy 22: HS8, Trinity Farm. d) A project level Habitats Regulations Assessment screening in accordance with Policy ST39.The Policy requires a ‘project level habitat regulation assessment screening’ in accordance with Policy ST39. This request and the justification for it, is not clear. Firstly, there should be no need to screen individual development sites given the Local Plan will need to be supported by a full HRA. Secondly, Policy ST39 does not appear to relate to HRA assessments at all. On this basis this requirement should be removed.</p>	
REF257	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Part of the site lies in a flood zone. I note the commitment to undertake land raising to defend against floods. However, with climate change and increasing flooding, should we be building in this zone at all, or are there additional measures being considered, eg, the building of stilt houses. I am pleased to see that it is planned that cycle routes would be extended. As a larger development, I assume that provision of school and doctors places etc have been taken into account.	Appropriate assessment have taken place to assess the impact on existing infrastructure and the risk from flooding. These assessments can be found on the Council's website.
REF273	Anglian Water	The wording which appears in Policy 22 (point 5. a) should be amended as set out in our comments relating to Bassetlaw Garden Village. We would ask that the criteria be consistently applied to all residential allocation sites. Please see suggested changes to the wording of the Bassetlaw Garden Village policy for the wording to be used.	Agreed. Amendments made to the revised policy for Trinity Farm

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST22 - Trinity Farm			
1197063	Resident	Another large development at the north western edge of Retford which will have a similar impact re traffic congestion as with Leafields.	Thank you for your comment.
REF283	Resident	22 HS8 92 7.8 Despite the access arrangements in the extant planning consent ref: 15/00493/OUT, this site's southern access should be provided by a single 'gateway' roundabout junction where Randall Way meets the North Road (A638), thereby alleviating the existing delays there instead of aggravating them. Access to the site east of North Road could then be off Randall Way, like Randall Park Way, etc. In the longer term, an eastwards extension of Randall Way, bridging the River Idle and connecting via Bolham to Tilt Lane/Smeath Lane, could form a northern distributor road for Retford, bypassing Welham and Claborough: add to ST51.	Thank you for your comment.
REF300 -	Natural England	Natural England advises that the impact of this housing allocation on the Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits SSSI should be fully considered. The site falls within the Impact Risk Zone for this SSSI which is notified for its exceptionally rich assemblage of breeding wetland birds. The location of the SSSI is not included on the policy maps however we do note that the SSSI is mentioned within the Sustainability Appraisal.	This has been subject to a detailed assessment of impact through the Councils Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitat Regulations Assessment. Appropriate mitigation will be required where necessary.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	A major development, it is very sad to see so much good agricultural land disappear, under the weight of the banner of "Housing and Industry Needs", surely there are other brownfield sites available. · What analysis has been made on the Idle Valley Nature Reserve both during the development and the longer term after residence. That is a must before a blade of grass has been cut.	The Council has assessed a number of sites throughout the town and will promote and allocate brownfield land where is suitable. However, due to there not being a sufficient number of brownfield sites, it means that some greenfield sites are proposed. Agricultural land classification isnt considered a constraint for this particular site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF056	Resident	Am a 13 year old resident of Tuxford, and being a teenager at Tuxford Academy I have the insight which you need in order to make your plans appropriate for a range of ages. I am suggesting a skate park because I know many people living in Tuxford who have an interest in skating and would like to have a skate park that they can access easily without having to make their parents drive. It will benefit our local community as currently there is not much available for the youth.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF061	Resident	Whilst I appreciate that development needs to take place across the whole of Bassetlaw the plan mentions but does not make best use of the brown field sites within the district. Brown field development should be given much greater weight and promoted within the plan. Neighbourhood Plans have been developed at great expense, both financial and the time local residents have put in. Please stop the planning department showing total disrespect for these plans, they should be followed to the letter and if exceptions are made by planning authorities then a FULL and DETAILED explanation should be provided. 'CIL' should not be wavered for ANY development.	The Council supports the priority to reuse brownfield land where available. However, due to the high density and constraints within Tuxford, there is very little existing brownfield land to reuse. Therefore we are needing to allocate some land to the edge of Tuxford on Greenfield Land. CIL would apply to developments within Tuxford.
REF062	Resident	Very pleased to see no vehicle access from Long Lane. Interested to see detailed planning application.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF064	Resident	This area includes Roman remains and artefacts. An archaeology survey is of the utmost importance. The sites NP04 and NP11 and adjacent areas are productive farmland. We do not need to lose this facility in this County, let alone Tuxford village.	Any area that has identified historical merit will be subject to the necessary national and local policy requirements in relation to protecting the historic environment. The Council's Conservation Officer has been consultation on the sites and has not provided any comment that would restrict its development potential. However, the Conservation Officer has noted the importance of the design of the site and how it can be appropriately incorporated into the wider landscape.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF088	Resident	<p>Tuxford is a small town with little on offer in the way of employment. It is highly likely that most houses on the site would be using motor vehicles to leave Tuxford for their place of work elsewhere. NP04 is a very large site with very clear impact to traffic and town infrastructure. It appears no traffic survey has been completed for this site and it would have a direct impact on the existing traffic problems found at the intersection of Ollerton road (A6075) and Eldon Street (B1164) and the intersection of Newark road/Newcastle street to Lincoln road (A6075). This is just the impact to the closest roads to the site but it would also push problems further into Tuxford with queuing from the A1 on Ashvale road (A6075) becoming worse. PG 98 - Policy 24: Site NP04 Ollerton Road, Tuxford</p> <p>3. a) Tuxford primary school has a capacity of 240 pupils, currently they have 333 pupils. The secondary school has a capacity of 1462 with current numbers standing at 1554. How will this be supported by the contributions for expansion?</p> <p>Other comments relating to this site:</p> <p>1. The land is Grade 2 agricultural land which I have been informed should not be developed upon according to the national plan. Please confirm or clarify if my understanding is incorrect.</p> <p>2. Previous sites that were put forward in the local plan, NP09 and NP10 were rejected by the council as they fall outside the envelope, I am under the belief NP04 also falls outside the envelope. I'd therefore like to understand why this is being put forward as it seems conflicting reasons are being used per site if this is the case.</p> <p>3. Previous planning permission has been sought on land opposite this site for development (http://publicaccess.bassetlaw.gov.uk/online-applications/propertyDetails.do?activeTab=relatedCases&keyVal=000HU9CSLI000) and has been refused twice. The details for the refusal are not available on the website but local knowledge was given that it was due to the impact to traffic on Ollerton road.</p> <p>4. The houses could be affected by sun flicker and noise from the nearby wind turbines.</p>	There is a requirement for additional housing growth in Tuxford over the plan period. This complies to all other designated Large Rural Settlements in Bassetlaw. Tuxford has a key role to play in supporting its residents and other smaller settlements in the area with important services and facilities. It is acknowledged that Tuxford is a constrained settlement with a complex road network, historic assets and an important landscape surrounding the area. The site at Ollerton Road provides an opportunity to plan for some additional growth. The site is close to the main road network and has access to the town centre and its services and facilities. The development will respect the landscape character and be planned to improve existing infrastructure where required such as the road network and the school. Access to and from Long Lane will only be for pedestrian as the road is not suitable for any additional vehicles.
REF097	Resident	Before any development, traffic issues must be addressed. Medical facility to be improved both schools to be improved.	Thank you for your comment.
REF100	Resident	<p>I live on Ollerton Road and face the road. The amount of traffic is already ludicrous. Between 6am and 9am then 4.30pm to 6.30pm the amount of cars and pollution being spilled into our home is awful.</p> <p>We have to listen to car music, telephone conversations and people sat with engines running. Getting from Ollerton Road onto Eldon Street at peak times is dangerous, especially for lorries plus the amount of construction lorries needed for the site.</p>	Thank you for your comment
REF102	Resident	If the proposed plan for NP04 goes ahead will the surface and drainage of Long Lane be improved? My wife and I live on Long Lane. I am 79 years of age and my wife is 76. My wife tripped coming back along Long Lane from Tuxford Christmas Market 2019 and suffered a badly gashed hand which needed medical treatment. If there is no vehicle access to NP04 there will need to be better, safer surface for pedestrians to use. I would be interested to hear the planners views on this matter before development commences.	Long Lane will only be used by existing vehicles to houses along the lane and by pedestrians from the new development. It will not become a new vehicular access point to the new development.
REF103	Resident	Before anything is done in this village and all the traffic needs to be seen to. The sewage does as well the school will not cope and doctors.	Thank you for your comment.
REF104	Resident	The traffic need seeing to the sewage needs dealing with the schools need more room for all the children. The doctors will need to be a lot bigger all these things need to be dealt with.	As part of new development, existing and future infrastructure is fully considered. Any additional infrastructure required from the development will be identified within the Policy for the site.
REF119	WH Bett and Sons	<p>Support the development for 1. There has been very little development in Tuxford over the last few years. It is important for people to be able to live in rural villages and towns rather than being ushered to living in major towns such as Workshop and Retford. The building of new houses in Tuxford will provide more opportunity for people to live in Tuxford. I believe that it is very important for young people to have the choice to continue to live in the village/town that they have been brought up in.</p> <p>2. Tuxford is an ideal village for development because it already has facilities such as schools, shops, library, museums, community centre and a doctors surgery. It has character, being an old coaching town, and an attractive rural settling. It has good infrastructure with the A1 passing through the village and the A57 close by.</p>	Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF119	WH Bett and Sons	<p>6. The land on Ollerton Road is only a short walk to the shops and other facilities.</p> <p>7. Ollerton Road would provide good access to the land.</p> <p>8. The Ollerton Road site only has houses proposed on one boundary, all the other boundaries are farmland therefore the only a small number of people would boarder the development.</p> <p>9. Both sites could potentially expand beyond the area currently marked in the plan and could provide more houses if there was a requirement.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
1194897	Resident	Using grade 2 prime agricultural land, to build housing in a rural community, surely contravenes all environmental policy. Brown field sites should be utilised. The proposed building work will be directly adjacent to the old age pensioner bungalows. With a prevailing South Westerly wind, this will cause dust and noise issues that will adversely affect the most vulnerable as well as contaminate a significant part of the rest of the village.	The farmland around Tuxford is of a high-grade. However, to restrict development on this basis would mean there are no opporunties for development. The Council has looked at all sites around Tuxford and considered an appropriate area of land that would have the least impact on the environment, infrastructure and the community.
1195187	Resident	NP04 is grade 2 agricultural land. This is the highest grade for the area. It is highly productive. Should land of this quality be given over to housing development when there are many pockets of lower grade land in the area, including NP10, that are far less value in these days of attention to increased carbon emissions? Currently this land, being at one of the highest points in the area, absorbs rainfall. This will not be the case if replaced by housing, roads and drains. NP04. This land, though it falls just outside the development footprint for the existing wind turbines, is in direct line from the prevailing (and continuous) SW wind that would give constant noise and flicker.	The farmland around Tuxford is of a high-grade. However, to restrict development on this basis would mean there are no opporunties for development. The Council has looked at all sites around Tuxford and considered an appropriate area of land that would have the least impact on the environment, infrastructure and the community.
REF141	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” <p>This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.” <p>The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”</p> <p>No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. <p>Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-</p> <p>“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”</p> <p>Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)</p>	The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:- 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:- B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by</p> <p>7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved;</p> <p>8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <p>• 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land."</p> <p>The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered.</p> <p>Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF142	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026."The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting."No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmonton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:- "Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction." Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, "large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties." The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:- 9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:- B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow</p>	<p>smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.	
REF170	Consultant	NP04 is open countryside, it is located on the edge of the village and, as indicated, will have negative impacts on the open views of farmland (southern part). It too has grade 2 soil and it does not have any conservation constraints, identical to NP16. NP04 will provide a housing estate on the entry into Tuxford from Ollerton, this may or may not be a bad thing but there is one thing for certain, it will change this approach into the village for good. NP04 is identified also as requiring possible access through allocations NP05 and NP15, neither of which are included within the Draft Local Plan. If this is the preferred access aim then it is unclear how this can be achieved over land that is not allocated.	The farmland around Tuxford is of a high-grade. However, to restrict development on this basis would mean there are no opportunities for development. The Council has looked at all sites around Tuxford and considered an appropriate area of land that would have the least impact on the environment, infrastructure and the community.
REF176	Resident	I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds: • 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.” The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.” No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:- “Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.” Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, “large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.” The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the	The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health. and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF177	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds: • 7.11.1 on page 97 states "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states "The Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026." The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and "topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here". It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that "Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site" because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because "Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting." No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60's bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although "Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction."Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,"large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties."The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF181	Consultant	<p>We object to the proposed allocation of Site NP04 (Ollerton Road, Tuxford) contained in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. We consider that it fails the tests of soundness as follows: Housing Need2. The Bassetlaw Local Plan is based on an annual housing provision of 478 dwellings per annum which is 55.7% above the 307 housing need per annum level that is required using the NPPF Standardised Methodology.3. Whilst the Local Plan might want to pursue a growth strategy based on a higher annualised</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>housing provision for the period 2018 to 2037; this does not justify the allocation of inappropriate or unsuitable sites. As such there is no unmet strategic housing need requirement to justify the allocation of site NP04.4. The Local Plan proposes 1,764 dwellings for the 'Large Rural Villages' which includes Blyth; Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe; Langold; Misterton; Tuxford; and Cottam Garden Community. Unfortunately the Local Plan does not indicate what existing level of committed housing exists in these settlements. As such it is unclear what is the residual unmet level of housing; which still has to be found through proposed site allocations.5. Unusually there is no housing background paper or other evidence document to help readers understand the unmet residual level of housing for the 'Large Rural Villages' or the choice of distribution for the site allocations in the Local Plan between the 6 settlements in this category. Of these 6 'Large Rural Villages' only Tuxford and Cottam Garden Community have had allocations identified. It is noted for example that Misterton has no allocations or committed housing sites identified in the Local Plan.6. It is understood that Blyth; Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe; and Misterton have neighbourhood plans either made or in the final stages. However the Local Plan does not indicate any detail as to how many dwellings these neighbourhood plans allocate; this further compounds the inability for plan users to understand how the Local Plan is aiming to deliver the identified housing figure for the 'Large Rural Villages'.7. It would appear that the proposed 1,764 dwellings for the 'Large Rural Villages' is based on the suggested blanket 20% growth figure in Policy ST2; although the figures in Policy ST2 in fact only adds up to 1,747 which is not quite the same as the figure in Policy ST1. Policy ST2 suggests a figure of 250 dwellings for Tuxford which it appears the Local Plan suggests would be largely delivered through site allocations NP04 and NP11 together with the 86 dwellings committed under 19/01165/RES on Ashvale Road.8. In this respect the allocation of site NP04 would make a contribution towards delivering the housing figure identified for Tuxford. However the site would result in planning harm that outweighs the benefit of housing delivery; particularly given the Local Plan proposing an annual housing provision some 55.7% above the actual standardised housing requirement. In addition there are other reasonable alternative sites elsewhere in Tuxford that would be more appropriate.Relationship to Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan9. Tuxford has a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan and this plan is currently undergoing a review. As part of that review process there has been consultation on possible site allocations. This was undertaken very recently in September 2019 and the fact that some allocations have now been included in the draft Local Plan is undermining the Neighbourhood Plan process, including the consultation undertaken. In addition local residents are now confused about the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan consultation and the sudden inclusion of two sites in the draft Local Plan.10. The Neighbourhood Plan consultation responses were returned to Bassetlaw DC which does not help with confusion between the two separate plans.11. This confusion and misunderstanding is exacerbated by the draft Local Plan referring to the consultation undertaken in September 2019 on the Neighbourhood Plan in paragraph 7.11.1. However the Local Plan states: "The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019." This is a misleading quote however as the results of the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan sites only recently published by the Town Council in the Tuxfordian clearly shows only 18% of people supported development on site NP04 whilst 41% of people did not support development on this site. In that respect it is the joint 6th ranked site in terms of level of objection and only the joint 8th ranked site in terms of level of support. As such the site was not supported by the local community in the recent consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan.12. We are aware from our client that many local residents are unaware that the comments they made on the Neighbourhood Plan will not automatically be considered by the LPA in drawing up the Local Plan. The timing and duplication is highly unfortunate and given that Bassetlaw has traditionally sought to promote neighbourhood planning; this lack of clarity means that in our view that the Local Plan fundamentally fails to meet the test of soundness requiring the plan to be positively prepared.Evidence13. The proposed site NP04 has not been comprehensively assessed in either the Land Availability Assessment process or the Site Selection Methodology in the form proposed for allocation.14. The proposed site allocation NP04 is not supported by sufficient robust evidence to justify its allocation and its omission from proper assessment in key evidence documents renders the proposed allocation and the entire Local Plan unsound. In particular the site is not assessed within the 'Site Allocations: Landscape Study' document (dated November 2019). That document only looked at proposed allocations in Harworth/Bircotes; Worksop; Retford; alongside possible employment sites around Markham Moor and the possible sites considered for a new settlement. Accordingly assessment of Tuxford appears to be a serious omission, particularly given that this is the only settlement proposed for site allocations which has not been assessed in landscape terms.15. The Local Plan in paragraph 7.11.2 states: "Careful, sensitive design should be informed by the landscape character of this town fringe location identified by the Site</p>	<p>landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>Allocations Landscape Assessment.” However this statement is misleading as this study does not address this proposed allocation.16. The ‘Transport Study Update’ dates from January 2019 and is based on the former spatial strategy that is no longer proposed. As such this evidence document is out-of-date and does not support the proposals now being advanced in the Local Plan.17. The site assessment methodology for both of the proposed Tuxford site allocations indicates that these need to be supported by a strategic transport model including the fact that several off-site junctions may require capacity improvements. Given this conclusion it is surprising and disappointing that the ‘Junction Assessments Report’ dated January 2020 does not assess the impact on any junctions within Tuxford. Given the nature of the low bridge in the centre of Tuxford; the presence of the A1 slip roads; the A6075; and the use of the B1164 as a local diversion route for the A1 there are particular highway considerations in Tuxford. These should have been assessed in order to confirm what off-site junctions may require capacity improvements and whether such improvements can actually be delivered.Sustainability Appraisal18. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) contains contradictory information in relation to the assessment of site NP04; as such this document is fundamentally flawed and undermines confidence in whether the site has been properly assessed. The site is assessed in Table 5.2 (Summary of SA Scores for the Site Options) and in the table in paragraph 6.107 that assesses Policy 24 which allocates site NP04.19. The differences between the SA tables is as follows:SA ObjectiveTable 5.2Table in paragraph 6.1071. Biodiversity0 +10. Air QualityN/A +11. Climate ChangeN/A +13. Cultural Heritage0 --14. Landscape & Townscape - +/-20. These differences involve more than a third of the SA assessment criterion, as such this is a substantial level of difference.21. We have taken the SA assessment in the table in paragraph 6.107 as our starting point as this relates to Policy 24 which allocates site NP04. This concludes that the site is likely to have a significant negative effect on the SA objectives of ‘land use and soils’ and ‘cultural heritage’. We agree with these conclusions which weigh heavily against the suitability of this site to be allocated.22. However in addition in our judgement the SA appears to incorrectly assess aspects of the site, the differences between the SA table and our assessment is as follows:SA ObjectiveTable in paragraph 6.107Our Assessment1. Biodiversity + 02. Housing + +3. Economy & Skills + +4. Regeneration & Social Inclusion + +/-5. Health & Wellbeing ++ +/-6. Transport + +7. Land Use & Soils -- --8. Water009. Flood Risk0 ?10. Air Quality + ?11. Climate Change + ?12. Resource Use & Waste0 +13. Cultural Heritage -- --14. Landscape & Townscape -/+? --23. There is no explanation as to why the biodiversity criterion has moved from having a ‘negligible or no effect’ to a ‘minor positive’ effect between the above mentioned two tables. In our view the site location and proposal would have a ‘negligible or no effect’.24. Whilst the site location does provide reasonable accessibility to some town centre services and facilities there is poor accessibility to some key services including the secondary school and GP surgery. Tuxford suffers from limited accessibility due to the road bridge under the A1 being the only connection between the two halves of the Town. The site is not within 800m of the GP Surgery as the SA suggests, it is 910m away from the closest part of the site by the most direct route and 1.6km from the secondary school.25. The proposed development would result in harm to primary school capacity as we explain in detail later. Policy 24 does refer to contributions towards the improvement of the existing public right of way at Long Lane for pedestrian access into the town. However Long Lane is not an adopted highway and we understand that the Lane has no clear ownership. Accordingly this policy requirement cannot be delivered and this will make the social integration of this site more difficult. The proposal involves no regeneration benefits, given this and the issues of accessibility and integration and impact on primary school capacity means that we consider that the proposal has a ‘mixture of positive and negative effects’ on Regeneration and Social Inclusion.26. In terms of Health and Wellbeing the poor accessibility to the GP Surgery; along with the need to enter an area of poorer air quality and a noise corridor (under the A1) to get to the GP Surgery; and the distances required to access other primary healthcare facilities together with harm to primary school capacity means that in our view the proposal has a ‘mixture of positive and negative effects’ on this criterion. In addition any allocation in Tuxford will result in vehicle movements through the A1 underbridge, this is an area of poorer air quality and as this provides the only pedestrian and cycle linkage between the two halves of the town in our view it must be deemed ‘uncertain’ what effect the site would have on the air quality criterion.27. Parts of Long Lane is at high risk of surface water flooding and the Environment Agency surface water flood risk mapping indicates that the farmland proposed to be allocated is the source of this surface water. Consequently the allocation of this site has the potential due to the topography to exacerbate this surface water flood risk, therefore we consider that the assessment should be ‘uncertain’ what effect the site would have on this criterion.28. The site is within the shadow of an existing wind turbine, there was previously concern expressed about the inter-relationship between this wind turbine and development with regard to noise and shadow flicker. There has been no assessment of this aspect, as such there is potential</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>that new development could result in the need to cease use of the wind turbine. Therefore we consider that the assessment should be 'uncertain' what effect the site would have on the climate change criterion.²⁹ In terms of the impact on landscape and townscape the comments of BDC Planning Policy on the Neighbourhood Plan concluded that: "The landscape is very open, with long distance views to the south west. Character: the site adjoins a residential area which is suburban in character with residential development to one side. However, the site is not contained and is very open in character." This view of the LPA is not currently reflected in the SA conclusions. The proposed site has no existing boundaries to the south or west and would represent an artificial sub-division of a large area of high quality farmland.³⁰ The site is located within the 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'. Introduction of a stark urban edge would harm the existing landscape character where the transition from the open fields to the town is mitigated by existing mature boundary treatments; the dipping topography; and the single storey nature of the western half of The Pastures.³¹ The site will be highly prominent from the western approach along the A6075 where the site will be unduly visible due to the approach road being over 10m in height above the site. The A6075 is at 75m AOD west of the Walkers industrial estate and is 73m AOD as you approach past the Walkers industrial estate; the site is at a height of around 60 to 62m AOD. Therefore on this approach you get clear uninterrupted views of the edge of Tuxford; these views become more prominent as you reach the Walkers industrial estate.³² Given the previously stated conclusions of the LPA; the landscape character sensitivity; the lack of any existing boundaries; and the prominence; we are of the view that the site would have a 'significant negative' effect.³³ In our view the SA fails to comply with paragraph 32 of the NPPF which states: "Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements¹⁷. This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains). Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered)." Landscape & Townscape and Heritage Assets³⁴. We have explained above under the SA heading the landscape and townscape impact including lack of physical boundaries, topography, prominence in views and landscape sensitivity which we don't repeat here for brevity. This harm would be exacerbated by the need to create a 2m wide footway along the highway which would require the removal of the existing hedgerow along Ollerton Road. Furthermore the Ollerton Road street lighting will also require extending accordingly as will the village gateway signing and road markings. This will significantly change the western gateway into the town and result in a harsh urban gateway rather than the semi-rural gateway that exists at present.³⁵ This change from semi-rural to harsh urban character would change the character and appearance of the Tuxford Conservation Area which runs along the southern side of Ollerton Road. This would harm the significance of this designated heritage asset and the provision of housing would not represent a public benefit that is sufficient to outweigh this harm, particularly when there are reasonable alternative sites available elsewhere that do not result in heritage harm and when the site is not required to meet the actual strategic housing need due to the Local Plan choosing to over-allocate housing. Consequently in our view the statutory duty in s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 on local planning authorities to preserve and enhance conservation areas while undertaking their planning duties is not met.³⁶ The adjacent part of the Conservation Area is within the Market Place character area where the Character Appraisal indicates that: "The historic layout and plan form of the character area is predominantly characterised by buildings that front onto the street, often directly onto or close to the highway. Any new development, including infill or replacement, should seek to respect this character." If this character were to be followed this would introduce substantial harm through the strong urbanisation of Ollerton Road. Modern suburban type of development that would be likely in a modern housing estate would be contradictory to this character which would also harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area gateway.³⁷ Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that: "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification." In this case we consider that there is no such justification, as such the policy and allocation conflict with national planning policy.³⁸ It would also conflict with paragraph 127 c) of the NPPF which requires planning policies and decisions to ensure that developments: "are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>(such as increased densities);"Environmental Constraints39. Paragraph 170 b) of the NPPF seeks planning policies and decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: "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;" The site is Grade 2 agricultural land which is of high quality and forms part of the definition of 'best and most versatile agricultural land'.40. Grade 2 agricultural land is defined by Natural England1 as: "Very good quality agricultural land - Land with minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. A wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can usually be grown. On some land in the grade there may be reduced flexibility due to difficulties with the production of the more demanding crops, such as winter harvested vegetables and arable root crops. The level of yield is generally high but may be lower or more variable than grade 1."41. Although most of Tuxford lies on Grade 2 agricultural land the proposed site here forms part of an extensive tract of best and most versatile agricultural land which makes it of greater agricultural benefit. Reasonable alternatives exist around Tuxford such as the 12 hectares of land between Lodge Lane and the Tuxford Academy which will become landlocked and unconnected to wider agricultural land.42. The proposed allocation would result in housing becoming closer to the site of the wind turbine permitted under 50/10/00046. Condition 6 on this consent requires "The level of noise emissions from the combined effects of the wind turbine shall not exceed 5dBA above the background noise level at any occupied property." The proposed allocation extends into the yellow area illustrated in Figure 5.1 Noise Emissions in the Environmental Appraisal which supported application 50/10/00046; as such there is potential for the site allocation to prejudice the operation of this wind turbine which would reduce the contribution that it can make to climate change. The noise emission contour was developed having regard to the advice in ETSU-R-97: The assessment and rating of noise from wind farms which remains the relevant advice as specified in Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 5-015-20140306). There has been no assessment as to the effect the proposed allocation would have on the wind turbine utilising ETSU-R-97: The assessment and rating of noise from wind farms.43. The consent for that turbine also has a condition 5 which states "No development shall commence until a scheme to satisfactorily alleviate the incidence of shadow flicker at any occupied property with windows facing towards the wind farm has been submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority." It is understood that a scheme to discharge this condition includes shutdown periods; although the actual details discharging the condition are not published on the LPA website.44. The Figure 6.1 Shadow Flicker in the Environmental Appraisal which supported application 50/10/00046; indicates that the proposed allocation would be located within the zone for shadow flicker potential. Given this if allocated the site would be likely to impose further restrictions on the operation of the wind turbine due to complaints that would be likely to arise which may be deemed to constitute statutory nuisance.45. The proposed allocation has significant potential to adversely affect the operation of the existing wind turbine which would not be in the interests of proper planning or the impact on climate change. In this respect the proposed allocation would not constitute sustainable1 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land#agricultural-land-classification-alcdevelopment as set out in paragraph 8 c) of the NPPF and undermine the ambition of paragraph 148 of the NPPF for the planning system to support the transition to a low carbon future.Accessibility and Highway Impact46. As indicated earlier whilst the site location does provide reasonable accessibility to some town centre services and facilities there is poor accessibility to some key services including the secondary school and GP surgery.47. Tuxford suffers from limited accessibility due to the road bridge under the A1 being the only connection between the two halves of the Town. Policy 24 does refer to contributions towards the improvement of the existing public right of way at Long Lane for pedestrian access into the town. However Long Lane is not an adopted highway and we understand that the Lane has no clear ownership. Accordingly as we indicated earlier this policy requirement cannot be delivered and this will make the social integration of this site more difficult.48. The proposed allocation would represent a 'bolt-on' to the edge of Tuxford with few opportunities to create integration and linkages. It will be reliant upon pedestrian and cycle access running alongside the main A6075 which provides for a poor environment due to the HGV movements to/from the Walkers industrial estate and the Boughton industrial estate which is reliant on the A6075 for access due to low bridge in Ollerton. For example Clipper logistics, a large scale B8 storage and distribution use for ASDA and others based at Boughton industrial estate is frequented by lorries too high to get under the low bridge in Ollerton. In addition the Walkers industrial estate generates numerous HGV crane movements and other movements including some exceptional loads which already have to utilise the footways and verges at the Ollerton Road and Eldon Street in order to manoeuvre the</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>junction.49. There has been no assessment of the traffic generation from the proposed allocation as such the requirement for junction capacity improvements has not been assessed. Accordingly the impact of a new access onto the A6075 on the free flow of traffic and in particular the relationship to HGV traffic using the Walkers industrial estate has not been assessed.50. The A6075 road adjacent to the proposed site has a natural dip in the road, this creates a partial blind spot for cars entering or leaving the village. This has the potential to limit the potential locations for any new access and would be likely to need the access to be created on the rise which together with the slight curve in the A6075 would result in any new access being highly prominent in the streetscene.51. Long Lane is a narrow lane which is not an adopted highway which directly serves around a dozen properties. Existing residential householders have indemnity insurance in place to protect their right of use due to this lack of ownership. It has no defined footway and as a shared surface private road pedestrian and vehicular conflict already arises.52. The lane is not of sufficient width to allow two vehicles to pass and we understand that Long Lane is already used for regular access to agricultural fields by farm vehicles/heavy goods vehicles. It also provides access to Westwood Farm on occasions, access to maintenance of wind turbine on land owned by Westwood Farm, access to maintain the railway line and bridges by Network Rail and associated contractors. This use already presents a conflict between vehicles and pedestrians using the footpath or residents and their children living on Long Lane. Encouraging greater use of the public right of way would exacerbate the potential for vehicular and pedestrian conflict. Infrastructure Demand53. The site as with all new housing development will generate demand of additional pupil numbers. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan indicates that site NP04 will generate a need for 20 primary school places and 15 secondary school places.54. Obtaining school capacity figures is not particularly straightforward as these are often not widely published, we have therefore used the school capacity figures published by Ofsted. It is accepted that parental choice impacts upon school planning and forecasting, however it would be reasonable to assume that development within Tuxford will impact on pupil numbers at Tuxford Primary Academy and Tuxford Academy.55. Tuxford Primary Academy has a capacity of 240 pupils, but the school is currently oversubscribed by having 333 pupils. The 2020-21 Nottinghamshire schools admission statistics anticipates the roll to be 339 pupils. This represents an anticipated roll of 99 pupils in excess of capacity, which is 41% over capacity before any additional development occurs.56. The allocation of Site NP04 and the other proposed allocation NP11 together with the committed housing site at Ashvale Road will collectively generate additional demand for a further 53 pupils (NP04 – 20; NP11 – 14; Ashvale – 19). This will result in an anticipated roll of 152 pupils in excess of capacity, which would then be 63% over capacity.57. Tuxford Academy has a capacity of 1,462 with current numbers standing at 1,554. The 2020-21 Nottinghamshire schools admission statistics anticipates the roll to be 1,550 pupils. This represents an anticipated roll of 88 pupils in excess of capacity, which is 6% over capacity before any additional development occurs.58. The allocation of Site NP04 and the other proposed allocation NP11 together with the committed housing site at Ashvale Road will collectively generate additional demand for a further 39 pupils (NP04 – 15; NP11 – 10; Ashvale – 14). This will result in an anticipated roll of 127 pupils in excess of capacity, which would then be 9% over capacity. (Note – this figure would be increased by development proposed outside Tuxford but within the catchment area which extends beyond Bassetlaw into Newark & Sherwood)59. Although financial contributions will be sought for expansion, it is noted that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan assumes that this additional capacity can be accommodated within expansion at existing schools. However in relation to the Primary Academy the school site measures 11,991m² including the Sure Start Centre and Nursery or 10,847m² excluding the Sure Start Centre and Nursery. The Primary Academy operates on a constrained site with no additional land available for expansion.60. Nottinghamshire County Council2 states that a 210 pupil Primary School requires a gross area of 10,900m², with a 420 pupil Primary School requiring a gross area of 19,300m². With the increased pupil numbers arising the Tuxford Primary Academy will potentially have a total of 392 pupils. The61. Tuxford Primary Academy site is only sufficient in size for a 210 pupil school which is in fact less than its designed capacity. With the predicted impact of the developments proposed in Tuxford the school site will be around 8,450m² too small. This will substantially harm primary education in Tuxford and as such the Local Plan should be planning for a second site for the school or the relocation of the school to a new site and redevelopment of its existing site for housing. In this respect there would seem to be more logic in planning for a more comprehensive development centered on NP11, the Ashvale Road committed housing site and a new primary school created as part of an extended education campus next to Tuxford Academy.2 Strategic Planning of School Places - areas of land required for schools based on current DCSF guidanceOther Matters62. The proposed allocation would require the diversion of a low voltage electricity line, although not uncommon the required re-routing would need to be along the eastern site edge and along Long Lane which would not aid a layout that could successfully integrate</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		with the existing built form. Conclusion 63. For the reasoning set out above we consider that the proposed allocation would have an unacceptable:· landscape and townscape impact;· relationship to existing built form;· impact on the significance, character and appearance of designated heritage assets;· relationship to nearby land uses including the nearby wind turbine;· level of accessibility;· impact on highway and pedestrian safety; and· impact on Grade 2 agricultural land. 64. Consequently the proposed allocation would fail the tests of soundness as explained earlier and it would not constitute sustainable development. Change Requested 65. Delete the proposed site NP04 and consider other reasonable alternatives such as site NP11 Land off Lodge Lane which could prevent strategic benefits of securing access and connectivity through to Tuxford Academy; would have a better relationship to existing built form brought about by the industrial estate and rail lines; and remove what would otherwise become a remnant piece of land left isolated from wider farmland	
REF198	Consultant	Policy 24 Site NP04 This site should not be included, its assessment is flawed. page 98 Tuxford does not have a Neighbourhood Plan therefore its inclusion, if based on this document, is incorrect. In terms of location, it is on the very edge of the town on a main entrance to Tuxford. It will extend Tuxford into the viewed open countryside which in itself will have a very negative effect on the town. It has heritage and conservation constraints and did not score as well as other promoted sites in Tuxford. The site at St John's College Farm is a far better site with excellent existing connectivity infrastructure. It is surrounded on 2 sides by housing and does not affect the visual attractiveness of the entrances to Tuxford. This policy needs to be readdressed.	Tuxford does have a made Neighbourhood Plan. However that plan does not have identified development sites and the town council are now in the process of reviewing such work. The smaller area identified at NP04 has considered the environmental and heritage issues. The appropriate stakeholders and departments have been consulted as part of the process.
REF201	Severn Trent	There are surface water sewers detailed within the vicinity of the site, it is therefore not anticipated that any surface water connection to the foul sewer will be permitted. Severn Trent would note that whilst Policy 24 section 1 states the need for high quality Sustainable design, there no definition of what this means, we would therefore recommend that statements are included to highlight that development should incorporate Water Efficient Design, SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy. Development should also consider Water re-use where appropriate.	A reference to water efficiency will be included within a revised Policy for the site.
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways Part 4, a) (i) - one point of access from Ollerton Road and a layout suitable for the provision of public transport up to the southern boundary of the site.	Thank you for your comment.
REF273	Anglian Water	No reference is made to the inclusion of water efficiency/re-use or SuDS provision unlike other housing allocation policies for Retford. We would ask that the criteria be consistently applied to all residential allocation sites. Please see suggested changes to the wording of the Bassetlaw Garden Village policy for the wording to be used.	A reference to water efficiency will be included within a revised Policy for the site.
REF389	Resident	My views on the housing plan for Tuxford. I am afraid I do not have any policy numbers as I am not online. My main concern is the use of Gilbert Avenue as an exit for the houses on the play area. Tuxford has three very good youth football teams where are they going to play if you build or use their field as an exist road. Surely Lodge Lane would be a more sensible exist for the house behind this field, thus saving the field for all Children. Gilbert Avenue is a nightmare as far as traffic is concerned, you should be looking at ways to improve not make matter worse. Lots of children live on this estate so you should be looking at ways to make a safe place for them to live and play, not increasing the traffic flows thus making it unsafe. The ideal place to build is either Marnham Road or Ollerton Road. Another great problem Tuxford as a whole is the drains. Lincoln Road has been closed recently due to raw sewage running down the road. This is not the first time problems have occurred, nor is it the only place. The whole sewage system wants a big overall before any more houses are built.	The amount of public open space would remain the same. However, if there was a proposal on the land to the south of Gilbert Avenue then this would provide a better recreational facility than the current one.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF429	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF430	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.” Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF431	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF432	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF433	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF434	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF435	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF436	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF437	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF438	Resident	<p>The public footpath and road from the pastures along Ollerton Road going into Tuxford narrows. At present 2 people can pass each other comfortably, this is made worse when vehicles park on or halfway on the pavement and someone on a mobility scooter, pushchair and wheelchair have to go out onto the road to go round that parked car. We have large vehicles now come thundering along this narrow part of Ollerton Road creating a side draft and its quite frightening for a normal able bodied person. The young and less mobile person cannot move out of the way quick enough. My new build will create an increase of large vehicles into the area and an increase of vehicles to the new properties and put more lives at risk along this already problem neck at Ollerton Road. I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.” The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.” No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:- “Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.” Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.) Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford, “large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.” The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to 	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be a requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years.</p> <p>• Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by</p> <p>7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved;</p> <p>8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change;</p> <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <p>• 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF439	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.
REF440	Resident	<p>Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF440	Resident	<p>We would also like to note that when the traffic is running freely on Ollerton Road (as it often does outside peak hours) there is a tendency for vehicles to travel too fast in both directions, not taking into account the SPEED limit parked cars etc. Many vehicles do not slow to 30mph as soon as they should if at all, whilst others travelling were often speed up before the end of the 30mph zone. Perhaps this could be considered along with any investigation into traffic congestion. Thank you.</p>	<p>Any necessary improvements to the existing highway network will be considered through the planning of the site. Any additional infrastructure requirement(s) will be identified within a revised policy for the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF441	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF442	Resident	<p>Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments. A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view. Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years.</p> <p>• Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by 7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action. However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <p>• 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be required for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
			land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF443	Resident	<p>Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.</p> <p>A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.</p> <p>Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:- <p>9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well-being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.</p> <p>and</p> <p>POLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page 134 states:-</p> <p>B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by</p> <p>7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved;</p> <p>8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change;</p> <p>Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." <p>The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also included to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any "known" planning constraints and those are taken into account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be a requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local Plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
			accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF444	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF445	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF446	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF447	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF448	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
REF449	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:• 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Transport Assessment for the site.” it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-“Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction.”Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle’s objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,“large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties.”The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		<p>sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, “Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land.” The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.
REF450	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds: • 7.11.1 on page 97 states “The inclusion of the site reflects the communities aspirations for Tuxford identified at a community consultation event held for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.” This is not true, as 41% responded No to NP04 – one of the highest negatives of any of the proposed sites. • 7.11.3 on page 97 states “The Land Availability Assessment 2020 2 identified the location as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford and the site as deliverable from 2026.”The Land Availability Assessment 2020 on site LAA476 in the column Potential impact on landscape, heritage and nature conservation contradicts itself. In stating the northern part of the site is within the Conservation Area and “topography, with the land sloping downhill to the north. No important views would be affected by development here”. It then states in reference to the southern part of the site that “Conservation would not support the allocation of that part of the site” because it would be visible from Newcastle Street/Egmanton Road. It qualifies the lack of support because “Views from the road into the open countryside are an important part of the rural character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”No mention is made of the views west which are visible from Ollerton Road, The Pastures, Newcastle Street / Egmanton Road and properties on Long Lane. Indeed, the view and peaceful location was surely one of the considerations when Bassetlaw Council originally built the Over 60’s bungalows on The Pastures with the gardens adjoining the arable land. The small part of the original LAA476 now selected as the proposed site NP04 being the closest possible site to the bungalows, which will therefore have a profound adverse effect on the view and other environmental aspects for those elderly residents. • 7.11.4 on page 97 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road.Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a</p>	<p>The consultation on sites in September 2019 was for potential sites within the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. These sites were consulted on as original sites and any identified constraints such as landscape and heritage were also include to give residents the information they required for them to make the appropriate comment. Although there was a generally negative response, this was for a much larger area that covered a significant area of land to the west. When considering the response, the Council decided that a smaller area – adjacent to the Pastures – would provide an opportunity for some, limited, growth whilst reducing any additional impact on the environment or on existing infrastructure. The Land Availability Assessment provides information on any “known” planning constraints and those are taking in to account when looking at the potential area of development. Consultation also took</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road		<p>Transport Assessment for the site." it is well known that the junction B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road is already a major problem. Indeed, in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update, No. RT102341 January 2019 from the original 2010 study identifies one of the known issues on the County Highway Network as:-"Tuxford - The B1164 Eldon Street/A6075 Ollerton Road simple priority junction was identified as having limited traffic capacity and being likely to require traffic capacity improvements if local plan development increased flows through the junction."Considering the amount of traffic accessing the Ollerton Road Industrial Estate has increased massively since that original 2010 study, particularly within the last 2-3 years, it is questionable how any improvement can be helped by the potential extra vehicles of residents who will occupy the planned development of 90 houses on NP04 (2011 census showed 80% of households in Bassetlaw have at least 1 vehicle, 36% more than 1 vehicle, and 81% of residents in Bassetlaw travel to work by car.)Quoting from Cllr J Ogle's objections to DBLP in the Consultation Responses 2019 and with reference to Tuxford,"large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties."The traffic flow between 0600 – 0900 and 1600 – 1830 each weekday on the last half kilometre of the A6075 West approaching the junction in Tuxford is already horrendous. At these peak times the traffic is regularly stationary from the Industrial Estate down to the junction. The vehicular access into the proposed site NP04 would have to be within this already over-used stretch of road. It can be anticipated that residents of the proposed development would also mainly wish to access Ollerton Road within these peak times for work / school journeys, thereby increasing the strain. Although Policy 24 proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane, it is most likely that residents will copy existing residents of Tuxford and the local area and visit the shops in town as they return home in their cars. The small amount of parking provided by the car parks on Newark Road and behind the Tuxford Working Mens Club (Ollerton Road), are already insufficient and a constant interchange of cars parking on Newcastle Street and Eldon Street is the norm, and can only be increased by the new developments.A new footway on Ollerton Road from site NP04 into town is also proposed, but considering the current traffic flow alongside, including a large percentage of HGVs, and the narrowness of the road this would not seem to be a realistic proposal from a safety point of view.Another consideration of the access onto Ollerton Road is during the proposed development of the site and the heavy plant needing to access the site. Such plant would have to come through the centre of Tuxford and the problem junction, exacerbating the flow-through problems already existing. This increase in heavy category vehicles could be expected to adversely affect the lower eastern end of the A6075 West and the junction with the B1164 for anything from two to several years. • Healthy and active lifestyles on page 133 states:-9.1.5 Additionally, people need to be able to access a choice of facilities and activities to enable them to keep fit and well, both physically and mentally, and enable them to feel part of a community which is welcoming, safe, clean and free from pollution. The provision of a broad range of services also makes a contribution to the character of the area and place shaping, promoting a sense of well- being which in turn can be a major contributory factor to their state of health.andPOLICY ST39: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page134 states:-B. Healthy, active and safe lifestyles will be enabled by7. ensuring that the current air quality in the District is maintained and, where possible improved; 8. creating high-quality and inclusive environments incorporating Active Design and the creation of safe, accessible and green environments which minimise and mitigate against potential harm from risks such as pollution and other environmental hazards and climate change; Monitoring of Air Quality in Tuxford by Environmental Health BDC indicates that Tuxford has the highest level of background particulate matter in Bassetlaw, although just under the levels acceptable according to the relevant European Directive and therefore presently below the level at which the council would be required to take action.However, it should be noted that monitoring of the air quality in Eldon Street close to the junction with Ollerton Road was higher than that monitored at the Lincoln Road A1 overpass. Yet the proposed development of site NP04 would surely increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at the junction and throughout Tuxford. • 6.6.3 on page 64 states, "Development should recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside, including the value of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land." The site NP04 is Grade 2 Agricultural Land and is considered one of the best pieces of Agricultural Land in the district.</p>	<p>place with the relevant departments and stakeholders when the Council considered the site. The views to the west of the sites are not considered to be of a public benefit unless they are viewed from a public place or highway (including public rights of way). Views to the west from properties are considered private views and are not a planning consideration. However, any key advantage point to a particular view from a public place will be considered in a revised policy for the site. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways are considered throughout the process. They have raised issues with traffic congestion in Tuxford, but there are no concerns about the scale of development on the proposed site. Necessary highway improvements will be requirement for the development. Bassetlaw District Council refer to NCC Highways for their comments on the existing highway capacity in Tuxford. They have stated that a Transport Assessment for the site will be required as part of a planning application. Comments from Councillor Ogle are welcome and we have invited comments from all stakeholders about the Local plan and their comments will be considered. Although Air Quality in Tuxford is an identified issue, this is largely due to the use of vehicles through the town and along the A1. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will provide a direct pedestrian route via Long Lane to the town centre which will reduce the need for car journeys to access schools and services. The Local Plan is, where possible, trying to reduce the need for greenfield development. However, in some places, such as Tuxford, there is little existing brownfield land to use to accommodate the number of properties identified for the town.</p>
REF453	Resident	<p>ST24 I think NP04 is a better site for housing the services wouldn't affect an already old and failing service system. Personally Im not in favour of any more building in Tuxford, roads, junctions, schools, doctors, sewers, parking are all under stress as it is. Extra housing extra people, children and services requires not so good for an already stretched village/town. We have no public toilets,</p>	<p>Existing infrastructure is considered during the site allocations process. Consultation is undertaken with all key stakeholders and infrastructure providers to identify</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST24 NP04 Ollerton Road			
		village hall or extra spaces within Tuxfords school cathment. Building outside of this village wuth new drains, roads etc would be better than tagging on and cramming in which is what you are proposing. You asked which sites we would prefer then discounted those everything in this village comes and goes along the very overcrowded and heavily polluted A6075 this would only get worse with any building within Tuxford.	whether any new or addiional infrastructure is required as part of a new development.
REF454	W. H. Bett and Sons	I am a partner in a farm at Tuxford, and have an interest in the land parcels, on Ollerton Road (ST24) and (ST25) the field behind Tuxford School. I am in favour for these sites to be developed for housing. I feel strongly there is a need for new housing in Tuxford, particularly so that young people can choose to stay in their local area. I would be happy for these parcels to go forward for development.	Thank you for your comment

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST26 - Affordable Housing			
REF136	A and D Architecture	5) Policy ST26 should be modified to state that static caravans are recognised by the Council as legitimate affordable housing. A new sub-section G should read: "G. The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites."	The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate sites for Home Parks. There are policies in the plan which can be used to determine applications for Park Homes.
REF205	Consultant	The Policy proposes the provision of 10% affordable on brownfield sites and 20% provision on greenfield sites. This policy is supported at the Church Farm site which is a combination of brown and greenfield land. It is also accepted that the development should have a mix of size of properties. Open book viability assessment is accepted. Information has been submitted to Hayton Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.	The Council will consider new sites submitted through the Land Availability Assessment process. Potentially suitable sites will be taken through the Sustainability Appraisal process.
1196559	Resident	ST26; The Policy on Affordable Housing must be maintained if not increased. This is essential for future generations, However, the Council and it's Planning Department MUST be strong with Developers who obtain approvals to include such housing and then apply for deferments and the Affordable element is lost.	The Local Plan can only deliver affordable homes where viable. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has informed this policy. The Council will use a range of other mechanisms, working with other agencies, such as Registered Providers, as well as the Local Plan to deliver affordable housing.
REF270	Barton Willmore	Uplift for affordable housing 2.71 Notwithstanding the case for an uplift in housing numbers to account for the economic conditions within Bassetlaw, we consider that there is a case to be made for the level of housing provision to be further increased to account for the need to provide affordable housing within the District. 2.72 The newly revised PPG notes that the SMOAN makes an 'affordability adjustment' to ensure that the standard method for assessing local housing need responds to price signals and is consistent with the policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. This specific adjustment in this guidance is made in response to the 'affordability' of housing rather than to meet the needs for 'affordable housing'. The adjustment is made only to ensure that housing provision is set at a level to ensure that the minimum housing need "starts to address the affordability of homes ". As a minimum, this policy requirement of a Local Plan is only that it does not make the affordability of homes worse. The above makes no requirement on the solving of affordable housing shortfalls within Districts. 2.73 The Council's 2017 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies affordable housing needs for the District separately, which the SMOAN does not. That affordable housing need shows a need of 134dpa for affordable homes between 2014 -2035. The Local Plan (at paragraph 7.13.5) shows that, taking into account current under delivery of affordable housing, there is a residual requirement for 2,578 affordable homes to be delivered within the plan period. 2.74 The Local Plan suggests that the above affordable housing needs will not be met due to viability issues. Whilst the ability of the open market to deliver affordable housing is an issue which must be addressed, including allocation of Sites in more buoyant market areas, the main contributing factor to the lack of affordable housing that can be delivered is the lack of housing proposed	The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment Update 2020 provides the basis for the housing numbers in the Local Plan and the approach taken to affordable housing. The housing requirement exceeds the standard method baseline therefore it is considered that the Local Plan does provide for an uplift to account for affordability and to provide more affordable homes through market led schemes than would have been the case if the standard method was used.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST26 - Affordable Housing			
		<p>overall.</p> <p>2.75 The Council has not provided a breakdown of what the maximum number of affordable units the proposed supply could deliver. However, from a review of the AMR data available it is clear that the delivery of affordable housing is likely to fall significantly below the 134dpa required through the plan period. In 2016/17, the Council's most successful year for delivering homes (459 dwellings) 67 of those were affordable which equates to circa 15%.</p> <p>2.76 In addition, of those 67 affordable housing commitments, one site was in Harworth and the remaining in Retford. Paragraph 2.13 of the AMR states that most of the affordable housing completions and commencements for the monitoring period are situated in Retford with a lack of affordable housing elsewhere. This further demonstrates that Retford is an important location within Bassetlaw for housing development and affordable housing. An uplift in the housing requirement for Retford will ensure that the Council can provide affordable housing within the District.</p> <p>2.77 If the above rate of delivery of affordable homes was maintained, the District would need to deliver some 893dpa to deliver the level of affordable housing it needs. With regard to the above, and in light of increasing difficulties facing the District with regard to affordability, it is considered that an additional uplift should be applied to the Council's housing requirement to boost the supply of housing to help meet affordable housing needs.</p>	
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>The affordable housing requirements of 10% for brownfield sites and 20% for greenfield sites are low and unlikely to create the mixed, sustainable communities Bassetlaw aims for. However, we appreciate the constraints imposed by current national planning policy guidance. CPRE has consistently produced evidence showing that this regime does not and cannot deliver the affordable housing needed.</p> <p>We welcome F. : "Any proposed amendments to a planning permission that results in a reduction in affordable housing of the original permission should be assessed by an Open Book Viability Assessment in accordance with Policy ST52." as this introduces the accountability and transparency.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the Council should understand and test the influence of all inputs on viability. The cumulative impact of infrastructure, other contributions and policy compliant requirements should be set so that most sites are deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations (para 57). The deliverability of the Local Plan should not be undermined (para 34). The Council should prepare a viability assessment in accordance with the NPPG to ensure that policies are realistic and the total cost of all relevant policies are not of a scale that will make the Local Plan undeliverable (ID : 61-039-20190315). The Council's viability evidence is set out in Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment by NCS Nationwide CIL Services dated August 2018. It is noted that the Council's viability assessment only includes costs for policy compliant requirements for accessibility, space and water efficiency standards. The Council consider that all other policy requirements such as provision of self & custom build plots, at least 10% on-site biodiversity net gain and provision of electric vehicle charging points do not have a significant impact on development costs. Such assumptions under-estimate the cumulative financial impact of policy compliant requirements on the viability and deliverability of residential development. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the Council should undertake further viability work. Policy ST26 should also be modified to be more flexible regarding on-site and off-site provision of affordable housing. On smaller sites, on-site provision may not be practical because it is not mathematically possible, no registered provider is willing to manage the new affordable units or other legitimate planning reasons.</p>	The most up to date Whole Plan Viability Assessment is 2019 not 2018 and concludes that all policy requirements can be achieved as part of a viable plan. The policy does make reference to on and off site affordable housing delivery.
1197091	William Davis	<p>The approach to affordable housing is broadly supported. However, it is noted that reference to development with a combined floorspace for 1000sqm is no longer included in the national policy and should therefore be removed from the policy. Given the guidance in the NPPF/NNPG that it is for applicants to demonstrate what has changed since the plan wide viability assessment (NPPF para 47 and NPPG para: 007 Reference ID: 10-007- 20190509) any requirement should be robustly justified and flexible. In terms of the Interim Plan Wide Viability & CIL Viability Assessment it is noted that: • Paragraph 4.22 of the Viability Assessment refers to National Housing Standards and does not appear to take into account the Future Homes Standard consultation (https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/the-future-homes-standard-changes-to-part-land-part-f-of-the-building-regulations-for-newdwellings) on changes to the Buildings Regulations which are to be introduced in 2020. These changes could add over £4,800 to the cost of a new dwelling. The Impact Assessment carried out on the Future Homes Standard consultation options identified a reduction in housebuilding as a potential impact. Given the likely introduction prior to adoption of the Local</p>	The Council will ensure that the policy reflects national policy. Policies and evidence can only be based on current building regulations. There is no certainty that the changes mooted in the Future Homes Standard consultation will be implemented. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has been subject to discussion with stakeholders. The purpose of Whole Plan Viability is to ensure that in general the development identified in the Local plan is deliverable. It is accepted that there may be exceptional cases where this is not feasible. Policy ST52 makes provision for those

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST26 - Affordable Housing			
		Plan it will be important that any requirement is future proofed to avoid the need for viability assessments to be submitted as a matter of course. • Construction costs have been assumed to be £1183/sqm including consideration of policy requirements. This represents an industry average and may not be applicable to every developer; a range of assumptions would provide a more robust figure. • The NPPG requires that plan makers engage with landowners, developers, and infrastructure and affordable housing providers to secure evidence on costs and values to inform viability assessment at the plan making stage (para 006 Reference ID: 10-006-20190509). The Viability Assessment does not provide any details of engagement carried out on the assumptions used. As part of the updated Viability Assessment input on the assumptions used in the assessment should be sought from stakeholders.	circumstances. These are detailed in the report. Further versions of the Viability Assessment will also be subject to stakeholder engagement.
REF299	Gladmans	Policy ST26 sets out that on major developments, the affordable housing requirement will be 10% on brownfield sites of which all the provision should be for affordable home ownership, and 20% on greenfield sites of which 50% will be for affordable home ownership and 50% will be for affordable rent. Where the contribution of affordable housing provision is likely to have an adverse impact on viability the developer will be required to provide an Open Book Viability Assessment in accordance with Policy ST52. Welcome the flexibility and proactive approach provided by this policy with regards to meeting the affordable housing needs of the District. Only through positively planning for significant housing growth can the Council realistically tackle market signals in a way which is advocated by the PPG and in doing so tackle the affordability issues prevalent in Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF310	P&DG	Draft Policy ST26 relates to the affordable housing provision for schemes of 10 or more residential units. Part B1 of the Policy should incorporate the broader definition of affordable housing outlined within Annex 2 of the Framework. The affordable housing should not be limited to affordable home ownership and affordable rent, it should also refer to all elements expressed in Annex 2 to make it compliant.	The Glossary provides the definition for affordable housing which was taken from the NPPF published at Jan 2020.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	This must NOT mean any reduction in the quality / type of build and where built as part of a larger development, then the "Affordable Housing" element must match the rest of the development in size, design, quality and build.	The policy states that affordable housing should be indistinguishable to market housing.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	EMPC fully endorses this policy and requests that it is enforced	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to seek the delivery of affordable housing in accordance with national and local policy requirements.
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Aspirational rather than categorical on how we will deliver the anticipated number of units. Despite policy and determined practice, we have achieved less than half of the five year target. The Plan will give us more 'clout' but our stated target is only a quarter of the expected need- 605 against 2578. Even allowing for those already on sites with permission that leaves a big gap to be filled by uncalculated alternatives. Moreover, the assumption that sites will deliver units does not address the appropriateness of those sites, (Harworth, I'm told, is a location people don't wish to move to) and will Cottam possibly have a similar problem?	The amount of affordable housing to be delivered by market housing schemes in the Local plan is the maximum that can be achieved by viable development. However the Council will facilitate the delivery of affordable housing in a range of ways. There is a requirement for affordable housing in all areas of the District.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
1192312	Resident	More information is required on how the council is going to create opportunities for Self and Custom Build. The reason many people want to self-build is that the large housebuilder companies create Identikit, homogeneous volume housing which does not suit the way they want to live (for example open plan living or home-workers). Self-builds tend to be more individual in their design and materials therefore, some flexibility and freedom of design needs to be allowed within planning policies.	The Council supports self build development, and policies in the Local Plan are enabling. High quality design is a priority for the Council. Innovation is supported where proposals do not have a negative impact on the environment/residential amenity.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
REF108	Globe Consultation	Whilst any such proposal would need to satisfy highways requirements, we are confident that this can be achieved, and discussions are ongoing with highways officers. Similarly, there are ongoing discussions regarding the development opportunity with the Council's Development Management team), it is considered that the redevelopment of this site would accord with Policy ST27, which seeks, amongst other objectives, making efficient use of land and maximising development densities on sites in and adjoining town centres. It is important to note that this site is included within the Council's brownfield land register and, as such, is deemed to constitute an appropriate location for development, and one which would reasonably be included as an allocated site within the upcoming Local Plan. It is for this reason that we have issue with Policy ST14 given the premature nature by which our client's site at Blackstope Lane was discounted from the LAA process.	The Council supports self build development, and policies in the Local Plan are enabling. High quality design is a priority for the Council. Innovation is supported where proposals do not have a negative impact on the environment/residential amenity.
REF136	A and D Architecture	6) Policy ST27 should be modified to promote Park Home static caravan sector growth by including a new subsection E as follows: "E Park Home static caravan sites The Council recognises the need to provide fair and equal treatment to the group in the community aspiring to live in Park Home static caravan sites run by competent Site Operators and will support applications for the development of such sites and will grant licenses to Park Home Site Operators who can demonstrate viability."	The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate sites for Home Parks. There are policies in the plan which can be used to determine applications for Park Homes.
REF136	A and D Architecture	These statistics indicate that the District includes an averaged sized group in the community of people living in static caravans. The evidence base does not make the claim that demand for the sector is in decline (the Nomis web site entry for October 2019 is no different to that cited above). The SHM A-OAN update 2017 states that the population of the District is likely to age over the life of the Local Plan and since Park Home Lifestyles are popular with older people it is likely that demand for static caravans will increase over the life of the Local Plan. There is no evidence therefore to support reducing the static caravan fraction of the District Housing Stock over the life of the Local Plan and yet, by providing for no growth in the sector and yet this is precisely the outcome DBLP Policy will unjustifiably deliver. The Local Plan should be "significantly boosting the supply of homes" in the static caravan sector. That duty is reinforced by the popularity of the type amongst older people who, as a group, is set to increase over the life of the Plan. To avoid a charge of "discrimination by ageism" the Council should not just provide land for static caravan sector growth that keeps pace with the average target for housing growth because that would unfairly reduce choice amongst a group in the community that is disproportionately increasing. Thus, a growth target of 35 static caravans (0.384% of 9087 dwellings) by 2037 would discriminate against older people. Since the number of people aged 65 and over is set to increase by 46% to 2107 one estimate of a fair and equal treatment of the sector would be to allow fractional growth of 46% i.e. that the static caravan fraction of the housing stock should grow from 0.384% to 0.56% ($=0.384 \times 1.46$). On that basis one estimate of a reasonable growth target in the sector without attempting primary research would be 51 static caravans ($=0.56\%$ of 9087 dwellings). The Council should therefore allocate land for at least 51 new Park Homes over the life of the Local Plan. Market research suggests that For a person aspiring to release equity and to release onto the market an under-occupied dwelling the Park Home static caravan option is an opportunity that should not be denied by lack of housing supply. The Local Plan should significantly boost the housing supply in this sector accordingly. Allocating no land for growth to serve this sector and this group in the community is unjustified negative planning that is contrary to national policy and makes the Local Plan unsound.	The Council does not consider it necessary to allocate sites for Home Parks. There are policies in the plan which can be used to determine applications for Park Homes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
REF215	Resident	<p>46. The point was made in para. 37 above that there is little point in having a three tier settlement hierarchy if that split is to be ignored for evolution of more detailed policies.</p> <p>47. Draft Policy ST27 is yet another example of this disconnected approach.</p> <p>48. Draft Policy ST1 aligns the Main Towns and the LRS's - and that is a sound approach given the stated intended wider than normal role of these rural settlements.</p> <p>49. However ST27-2 states that for housing densities in the towns it should be an average of 30 dwellings per hectare (in fact at 12 dwellings to the acre a lower figure than is likely to make the most effective use of the land) whilst in all other settlements "... densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan.."</p> <p>50. As in ST2 a strict and limiting criteria is introduced (local housing needs) without indicating what "local" means and how that correlates with the broader aims of the Local Plan.</p> <p>51. What the Draft policy also seems to be stating is that the planning of all rural settlements, large or small, is to be done through Neighbourhood Plans</p>	<p>The Design Policy will be used to guide the density and scale of development in each area. In urban areas, 30 dwellings per hectare is considered to be a suitable starting point. The Council will continue to support the development of Neighbourhood Plans, but it is not intending to require areas to produce a neighbourhood plan. There are sufficient policies in the draft Plan which will be used to determine planning applications in rural areas.</p>
1196559	Resident	ST27; Densities and space around buildings are both critical items and must be dealt with in line with ST26.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
REF253	Fisher German	<p>Self-Build</p> <p>The requirement to deliver 2% serviced plots on sites of 100 dwellings or more is not supported. Whilst we agree that the Council should be actively seeking to support self-builders (it is a statutory requirement to do so), the method of delivery is considered fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>There is We are yet to see evidence that this method of delivery has been successful. In our experience most self-builders do not wish to be within or adjacent to a modern housing development, instead preferring bespoke, rural opportunities. Furthermore, just because individuals are registered on the self-build register it does not mean that they will all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and lack skills required will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property. It is also important to note that individuals can be on multiple self-build registers, which inflates the figures across a number of areas.</p> <p>This policy requirement will serve to frustrate and slow housing delivery, given special consideration would need to be given to the location of the plots and how they can be accessed safely and independently from the typical development parcels. The delivery of plots following unsuccessful marketing is also considered to be more difficult than suggested within the Policy. The Policy assumes such plots could simply just be built out, but not many developers will want to build out single serviced plots. This could leave undeveloped plots for significant period of time. Such requirements will also deter developers, given the increased complexity and lack of certainty of outcomes.</p> <p>There appears to be no reference to self-build or the provision of serviced plots within the viability study and as such the impacts of such policy requirements and the impacts on site viability are not known. It is considered that such proposals are likely to negatively impact viability in both the costs of providing such plots and the reduced land values as developers seek to mitigate for potential risks.</p> <p>The Council should instead seek to ensure a positive policy environment exists where suitable self-build schemes, either of individual units or larger schemes providing serviced plots will be treated favourably. This encourages delivery in line with the Council's statutory duties, without compromising sites which make up a vital facet of the Council's overall proposed housing supply.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. There is a caveat within the policy which enables self build plots to be return to market housing: 'Plots should be made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months. If after that time, they have not been sold the plot(s) may either remain on the open market as self-build or be built out by the developer as market housing'. As such, your theory will be tested through this policy mechanism. Sites/plots will also be offered to households who have registered an interest with the Council (those on the self build register).</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Under the Self Build & Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, the Council has a duty to keep a Register of people seeking to acquire self & custom build plots and to grant enough suitable development permissions to meet identified demand. The NPPG (ID: 57-025-201760728) sets out ways in which the Council should consider supporting self & custom build. These are :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developing policies in the Plan for self & custom build ; • using Council owned land if available and suitable for self & custom build and marketing such opportunities to entrants on the Register ; • engaging with landowners who own housing sites and encouraging them to consider self & custom build and where the landowner is interested facilitating access to entrants on the Register ; and • working with custom build developers to maximise opportunities for self & custom housebuilding. <p>The HBF is supportive of the Council's policy approach towards self & custom build for its potential additional contribution to overall HLS as set out in Policy ST27 :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point (B) - the Council will support proposals for self-build & custom build housing that help meet the needs of those on the Self Build & Custom Housebuilding Register, provided they are compliant with other Local Plan policies ; and <p>10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point (D) - Neighbourhood Plans will be expected to consider the local need for self-build housing and where appropriate identify allocations for self-build & custom housing. <p>The HBF is not supportive of restrictive policy requirements for the inclusion of self & custom build housing on housing site allocations, which only changes housing delivery from one form of house building to another without any consequential additional contribution to boosting housing supply. The HBF object to Policy ST27 Bullet Point (C), which states that :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On housing allocations of 100 dwellings or more 2% of the proportion of developable plots should be set aside for self-build & custom housebuilding. Plots should be made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months. If after that time, they have not been sold the plot(s) may either remain on the open market as self-build or be built out by the developer as market housing. <p>The provision of serviced plots for self & custom build on housing allocations of 100 or more dwellings should not be sought. This policy requirement seeks to place the burden for delivery of self & custom build plots onto developers contrary to national guidance, which outlines that the Council should engage with landowners and encourage them to consider self & custom build. The Council's proposed policy approach should not move beyond encouragement by seeking provision of self & custom build plots on allocated housing sites of 100 or more dwellings.</p> <p>All policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence, which should be adequate, proportionate and focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned. The Council's Self & Custom Build Register alone is not a sound basis for setting a specific policy requirement. As set out in the NPPG, the Council should provide a robust assessment of demand including an assessment and review of data held on the Council's Register (ID 2a-017-20192020), which should be supported by additional data from secondary sources to understand and consider future need for this type of housing (ID 57-0011-20160401).</p> <p>The Council should also analyse the preferences of entries as often only individual plots in rural locations are sought as opposed to plots on larger housing sites. It is also possible for individuals and organisations to register with more than one Council so there is a possibility of some double counting. The Register may indicate a level of expression of interest in self & custom build but it cannot be reliably translated into actual demand should such plots be made available. The Council has provided no supporting evidence on entries on its Register.</p> <p>The Council's policy approach should be realistic to ensure that where self & custom build plots are provided, they are delivered and do not remain unsold. It is unlikely that the provision of self & custom build plots on allocated housing sites of 100 or more dwellings can be co-ordinated with the development of the wider site. At any one time, there are often multiple contractors and large machinery operating on a housing site from both a practical and health & safety</p> <p>11</p> <p>perspective it is difficult to envisage the development of single plots by individuals operating alongside this construction activity. If demand for plots is not realised, there is a risk of plots remaining permanently vacant effectively removing these undeveloped plots from the Council's HLS.</p> <p>Where plots are not sold, it is important that the Council's policy is clear as to when these revert to the original developer. It is important that plots should not be left empty to the detriment of neighbouring properties or the whole development. The</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. There is a caveat within the policy which enables self build plots to be return to market housing: 'Plots should be made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months. If after that time, they have not been sold the plot(s) may either remain on the open market as self-build or be built out by the developer as market housing'. As such, this provides a flexible approach which enables developers to test the market.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
		<p>timescale for reversion of these plots to the original housebuilder should be as short as possible from the commencement of development. The proposed marketing period of 12 months is too long. The consequential delay in developing those plots presents further practical difficulties in terms of co-ordinating their development with construction activity on the wider site. There are even greater logistical problems created if the original housebuilder has completed the development and is forced to return to site to build out plots which have not been sold to self & custom builders.</p> <p>The 2019 NPPF states that policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that a decision maker knows how to react to a development proposal (para 16d). The requirement for appropriate marketing is vague, which means uncertainty for developers. If the policy is to be effective, the Council should provide further clarification of its requirements which should be justified by supporting evidence.</p> <p>As well as on-site practicalities any adverse impacts on viability should be tested. It is the Council's responsibility to robustly viability test the Local Plan in order that the cumulative impact of infrastructure, other contributions and policy compliant requirements are set so that most development is deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations at planning application stage and the deliverability of the Local Plan is not undermined. The Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment by NCS Nationwide CIL Services dated August 2018. does not test the financial impact of Policy ST27.</p> <p>The Council is also reminded that self & custom build are exemption from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions and affordable home ownership provision as set out in national policy. On housing sites allocations of 100 or more dwellings, fewer dwellings are eligible to make contributions towards infrastructure and affordable housing, which may have detrimental impacts. The Council may have aspirations for self & custom build but this should not be pursued at the expense of delivering affordable housing.</p> <p>Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST27 should be amended to delete Bullet Point (C).</p>	
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST28 states that on schemes of 50 or more dwellings, at least 20% should be designed to meet the requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings under Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. The 2019 NPPF states that policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that a decision maker knows how to react to a development proposal (para 16d). It should be clear that the requirement for 20% M4(2) compliant dwellings only applies to schemes of 50 or more dwellings for housing schemes for older people. There should be no conjecture that this requirement applies to general family housing schemes. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST28 should be modified.</p>	<p>This will be kept under review as the Plan progresses.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>The approach to mix, density and type set out in Part A is broadly supported. However, the wording of Part 3 is unclear. It states that new housing development will be supported where it provides "...a mix of market and affordable housing, and specialist housing for older people and disabled persons". This could be interpreted to mean that all residential sites should include specialist housing. This would be opposed as not every site is suitable for specialist housing or capable of accommodating it. The approach to self-build is not supported. It is not considered necessary or practical to provide self-build dwellings on residential schemes. It is understood that there are currently 75 people on the Self Build Register but the policy will provide 140 plots, substantially more than necessary. There are a number of practical issues related to the provision on market housing sites including health & safety, payment of developer contributions and phasing. A number of similar policies have been found not to be sound and removed from emerging Local Plans due to these issues. It is considered that it would be more appropriate to include a policy that is supportive of self-build subject to certain criteria. It may also be possible to include an element of self-build in the new settlements being proposed as suitable parcels can be more easily built into the masterplan.</p>	<p>Part 3 of the Housing Mix Policy will be amended to clarify 'an appropriate mix of housing' will be supported. The quantum of development will be determined by the Affordable Housing Policy and Specialist Housing Policy. The Government requires Councils to take a proactive approach to the delivery of self build plots. Whilst there is currently in excess of 84 households on the Self Build Register, this covers a three year period. As such, that equates to 28 households per annum (420 households over the Plan period). The Policy enables a flexible approach which could see plots returned to market housing within a 12 month period if there is no demand.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>As with Policy ST27, the broad thrust of the policy is supported. However, it is unclear if the requirement for 20% of schemes to be designed to meet Part M4(2) refers to residential schemes or schemes for care homes. If for residential schemes, it is considered that the evidence provided does not justify the requirement for Part M4(2). The wording is also considered unsound given that it says 'at least 20%' which does not provide certainty for developers. Given the concerns raised about the Viability Assessment, a review of the viability assessment will be required taking account of the increased costs resulting from Part M4(2).</p>	<p>This relates to residential schemes. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that it is deliverable. The Council's evidence (Bassetlaw Local Housing Needs Assessment 2020) provides justification for this policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST27 Housing Mix, Type and Density			
REF299	Gladmans	<p>5.2.1 Gladman broadly support the suggested approach of Policy ST27 which seeks to provide a range of housing types to meet the ever-growing needs of the District. In particular, Gladman remain supportive of the fact that the above policy does not set out a prescriptive approach regarding the specific mix of properties.</p> <p>5.2.2 Reflecting on our previous representations, Gladman consider that reference to Neighbourhood Plans should not be referenced in the text of the policy. The approach advocated by the Council is better suited to dealing with housing mix, tenures, types and sizes. If a Neighbourhood Plan were to come forward and sought to impose specific requirements, then the flexibility proposed by Policy ST27 would be lost.</p> <p>5.2.3 The second element of Policy ST27 outlines the Council's proposed policy approach towards self and custom build housing. Whilst Gladman are broadly supportive of this policy element we are of the opinion however that criterion C of the Policy ST27, which states on housing allocations of 100 dwellings or more 2% of the proportion of developable plots should be set aside for self-build and custom housebuilding, should be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>5.2.4 The provision of serviced plots for self and custom build on housing allocations of 100 or more dwellings places the burden for delivery of self and custom build plots onto the developer contrary to national guidance. Whilst acknowledging the Council's aspirations for self and custom build housing, the policy should not move beyond encouragement by seeking provision of self and custom build plots on allocated housing sites of 100 dwellings or more.</p> <p>5.2.5 Gladman would be happy to explore self-build and custom build plots further with the Council, in relation to our land interests at Bevercotes Colliery.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in conformity with Local Plans. The Council will continue to support the development of Neighbourhood Plans where they propose to deliver the aims and objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The Government requires Councils to take a proactive approach to the delivery of self build plots. Whilst there is currently in excess of 84 households on the Self Build Register, this covers a three year period. As such, that equates to 28 households per annum (420 households over the Plan period). The Policy enables a flexible approach which could see plots returned to market housing within a 12 month period if there is no demand.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>5.3.1 The above policy requires development proposals of 50 or more dwellings to provide a minimum of 20% of homes to meet M4(2) Building Regulations. In principle Gladman acknowledge the importance of delivering housing to assist in meeting the needs for older people and those with mobility issues. The proposed introduction of higher optional standards for M4(2) however must be supported by robust evidence that would address an identified need for such properties in line with the requirements of the Framework10.</p> <p>5.3.2 Gladman suggest the policy is modified and flexibility added to the policy wording which provides 'support' for the provision of M4(2) but does not set a policy requirement which could impact development viability.</p>	<p>This relates to residential schemes. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that it is deliverable. The Council's evidence (Bassetlaw Local Housing Needs Assessment 2020) provides justification for this policy.</p>
REF310	P&DG	<p>Self-build Policy ST27 refers to self and custom build housing, stating that the Council will support proposals for self and custom-built housing to help meet the need of those wishing to build their own home. Part C stipulates that allocations of more than 100 dwellings should provide a 2% proportion of plots for self-build projects, which would expire after 12 months of no interest. While it is accepted that schemes of self and custom build homes should be encouraged through the Local Plan process, it has been proven not to be a sound process in neighbouring and more recent Local Plan Examinations (Bolsover and Mansfield) to put forward a distinct percentage requirement in policy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted. Lia Council I am reviewing the density Estates housing mix, type and will make any necessary amendments.</p>
REF327	Scrooby Parish	<p>Policy ST28: Specialist Housing Having a specific policy of this nature is welcomed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	<p>EMPC endorses this policy. However, it should be noted that recent developments have failed to reflect the character of the village and have not provide adequate starter homes or homes for elder residents. East Markham Parish Council also draws BDC attention to its Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 that specifically states the following. 1. New housing developments should deliver a housing mix that reflects the demonstrable need for smaller dwellings. 2. Developers must show this local need has been taken into account in the different housing types and bedroom numbers proposed. It is our view that this policy has been ignored in recent planning submissions by BDC.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST28 - Specialist Housing			
REF136	A and D Architecture	<p>These statistics indicate that the District includes an averaged sized group in the community of people living in static caravans. The evidence base does not make the claim that demand for the sector is in decline (the Nomis web site entry for October 2019 is no different to that cited above). The SHM A-OAN update 2017 states that the population of the District is likely to age over the life of the Local Plan and since Park Home Lifestyles are popular with older people it is likely that demand for static caravans will increase over the life of the Local Plan. There is no evidence therefore to support reducing the static caravan fraction of the District Housing Stock over the life of the Local Plan and yet, by providing for no growth in the sector and yet this is precisely the outcome DBLP Policy will unjustifiably deliver.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be "significantly boosting the supply of homes" in the static caravan sector. That duty is reinforced by the popularity of the type amongst older people who, as a group, is set to increase over the life of the Plan. To avoid a charge of "discrimination by ageism" the Council should not just provide land for static caravan sector growth that keeps pace with the average target for housing growth because that would unfairly reduce choice amongst a group in the community that is disproportionately increasing. Thus, a growth target of 35 static caravans (0.384% of 9087 dwellings) by 2037 would discriminate against older people. Since the number of people aged 65 and over is set to increase by 46% to 2107 one estimate of a fair and equal treatment of the sector would be to allow fractional growth of 46% i.e. that the static caravan fraction of the housing stock should grow from 0.384% to 0.56% (=0.384 x 1.46). On that basis one estimate of a reasonable growth target in the sector without attempting primary research would be 51 static caravans (=0.56% of 9087 dwellings).</p> <p>The Council should therefore allocate land for at least 51 new Park Homes over the life of the Local Plan. Market research suggests that for a person aspiring to release equity and to release onto the market an under-occupied dwelling the Park Home static caravan option is an opportunity that should not be denied by lack of housing supply. The Local Plan should significantly boost the housing supply in this sector accordingly. Allocating no land for growth to serve this sector and this group in the community is unjustified negative planning that is contrary to national policy and makes the Local Plan unsound.</p>	The Council is proposing to allocate land for a range of housing types. The Policies in the Plan are supportive of housing for older people and disabled people. It is not considered necessary to allocate land specifically for park homes.
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Under the 2019 NPPF, the Council should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area (para 65). As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the determination of the minimum number of homes needed should be informed by an LHN assessment using the Government's standard methodology unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach (para 60). The standard methodology is set out in the updated NPPG. The LHN for Bassetlaw is set out in the Council's Spatial Strategy Background Paper dated January 2020. Bassetlaw's minimum LHN is calculated as 306 dwellings per annum between 2018 – 2037. This calculation is based on 2014 Sub National Household Projections (SNHP), 2018 as the current year and 2018 affordability ratio of 6.21. The calculation is mathematically correct. As set out in the NPPG, the LHN is calculated at the start of the plan-making process however this number should be kept under review until the Local Plan is submitted for examination and revised when appropriate (ID 2a-008-20190220). The minimum LHN for Bassetlaw may change as inputs are variable and this should be taken into consideration by the Council. The Government's standard methodology identifies the minimum annual LHN. It does not produce a housing requirement figure (ID : 2a-002-20190220). LHN assessment is only a minimum starting point. The Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes as set out in the 2019 NPPF remains (para 59). Any ambitions to support economic growth, to deliver affordable housing and to meet unmet housing needs from elsewhere may necessitate a housing requirement figure above the minimum LHN. In Bassetlaw, there is justification for a housing requirement above the minimum LHN. The NPPG indicates that if previous housing delivery has exceeded the minimum LHN, the Council should consider whether this level of delivery is indicative of greater housing need (ID : 2a-010-20190220). In Bassetlaw, housing delivery between 2010 - 2018 has averaged 329 dwellings per annum. The NPPG also recommends that recent assessments of housing needs should be considered too (ID : 2a-010-20190220). The Council's latest Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN) is set out in North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw OAN Update Final Report dated October 2017 by G L Hearn. This SHMA identified the following housing needs for Bassetlaw :-• 340 dwellings per annum based on a demographic calculation comprising of 2014 Sub National Population Projections (SNPP) plus adjustments for 10 year migration trends & household formation rates in younger age groups ;• 374 dwellings per annum with an uplift to enhance affordable housing delivery ; and• 417 dwellings per annum to align housing / jobs and to support an ambitious economic growth scenario (4,800 jobs).As set out in the recently published Planning Inspectorate Guidance for Local Plan Examination, evidence base documents, especially those relating to development needs and land availability, that date from two or more years before the examination submission date</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will make the background evidence as clear as possible.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST28 - Specialist Housing			
		<p>of a Local Plan may be at risk of having been overtaken by events, particularly as they may rely on data that is even older. Any such documents should be updated as necessary to incorporate the most recent available information. The Council has prudently reviewed and updated its assessment of housing needs. Jobs growth in Bassetlaw will generate a need for an increased labour supply to meet increasing employment demand, which will in turn lead to a need for new homes to accommodate the new population. The 2018 Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) by G L Hearn uses three economic forecasting models from Oxford Economics (OE), Cambridge Econometrics, and Experian to assess jobs growth over the plan period and to inform the number of new homes required to support such jobs growth. In the District over the last decade or more, evidence of the strong performance of the transport and manufacturing sectors implies that uplifted scenarios to the baseline economic forecasts are appropriate. After the inclusion of uplifts to the transport and manufacturing sectors, the OE forecasts are considered to reflect the District's economy. The OE midpoint has been identified as the expected future economic scenario. This results in an increase of 3,400 jobs to 2035, which in turn results in a need for an increase of 3,323 people in the resident labour supply. This translates into an economic led housing need of 390 dwellings per annum. A market for commercial development along the A1 corridor in the north of the District is emerging, which will serve a sub-regional market for distribution and industrial land that may exceed historic competitions. When jobs growth of 3,400 to 2035 is projected forward to 2037 (5550 jobs), the EDNA 2019 identifies a housing requirement of minimum 478 dwellings per annum. The NPPG states that total affordable housing need should be considered in the context of its likely delivery as a proportion of mixed market and affordable housing developments. As set out in the NPPG, an increase in the total housing figures may be considered where it could help deliver affordable housing (ID : 2a-024-20190220). The SHMA Update identified affordable housing need of housing need of 2,814 affordable homes (134 affordable dwellings per annum) 2014-2035. Only 236 affordable homes were delivered in the District between 2014 – 2019 therefore there is a residual requirement for 2,578 affordable dwellings. Even though the Whole Plan Viability Assessment identifies that it is not possible to deliver the full requirement for affordable housing through contributions from market housing schemes, a higher overall housing requirement will contribute towards delivery of greater number of affordable homes. The Council recognises the need to plan for more homes than the minimum LHN of 306 dwellings per annum. Policy ST1 – Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy states that there will be provision of land for a minimum of 9,087 dwellings (478 dwellings per annum). The Council's proposed housing requirement of 478 dwellings per annum for the plan period is justified to meet housing needs of the population, to support economic growth of the District and to help deliver affordable housing. However, the Council should make clearer statements about its LHN and housing requirement figures and the derivation thereof in the pre-submission Local Plan. There should also be a distinction between the District's housing requirement and its HLS.</p>	
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST28 states that on schemes of 50 or more dwellings, at least 20% should be designed to meet the requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings under Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. The 2019 NPPF states that policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that a decision maker knows how to react to a development proposal (para 16d). It should be clear that the requirement for 20% M4(2) compliant dwellings only applies to schemes of 50 or more dwellings for housing schemes for older people. There should be no conjecture that this requirement applies to general family housing schemes. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST28 should be modified.</p>	<p>The requirement is proposed to be applicable to all residential schemes, not just housing for older people. This will be clarified in the policy.</p>
1197091	William Davis	<p>As with Policy ST27, the broad thrust of the policy is supported. However, it is unclear if the requirement for 20% of schemes to be designed to meet Part M4(2) refers to residential schemes or schemes for care homes. If for residential schemes, it is considered that the evidence provided does not justify the requirement for Part M4(2). The wording is also considered unsound given that it says 'at least 20%' which does not provide certainty for developers. Given the concerns raised about the Viability Assessment, a review of the viability assessment will be required taking account of the increased costs resulting from Part M4(2).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, which are noted. The requirement is proposed to be applicable to all residential schemes, not just housing for older people. This will be clarified in the policy. The minimum 20% requirement has been identified as viable in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The requirement for specialist housing is higher than 20% (evidenced by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment). Where viable, the Council may seek a higher level of accessible housing, in line with national policy and guidance.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST28 - Specialist Housing			
REF299	Gladmans	The above policy requires development proposals of 50 or more dwellings to provide a minimum of 20% of homes to meet M4(2) Building Regulations. Acknowledge the importance of delivering housing to assist in meeting the needs for older people and those with mobility issues. The proposed introduction of higher optional standards for M4(2) however must be supported by robust evidence that would address an identified need for such properties in line with the requirements of the Framework10. Suggest the policy is modified and flexibility added to the policy wording which provides 'support' for the provision of M4(2) but does not set a policy requirement which could impact development viability.	The minimum 20% requirement has been identified as viable in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The requirement for specialist housing is higher than 20% (evidenced by the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment). Where viable, the Council may seek a higher level of accessible housing, in line with national policy and guidance.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Having a specific policy of this nature is welcomed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST29 - Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople			
1197063	Resident	There are currently 54 traveller pitches across the District (para 7.16.2) with an estimated additional need of 40 pitches by 2037. This equates to a 74% increase in gypsy/traveller need in the District over 15 years. There are currently 4 pitches at Daneshill and this is already having an impact upon the village of Sutton cum Lound in terms of the school; there is evidence of village residents moving their children out of the school because of this, which will undoubtedly have a longer term impact upon the sustainability of the school in the village. The closure of the village school will have a considerable impact upon the village and the Local Plan, reducing any potential need for additional housing in the village and potentially reducing the size of the village in the longer term. The plan does not identify where these additional pitches will be placed and the chart in (C) does not add up to the 54 identified in para 7.16.2. The location of any additional plots needs to recognise the impact upon the surrounding areas and should be made in close consultation with local residents.	The Policies Map which accompanies the Local Plan shows the location of site GT003 at Daneshill. Nottinghamshire County Council - the Local Education Authority - are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan and have identified no concerns with site GT003 in relation to education. Para 7.16.2 identifies that there are currently 54 residential pitches in the District. There is a need for 40 pitches by 2037 to meet the needs of the gypsy and traveller community. Policy ST29 makes provision for new pitches to meet the identified need for the first 10 years of the plan (29 pitches). Policy ST29 also provides criteria against which any application for gypsy and traveller accommodation will be assessed. This will provide for the rest of the need.
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	This policy requires a section that states: The site would not lead to the loss, or adverse impact on landscape character and value, heritage assets and their settings, nature conservation or biodiversity sites; The four steps of the mitigation hierarchy should be applied — avoid, minimize, restore and offset are appropriate in this instance.	Policy ST32, ST34, ST35, ST36, ST37 and Policy 38 ensure that the impact of new development on landscape character, heritage and biodiversity is appropriately managed. This applies to gypsy and traveller accommodation. However for completion reference to biodiversity and heritage assets will be added to Policy ST29.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST30 - Houses in Multiple Occupation			
1177309	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	While HMOs should be encouraged where they fulfil a genuine need, I think we need to consider how they are managed and regulated across the district in future so that they don't become a problem, as some councils have reported across the country.	Policy 30 provides the framework to manage the level of HMO's in the District. In Workshop an Article 4 Direction has been made for the Central Area to protect the housing mix, character of the area and the local environment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST31 Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings			
1196559	Resident	Essential to maintain a base for the Agricultural Industry that we must support. Care must be taken that such development is allowed for the property then to be declared 'redundant' to the Agricultural business and sold on the open market.	Policy ST31 ensures that occupancy conditions will be used to ensure the dwelling remains in use by rural workers. Removal of occupancy conditions will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where the criteria in the policy are met.
REF310	P&DG	Policy ST31's wording of "Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwelling" is restrictive in its title and should be amended to "Development in the Countryside", similar to as tested on Examination in nearby Bolsover District, which would reflect a slightly more comprehensive approach to development in Bassetlaw. The policy could include a more prescriptive set of circumstances in which development would be supported. For instance, the Bolsover Draft Local Plan, due to be scheduled for adoption at Full Council on 4th March 2020, cites one or more of the following: • Involve a change of use or the re-use of vacant, derelict or previously developed land • Are necessary for the efficient or viable operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry and other appropriate land-based business, including the diversification of activities on an existing farm unit • Are small scale employment uses related to farming, forestry recreation, or tourism • Secure the retention and/or enhancement of a community facility • Secure the retention and/or enhancement of a vacant or redundant building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area and can be converted without complete or substantial reconstruction • Are in accordance with a made Neighbourhood Development Plan • The buildings of exceptional quality of innovative design • In all cases, where development is considered acceptable it will have to respect the form, scale and landscape character, through careful location, design and materials. This would result in combining Policy ST31 and Policy ST11 to form a much more concise and methodical Policy relating to all development in the countryside including those in the smallest settlements in the hierarchy that may have potential for modest growth of the rural economy, limited housing and improvements to the tourist offer locally as desired by other policies in the plan. The new combined Policy would complement ST12, particularly part e which relates to tourism related development which seeks to bring underused or neglected heritage assets back into economic use, it would be compliant with paragraph 83 of the NPPF.	It is considered that Policy ST2 Rural Bassetlaw, Policy ST11 Rural Economic Growth, Policy ST12 Visitor Economy together with Policy 31 comprehensively address all matters relating to the rural area as identified by National Policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST32 Design Quality			
REF047	Sport England	Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process. In addition Strategic Objectives 8 and 9 would be supported and implemented by the use of Active Design.	Reference to Active Design has been added to Policy ST32 and is also referenced in the Policy ST39 Promoting Healthy, Active lifestyles.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST32 Design Quality			
1191455	Resident	Given the need to reduce carbon emissions, the Local Plan should mandate that all dwellings in new developments in the Plan should be carbon neutral and be built with solar panels & heat exchangers (for cheaper than retrofitting them). Also all new dwellings should have electric car charging ports built in to encourage the move away from the internal combustion engine. Similarly, any commercial development should also have solar panels and at least 50% of the parking should have electric charging points	National planning practice guidance states that Local Plans can set energy performance standards for new housing or the adaptation of buildings to provide dwellings, that are higher than the building regulations, but only up to the equivalent of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and are not restricted or limited in setting energy performance standards above the building regulations for non-housing developments, as long as it can be demonstrated that it is financially viable to do so. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment shows that it is not financially viable to require energy performance standards for dwellings higher than the Building Regulations. But Policy ST45 requires non residential development to meet the appropriate BREEAM standard. All new development will have appropriate infrastructure built in to ensure connectivity for electric vehicles can be achieved. Electric vehicle parking requirements are set in the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards.
REF136	A and D Architecture	Policy ST32 should be modified to ensure that development managers do not discriminate against proposals for Park Home static caravan developments on spurious design grounds simply because static caravans are factory-built standardised products and site layouts do not necessarily conform to traditional urban design principles suited to traditional town plans and mainstream housing layouts. It is not possible to generate an inclusive form of words and therefore a specific sub-section 8 should be added as follows: " 8 Park Home static caravan sites. The Council recognises that Park Home static caravan sites are a unique and established modern form of development that meets the needs of a group in the community and depends for viability on flexible layouts populated by factory-built dwellings and that the character and design quality of Park Home static caravan site layouts of a single storey are uniquely and sufficiently controlled by model standards published by central government and local authority license conditions. Therefore, Council recognises that it would be inappropriate to seek to control the design of Park Home static caravans and/or their arrangement on Park Home static caravan sites by imposing design rules suited to mainstream housing design and mainstream housing layouts and derived from traditional urban and/or architectural models in SPG documents."	Policy ST32 applies equally to all forms of new development, and is suitably flexible to ensure that proposals for static caravan sites for example will be judged on their own merits. Planning processes and licensing are separate procedures requiring compliance with different legislation and guidance. Gaining planning permission does not necessarily guarantee you a licence and vice versa. It is therefore appropriate for all new development including static caravan sites to address the criteria within Policy ST32.
REF182	DHA Planning	This is another policy where we support the aims and objectives. Indeed, as the Council's employment site assessments paper recognises, the existing units at EIP are of a very good quality. The policy could be improved for the sake of clarity. As worded, policy ST32 does not differentiate between residential and other forms of development. Section 3 of the policy is concerned with architectural quality and materials, with 3(b) requiring developments to "take inspiration from the positive local architectural features and materials in their designs and produce a development with reference to local architectural or material merit and distinctiveness." This may be appropriate for smaller scale buildings in an urban setting, for example, but is less practical for very large-scale industrial buildings such as those at EIP. This could be remedied by adding the words "where appropriate" at the start	Policy ST32 amended as requested.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST32 Design Quality			
		of 3(b). Furthermore, section 6 (Private Amenity Space) is clearly aimed at residential developments, yet as worded would currently apply to all developments. 6(a) should be reworded to state: "New residential development should provide an appropriate standard of private amenity space..."	
1196060	Resident	BDC and planning dose not have a good record for the design or quality of developments. the Rampton treswell road development is neither good design nor in keeping with the local vernacular. BDC approved this development despite local objections. hows to say this will happen again and again.	Policy ST32 requires new development to reflect local distinctiveness, architectural quality and materials. Once adopted the Council will have an up to date Local Plan, based on up to date national policy and local evidence. All new development will therefore need to be in accordance with the Local Plan including Policy ST32.
REF198	Consultant	This policy is to be welcomed. However, it states all the issues that the Council would want to see but does not relate or refer to a design guide that the Council have or will have. Instead it would appear that any scheme will be a subjective view taken by an Officer. A design guide would be of enormous help to applicants giving them some guidance, particularly in sensitive areas.	Policy ST32 refers to a Design Quality SPD, which will be produced on adoption of the Local Plan. This will apply District wide. Neighbourhood Plans may also contain policies relating to design which should be used to guide design in that parish/location.
REF201	Severn Trent	Generally supportive of the principles behind policy ST32, but note that whilst there is a statement about permeable surfacing, there is no further mention of the need to follow the Drainage Hierarchy, or implement well designed SuDS that incorporate water quality, biodiversity and amenity benefits as well as water quantity. Hope that policies relating to design requirements would highlight the need to design water efficient properties. Some example wording can be found under the Bassetlaw Garden Village Section of this response.	Policy ST47 details the Council's requirement for well designed SuDS being incorporated and implemented in new development, as requested. Policy ST46 further details issues regarding water quality as well.
1196694	Resident	7.2.3 – whatever the design of the development, this is not a sustainable development – the ability of future generations to meet their own needs for health and wellbeing, enjoyment of nature, landscape and the natural environment will be compromised.	Noted. Thank you for your response.
REF270	Barton Willmore	Agree with the Local Plan's approach to design in general and consider that it reflects the provisions of the NPPF. Consider that the Council's policy objective should be amended to seek to achieve the highest 'practicable' standards of achievable design. It is necessary to see the design of new housing in the context of all sustainable planning aims including, for example, provision of physical and community infrastructure and affordable homes. Decision makers should be afforded the flexibility to focus on design to the extent that it does not undermine the ability of the Local Plan to achieve those other aims.	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment states that in general the requirements of Policy ST32 can be secured alongside all other policy requirements as part of a financially viable Local Plan.
REF273	Anglian Water	Policy ST32 as drafted cross refers to the water efficiency requirements outlined in Policy ST45 of the Local Plan. The phrase used is 'nationally recognised environmental standards' which does not appear elsewhere in the plan. It would be helpful to make it clear that residential development proposals will be expected to meet the optional requirement of 110 litres/per person/per day (as a minimum) and that development proposals are to incorporate water re-uses wherever possible.	Noted. Policy ST32 will be amended to refer to nationally recognised standards in Policy ST45. The phrase will be explained in the context of that policy.
1197091	William Davis	Overall the aims of the policy are supported as they are consistent with national policy (NPPF paragraphs 124 and 127). However, consideration should be given to any conflict with the new national design code and any viability issues potentially arising from more onerous requirements.	Policy ST32 will make be amended to ensure new development reflects the principles of the National Design Code. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment states that in general the requirements of Policy ST32 can be secured alongside all other policy requirements as part of a financially viable Local Plan.
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	Landscaping a) New development should provide a positive hard and natural landscaping scheme, including boundary treatments that complement the development and respect the surrounding context, particularly where a development site is adjoining surrounding countryside; b) Trees or hedgerows must be appropriate to the size of the site and consider their proximity to new buildings. Advocate additional wording that stipulates a high proportion of species used in landscaping schemes should be native and ideally, of local provenance.	Noted. Policy ST32 has been amended accordingly.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST32 Design Quality			
REF327	Scrooby Parish	This is welcomed but must be reinforced and aggressively enacted. All to often designs are accepted that do not meld into local character or current build quality.	Policy ST32 requires new development to reflect local distinctiveness, architectural quality and materials. Once adopted the Council will have an up to date Local Plan, based on up to date national policy and local evidence. All new development will therefore need to be in accordance with the Local Plan including Policy ST32.
REF347	NJL Consulting	Caddick are striving to deliver a high quality employment led development on the site and this will, where feasible, include quality design. However certain forms of development have fixed design and layout requirements. The policy, as currently drafted, is too inflexible and sets onerous requirements which could frustrate the very objective the policy is seeking to deliver. The policy should be amended to include an introduction that 'the design of each development will be considered on its merits, reflecting the nature of the scheme and individual site requirements', that way the policy can remain sound.	Paragraph 8.1.6 states that each scheme will be judged on its merits, this would apply to employment development. Policy ST32 will be amended to clarify that architectural style and detailing should be appropriate to the type of development.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	EMPC endorses this policy and asks for it to be enforced. Recent development in our village has failed to meet points 1a, 3a, b, c and 7 and has concerns about future enforcement.	Policy ST32 requires new development to reflect local distinctiveness, architectural quality and materials. Once adopted the Council will have an up to date Local Plan, based on up to date national policy and local evidence. All new development will therefore need to be in accordance with the Local Plan including Policy ST32.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape Character			
1177432	Resident	The idea of Green Gaps is fully supported. These are necessary in order to protect the character of settlements and to prevent urban sprawl into the countryside. The Green Gap on the south side of Ordsall (GG7) is particularly welcomed as development in this area would have a big visual impact when entering Retford from the south (from London Road / Ollerton Road). This land is elevated and is particularly visible.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF093	Resident	Overall the policy reads very well. The supporting text (8.3.8-8.3.14) is helpfully clear that the approach is landscape- led and is not a coalescence policy. In other Plans these different approaches can sometimes become blurred. In a broader sense I would suggest that the proposed Green Gaps are a fundamental part of the Plan's approach to sustainable development. However, Policy ST34 is rather separate from the earlier set-piece strategic policies in the Plan. Planning Inspectors are nervous about such policies where they conclude (rightly or wrongly) that green gaps have been designed to prevent development taking place or limiting its scale (see the Hart Local Plan in Hampshire). In your case I suggest that it would do no harm to dovetail the proposed Green Gaps into the wider strategy. This would run with your summary point 3 in paragraph 4.6 of the Green Gap study. The resulting message would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDC has an overall strategy; • BDC has planned for strategic and local growth; • That growth will be sustainable; • In this context the Plan has identified Green Gaps; • The Green Gaps protect the landscape setting of the settlements concerned; and • The settlements affected have sufficient environmental capacity to allow them to grow elsewhere without impacting on the green gaps. Paragraph 8.3.13 will probably assist with your case at examination. The Council will be able to demonstrate that the policy intends that some development could take place without affecting the character of the landscape (but see below). 	An addendum report has been produced to respond to the comments received during consultation. This paper further explains the rationale for the Green Gap and their purpose - including how they intend to be managed through a revised Policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
REF093	Resident	<p>Would there be merit in having the Green Gaps as a separate policy? - I raise this as I am unclear whether or not parts A and B of the policy would apply to the identified Green Gaps The policy (after the list of the Green Gaps) requires that development has a positive effect on the openness, appearance and functionality of the landscape quality of the Green Gaps concerned. I can see that paragraphs 8.3.13/14 provide some clarity on what may be acceptable. However, the approach in these paragraphs raise the following matters:</p> <p>Firstly, as drafted the policy requires a positive impact on landscape character to be achieved by proposed development. The more traditional policy approach is to ensure that any harm from development is not unacceptable. This will be a matter of local judgement and choice. In the event that you stick with the policy as drafted, I would imagine that you may be challenged either by a landowner or the Inspector about how this ambition would be managed/achieved. Secondly if the ambition of the policy is to support agricultural and other open rural uses in the identified Green Gaps (8.3.13/14) should the policy comment as such? In the event that you stick with the policy as drafted I would imagine that you may be challenged by either by a landowner or the Inspector about the relationship between a generally-worded policy on the one hand and the supporting text which potentially restricts development in a Green Gap to agriculture and other rural activities on the other hand. Thirdly the policy may need to define how it intends to address the 'adjoining the Green Gaps' issue. Some of the Gaps are extensive in scale and as such there will be significant tracts of land which are adjacent to the designated area. If not clarified the issue has the ability to be a DM officer's nightmare and a lawyer's playground in equal measure.</p>	Agreed. There is now a separate policy within the Local Plan specifically for the Green Gaps. This policy provides a criteria for applications.
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>We welcome the aspirations of this section which should help to ensure that consideration is given towards the design of new development and the creation of new positive spaces. We do believe that is it essential that the document provides guidance and certainty to developers and decision makers over how waterfront spaces should be incorporated into new development. Waterfront areas feature unique characteristics as a setting for development and form key areas in Worksop and Retford for leisure, recreation and tourism. There are specific needs to ensure that development integrates positively with waterways, ensuring that development is designed to improve access to, along and from the waterway; and ensuring development optimises natural surveillance of the waterway.</p> <p>As such, we wish to highlight as an example of good practice, policy SP31 within the Rotherham Sites and Policies Document, adopted in June 2018. This states that: "Subject to satisfying other relevant planning policy, development adjacent to canals will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Be of a high-quality design that integrates the canal into the development proposal in a way that treats the waterway as an area of usable space; b. Integrate the waterway, towing path and canal environment into the public realm in terms of the design and management of the development; c. Improve access to, along and from the waterway and improve the environmental quality of the waterway corridor; d. Optimise views of water and generate natural surveillance of water space through the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings, recognising that appropriate boundary treatment and access issues may differ between the towing path and offside of the canal; and e. Improve the amenity of the canal. Development that would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the canal by virtue of noise, odour or visual impact will not be supported." The existing policies in the draft Local Plan do not directly address requirements for waterside design and we believe that it is necessary for either Policy ST32: Design Quality or ST34: Landscape Character to be expanded to include a section addressing requirements for waterfront development. Although section 8.4 refers to general policies to consider Multi-Functional Green and Blue Infrastructure, this section does not directly address considerations for designs relating to built development and its impact on the local landscape. As a result, we do believe that policy text directly relating to waterfront development should be provided within either section 8.1 or 8.3 to make the plan effective. 	Thank you for your comments. Waterfront development, regeneration and design are specific issues related to particular places. The Local Plan does cover this either for proposed sites or design led planning policies.
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	Policy ST34 refers to a map showing green gaps we have been unable to find it as it mentions one between Retford South and Eaton. Could Bassetlaw forward a copy to us?	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
REF194	Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	It is pleased to see that the Policy to maintain the separation between existing villages is to remain. Being a Parish in which there are two villages the Parish Council feels that it important that this separation continues in order to identify the two communities within the Parish. It allows the two communities to continue their existing independent character.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of bullet point 3, as it highlights the need to protect Watercourses, watercourses form a vital part of the natural water system. The culverting or removal of watercourses can make it difficult to drain developments resulting in flows being connected to the sewerage system.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>Policy ST34 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan states: The Policy is accompanied by supporting text concerning ‘Green Gaps’ at paragraphs 8.3.8 to 8.3.14. The Green Gaps are illustrated on the Draft Policies Map. This indicates that Green Gaps are collectively proposed to extend to the south of Oldcotes, around most of Langold and around Carlton in Lindrick. It is noted that part of the proposed site lies within the Green Gaps area of GG2: Oldcotes-Langold-Carlton in Lindrick.</p> <p>5.3 Each of the evidence base documents which are referred to in the Draft Policy are discussed further below: Landscape Character Assessment – Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire, August 2009</p> <p>5.4 This Landscape Character Assessment was identified directly in the text of Policy ST34 as one of the documents which have informed the creation of the policy (albeit the Policy text appears to erroneously refer to this as the ‘Landscape Capacity Assessment’).</p> <p>5.5 The site lies within the Magnesian Limestone Ridge regional character area and specifically the landscape character parcel of ML03: Langold, which is identified as having a ‘very good’ landscape condition and a ‘moderate’ landscape sensitivity, which equates to the policy of: ‘Conserve’.</p> <p>5.6 Despite the results of the Landscape Character Assessment, part of the site has already been deemed acceptable for housing, as confirmed by the planning application 15/01605/OUT. It is therefore considered that there is no reason why the evidence set out in the Landscape Character Assessment would preclude further development in the wider site area and no specific evidence to suggest that this area would need to form part of the Green Gaps, in order for them to serve their primary function. In conclusion, the Green Gap area to the north of Langold should be amended to exclude the full area of the extended site proposals. This would not detrimentally impact on the openness, appearance and functionality of the landscape quality of the Green Gap and specifically the Green Gap would continue to deliver its primary purpose of preventing coalescence between Langold and Oldcotes. This would not then prevent the development proposals, along with their proposed landscape mitigation, from being able to deliver future sustainable development which was compliant with Policy ST34.</p>	The Green Gap to the north of Langold does exlude the two sites that have existing planning permisison. It dies however include the remaining open land between the development site and the village of Oldcotes. The reasining and justification for including this area is identified within the Green Gap Study.
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>We acknowledge the requirement for development proposals to demonstrate how they have regard to landscape character areas, and we support the inclusion of mitigation measures. However we strongly object to Local Plan’s emerging approach to identifying “Green Gaps”. The Local Plan and Policies Map identifies these ‘Green Gaps’ as existing between settlements and around settlement fringes, some of which are protected such as Conservation Areas. Our Client’s land is proposed to be designated as a Green Gap GG8 (Retford West) within Policy ST34 and Local Plan Proposals Map. Three proposed Green Gaps for Retford (GG6, GG7 and GG8) enclose the entire southern, eastern and western boundary of the designated Main Town, which seeks to essentially safeguard the entire area to the south of Retford from development. Notwithstanding out Client’s clear case as to the appropriateness of land to the south of Retford as a location to meet the future development needs of the town, we object to the designation of a Green Gap in this location as a matter of principle. We consider that the Green Gap policy is not justified, serves no meaningful planning policy purpose and seeks to add an undue level of protection to land on the basis that it is not the Council’s current preference for development. The Council’s justification for the above policy approach is set out within the evidence base for the Draft Local Plan within the ‘Green Gap Study’. The Study has been prepared to safeguard areas of “important landscape” in sensitive locations and as a reaction to development pressure within the district (Section 5). It is our Client’s position that the document does not justify the allocation of the Green Gaps. Paragraph 5.2 of the document simply states “it is certain that similar pressures will continue over the next 20 years” indicating that there has been substantial development in recent years and “in some cases” settlements extending into the countryside. We note that, to cater for the growing needs of the District and to facilitate a ‘step change’, development of greenfield land will necessary over the plan period and it is not sustainable to prevent development on land that is well -suited for development and located on the urban fringe of</p>	There is a clear justification for Green Gap policies (or similar), based on planning practice and guidance. Examples can be drawn from several Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans (see Section 3) The matter is, therefore not one of principle but more about whether the extent of any given Green Gap is justified and how the flexibility within a redrafted Green Gap policy would allow for appropriate development to occur. The landscape to the South of Retford is distinctive comprising north-south running ridge or plateau, with extensive views in all directions and the slopes and bottom of the River Idle valley. It provides a countryside setting, with access opportunities, for the Retford housing areas of; Ordsall, South Retford, Thrumpton & White Houses and it is a rural setting for the village of Eaton. Whilst is may be justifiable to examine the details of the Green Gap where it adjoins the built up area and/or to consider if well planned and landscaped residential development may be appropriate, there is no justification for the removal of Green Gap 8 in its entirety.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		settlements such as Retford without the risk of merging with any settlements to the south or surrounding area. Whilst there is planning merit in maintain distinctiveness and local characteristics of settlements, the Green Gap study provides no meaningful evidence to demonstrate that protection of land to south of Retford is important to maintaining its character or distinctiveness. There is nothing significant or distinctive regarding the area to the south of Retford and its relationship with surrounding villages which are physically and visually removed from Retford. We consider that the Council's proposed Green Gap designation to the south and west of Retford should be deleted from the Local Plan.	
REF275	Consultant	The necessity to have requirements to protect the area of landscape character, and how developers have regards for these areas is clearly understood and supported. We do, however, strongly oppose the emerging approach presented in the Local Plan to identify Green Gaps and its current use in the Local Plan. These are identified in the policies maps as areas between the settlements and around settlement fringes, some of these areas are already classified as conservation areas. There are three Green Gap areas proposed around Retford, on the southern, eastern and western boundaries (GG6, GG7, GG8). This is seeming in place to restrict development in this area on the outskirts of Retford. Regardless of our clients appropriate, and previously identified, land suitable of meeting the need of the town, we also object to this policy due to its lack of substantial justification, serving no meaningful planning purpose and an over the top protection from future development. The current layout of policy combined with the Flood Risks in channels development of Retford in an unnatural, uncharacteristic and unsustainable manner. These restrictions will have major impacts of Retford, the town centre and the villages that rely upon it. There is no evidence to suggest the area of land south of Retford is important to retain the character of the town. We believe that the green gap designation to the south and west of Retford should be removed from this Local Plan	The landscape to the South of Retford is distinctive comprising north-south running ridge or plateau, with extensive views in all directions and the slopes and bottom of the River Idle valley. It provides a countryside setting, with access opportunities, for the Retford housing areas of; Ordsall, South Retford, Thrumpton & White Houses and it is a rural setting for the village of Eaton. Whilst it may be justifiable to examine the details of the Green Gap where it adjoins the built up area and/or to consider if well planned and landscaped residential development may be appropriate, there is no justification for the removal of Green Gap 8 in its entirety.
REF280	Avant Homes and Wyndthorpe Developments.	From review of the background evidence, it is clear that the Council's intended function of the Green Gaps are to set clear, long term, defensible and recognisable boundaries using readily recognisable features such as roads, streams, belts of trees or woodland edges, footpaths/tracks, canals and railway lines. At face value, it would appear that such a prohibitive methodology shares similarities with the function of the Green Belt. The extent of the Green Gaps are taken from the 2009 Landscape Character Assessment which had broadly characterised areas. In some cases, the landscape has changed due to development which may have affected the classification and shape of these broad areas which would resultantly implicate that the extent of the selected Green Gaps would change alongside this. An updated landscape character assessment along with a more accurate Green Gap Report assessing individual sites on their merit would be welcomed and is encouraged to provide a robust evidence base for such a restrictive policy. Indeed the relevance of this exercise is further justified by virtue of the approved planning application in relation to land off Doncaster Road (ref 18/01148/FUL). A flaw of the Green Gaps Report is that the Council's preferred allocations have been excluded from the assessment and further scrutiny, implying that their environmental suitability for development has already been pre-determined. The rejection of the preferred allocations from the assessment should therefore deem the assessment as incomplete and biased in determining the extent of the proposed Green Gaps. The Green Gaps proposed will define the spatial plan for duration of the plan period and can therefore be seen as a 'long-term' prohibitive policy which will have a detrimental impact on the flexibility of maintaining a deliverable 5 year housing land supply and changing economic circumstances. The extent of the coverage of the Green Gap proposed is significant in scale, wrapping around major urban areas and constraining the majority of growth within the edge of the defined boundary in what can be considered sustainable and viable locations for residential growth. Although it is noted that the Green Gaps have left directions for growth for some urban areas, the sustainability and viability of the remaining unrestricted land has not been factored in to the plan's flexibility to deliver housing, resulting in potential future supply issues for Bassetlaw if the preferred allocated sites are deemed unsuitable or are subsequently un-deliverable over the plan period.	It is intended that, whilst they would be open to review in future Bassetlaw Local Plans (or any successor documents), Green Gaps should have robust and easily recognisable boundaries. To achieve this, applying the principles for drawing Green Belt boundaries is quite reasonable. However, this does not state or imply any intent that Green Gaps are a backdoor way of introducing Green Belt into Bassetlaw. This is made explicit in the wording of the proposed new, separate, Green Gap policy and its explanation in Section 6 of the Green Gap Study. The 2009 assessment remains pertinent in conjunction with the more recent NE Natural Character Areas. The Green Gaps have been defined based on the emerging policy context, recognising existing commitments and emerging allocations for new housing and employment around settlements. As noted above, should preferred/allocated sites fail to come forward within the plan period, those sites and their relationship with Green Gaps can be considered in a future review(s) of the Local Plan.
REF280 (LAA)	Avant Homes and Wyndthorpe Developments.	Carlton-in-Lindrick adopted their latest revision of the neighbourhood plan in February 2019, within this, policies or importance are implemented within this plan which has had influence within the Green Gap Report, and the also informing the Draft Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan has allocated two large sites for future growth within the area; Land East of Doncaster Road, and Firbeck Colliery. The land East of Doncaster Road is currently being developed by Avant Homes after obtaining planning permission for 151 dwellings (18/01148/FUL). Firbeck Colliery is proposed for 407 dwellings and is pending a planning decision. Through the determination of the associated planning application, this site was deemed suitable for development in respect of both both environmental and technical constraints. Policy 10 identifies locations of important views from Doncaster Road	The Green Gaps have been defined based on the emerging policy context, recognising existing commitments and emerging allocations for new housing and employment around settlements. As noted above, should preferred/allocated sites fail to come forward within the plan period, those sites and their relationship with Green Gaps can be considered in a future review(s) of the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		highlighting 6 views east, of which these areas have been included within the designated Green Gap in the Draft Local Plan. The purpose of this policy is to show no support towards developments which will negatively impact the views into their respective areas. As one of the views (view 6) is directed at the recently approved development it can be considered that the views do not implicate that no residential development shall be placed however is there to promote to “conserve, protect and/ or otherwise enhance the views for the benefit of the communities, for leisure, recreation use, and of provision as a haven for wildlife.” A design should therefore be adaptive to benefit these sought for qualities.	
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>We welcome this policy, especially “B. All developments of 10 or more dwellings and non residential development of 1000sqm or more floorspace, will be supported subject to the provision of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot; 2. Protection of, connection to, and extension of where practicable, existing pedestrian, cycle and equestrian routes as part of a convenient, safe and attractive network for users; 3. Public transport enhancement where justified, including measures to encourage public transport use” <p>The recognition in 3. that measures to encourage public transport use will (often) be needed is welcome. Rigorous assessments independent of applicants and developers will, however, be necessary to ensure that the “where justified” condition in 3. is not used as a reason not to provide public transport alternatives.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF282	National Trust	<p>While National Trust generally supports Policy ST34 we believe that it should be more aspirational. We suggest that proposals should be required to have specific regard to national and local Landscape Character Assessments, rather than only those assessments intended to inform the local plan (currently listed in Part A). It would also be beneficial if the aspiration of supporting the Sherwood Forest Restoration Plan referred to at 10.1.11 was incorporated into this policy. It is not clear how Green Gaps have been identified as the associated report only includes an assessment of the areas already suggested. Consequently, it is unclear why a Green Gap should not be established between Worksop and the A1 where the risk of linear urban sprawl is clearly at its most marked. It is notable that while this area to the east of Worksop has not been assessed by the Green Gaps Report, the report specifically refers to ‘settlements extending into the countryside with the potential for them to merge in the future... erosion of local landscape character between settlements some of which is locally valued and has historic value. Examples of this include... Worksop (E). The (commercial) development of Manton Wood with major HQs and warehouses; ... [and] The A1 junctions, services and associated development (Blyth, Morton...)', p15. With a proposed Garden Village to be sited between Worksop and Retford, the Draft Local Plan is promoting an extended area of urban sprawl stretching from Worksop to within 2.5km of Retford, which conflicts with its own Green Gap Report. We suggest that the proposed Green Gaps ought to be revisited with additional areas being identified on the basis of how well they meet a range of criteria.</p>	Additional work has been undertaken to review the comments on the Green Gaps and identify policy revisions. The review concluded that there will be no change to the boundaries of the proposed Green Gaps, but there will be a separate policy in the updated version of the Local Plan. This will provide more local detail for development within and adjoining green gaps.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
1197091	William Davis	<p>Whilst there are no objections to Part A and B of Policy ST34 there are significant concerns regarding Part C on Green Gaps, specifically GG4: Worksope West – Shireoaks and Rhodesia. A review by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect (see attached) has identified that this policy is not consistent with national policy nor justified by the evidence (namely the Site Allocations: Landscape Study (November 2019) and Green Gaps Report (November 2019)) as required by the tests of soundness. The Green Gaps Report justifies the inclusion of the green gap element of Policy ST34 with reference to paragraphs 170 and 171 of the NPPF. Of relevance these set out three matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protecting and enhancing valued landscapes; • recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside; and • allocate land with least environmental or amenity value. <p>No robust evidence has been provided which follows the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Edition 3 (GLVIA) Box 5.1 to justify the identification of GG4 as a ‘valued landscape’ worthy of protection and enhancement. Regarding intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, this is an emotive and subjective matter which can only be judged against the value of the landscape. Again, the landscape study fails to meet the full criteria for defining value. Finally, the allocation of land of least environmental or amenity value; value has not been considered in line with the accepted guidance of GLVIA3. As such the Green Gap policy is not consistent with national policy. The Green Gap Report also references Planning Guidance on the Natural Environment stating it supports Green Gaps. The quote provided from the guidance does not at any point mention Green Gaps. The only place where there may be implied support for the Green Gap policy in Plans can also include policies to avoid adverse impacts on landscapes and to set out necessary mitigation measures, such as appropriate design principles and visual screening. Excluding land by the Green Gap map based blanket ‘no development’ policy does not accord with the subtler requirement of the guidance seeking appropriate design principles and visual screening. In fact mitigation is practically addressed in full by Policy ST34.B allowing the use of clauses 1 – 6 when assessing and informing/guiding all new developments. There are also a number of concerns with the supporting evidence to the policy. The attached review sets these out in detail but in summary these are:</p> <p>Site Allocations: Landscape Study (November 2019):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not a landscape character assessment and does not meet evidence required by the NPPF • lack of methodology • document does not identify the author(s) nor their qualifications • weak descriptions and incorrect statements in the findings table • the Views and Landscape Features map for 14H, do not identify the locations of the photographs making it difficult to locate the viewpoints on the ground. • We are not told what lens or camera is used so the images do not meet GLVIA3 guidance. 	<p>This is overstated, it is not prescribed that GLVIA3 is used in all studies. Indeed, the approach to defining Green Gaps was intended to be broadly based, including: Use of the existing evidence base (e.g. the relevant NCAs and the 2009 Study).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognising recent commitments and potential allocations in the Local Plan. - Taking account of Neighbourhood Plans. - Information from recent site visits. <p>The extent to which the approach to Green Gaps reflects National Guidance and good practice is, therefore, a matter of opinion. There is no compelling argument that not using a methodology such as GLVIA3 renders the proposed policy unsound. The Local Plan is positively prepared, and the Green Gaps policy is part of a wider approach/appropriate strategy to enable sustainable development, consistent with national policy. With reference to the NPPF, it is not necessary for a landscape to be designated for it to be “valued.” The definition of Green Gaps will not prevent the overall development requirement from being met. The Green Gap policy is not about allocating sites, therefore, there is no need to specifically consider whether an area of land has the “least environmental or amenity value.” For some of the intended functions of a Green gap, the current quality of the land may not be an overriding consideration. At a more strategic level, the definition of Green Gaps is part of a wider approach to achieving sustainable development, focusing on brownfield land, new villages and the regeneration of former power station and mining sites. It is not correct to say that the Green Gap policy is intended to prevent all development. The proposed separate Green Gap policy (see Section 6) is explicit that if development reflects local landscape and character it may be acceptable within or adjoining a Green Gap</p>
REF295	dmc20eighteen	<p>The policy is to be found at Section 8.3 on page 119 of the Draft Local Plan. It recognises at 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 that the diverse landscapes of Bassetlaw have been influenced by human activity and that this activity leads to changes in landscape character. It is reasonable to say that this will continue to be so and that policy should guide such change and not seek to block or prevent change.</p> <p>At Para 8.3.4 the text correctly states that The National Planning Policy Framework advises that a landscape character assessment (LCA) should inform policy making and planning decisions. It goes on to reference the LCA prepared in 2009 for the district. In reviewing the Landscape Study 2019 the author will question whether this document is in fact a landscape character assessment and if not whether it offers robust evidence to underpin the policy and in particular the green gap proposals therein. The policy text refers to Figure 26 on page 120. Unfortunately the figure does not identify the character areas nor the settlement names which for the reader, particular the general public, makes it difficult to locate not only areas of land but also towns and villages that would assist with orientation.</p> <p>At 8.3.5 on page 120, the text makes reference to sensitivity. This subject is covered in the 2009 LCA where it finds the landscape, which falls in the policy zone MLPZ11 (14H in the Landscape Study), to be only of moderate sensitivity. This fact is not mentioned neither in the 2019 Landscape Study nor in the 2019 Green Gap Report nor considered in either of their conclusions.</p>	<p>This is overstated, it is not prescribed that GLVIA3 is used in all studies. Indeed, the approach to defining Green Gaps was intended to be broadly based, including: Use of the existing evidence base (e.g. the relevant NCAs and the 2009 Study).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognising recent commitments and potential allocations in the Local Plan. - Taking account of Neighbourhood Plans. - Information from recent site visits. <p>The extent to which the approach to Green Gaps reflects National Guidance and good practice is, therefore, a matter of opinion. There is no compelling argument that not using a methodology such as GLVIA3 renders the proposed policy unsound. The Local Plan is positively prepared, and the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		<p>Such moderate sensitivity increases the landscapes capacity for change even when considered against other factors such as condition and value.</p> <p>8.3.6 continues to underpin the importance of the 2009 LCA and indeed states that a 2019 review confirms the principles of the 2009 assessment remains sound. It is important therefore to look at these principles and findings of the 2009 LCA. This will be done in the review of the Landscape Study that follows. The supporting text of the policy goes on to reference the green gaps proposal in the policy. At 8.3.8 it states that important undeveloped areas of land exist between settlements and around settlement fringes. It goes onto state at 8.3.9 that the gaps between settlements also help give the sense of leaving one place and arriving at another. The text however does not state the role of the land around the fringes of settlements. It would help the reader if the local plan included, in the supporting text of the policy, a statement on the role of the fringes of settlements in the green gap proposals. At 8.3.11 the text helpfully sets out the guidance for Green Gaps in terms of openness, appearance and function. What is noted is that the term used is guidance and not recommendations in the Green Gaps Report. It can be inferred that the report is therefore seen by the local plan as merely offering advice or information aimed at resolving issues affecting land between settlements or around settlement fringes. By dint of such a statement it is reasonable to imply that other robust assessment such as that provided by applicants could equally inform and guide the policy on green gaps or new development therein. The Para. 8.3.11 goes on to acknowledge that green gaps have a capacity to accommodate development. As such it is reasonable to say that the policy does not exclude appropriate development from green gaps. At 8.3.12 overleaf it suggests that significant development could adversely affect openness, appearance, functionality and therefore quality of these landscapes. Two issues arise from this statement, firstly what level of significance is acceptable? In GLVIA3 significance is measured from major to low or negligible. Secondly, it is important to recognise that all development has significance; it is the measure or scale of that significance that is important to the impact on landscape or its visual qualities. For instance a development could be acceptable if its significance is found to be limited especially if it retains key elements of openness (say, as part of proposed open space), improves or retains appearance (adds to woodland or hedgerow cover) and allows the landscape to function in whatever role is considered appropriate whether as it was previously or as it could be in the future. This returns to the opening paragraphs of the policy where it accepts that the Bassetlaw landscape has changed and was influenced by human activity and given the inevitable progress of the economy, society and places the landscape will continue to be influenced and changed. actually states that Green Gaps do not prevent development taking place. It sets out examples of possible appropriate forms of development, such as agricultural buildings and rural uses, but does not restrict appropriate development to those uses. This therefore should not exclude open space or landscaping that could be demonstrated would sit comfortably within the open character, role and function of the Green Gap. And in Para. 8.3.14 it indicates that if evidence is presented that shows new development is well sited, well designed and landscaped the policy would not prevent such development taking place. Policy ST34.A There are various anomalies in the titles of the evidence documents as stated in the paragraph where evidence documents are referred to. After enquiries of the local plan team at Bassetlaw DC were made, it was confirmed that “In terms of the reference in part A of Policy ST34 this is referring to the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment 2009 and the more recent Landscape Study in relation to the potential development sites undertaken in Nov 2019”. The enquiry confirmed that “the references should be made clearer in any revision to the Local Plan”. These anomalies in matters of evidence undermine the policy and place inaccurate and confusing source information in front of the public and also the Secretary of State when examining the soundness of the plan. What the enquiry does now confirm is that the 2009 LCA remains pertinent evidence to the policy.</p> <p>Policy ST34.B</p> <p>The requirements for “testing” a development as set out in 1 - 6 are most commendable and underpinned by national policy. As such they must be the means, the process, by which new development whether in Green Gaps or outside, could be found to be appropriate as set out in Para’s 8.3.13 and 8.3.14 previously. It therefore falls upon the proposer or applicant to meet the test to show that development is indeed acceptable.</p> <p>Policy ST34.C</p> <p>The Green Gap policy is noted and will be commented upon in detail in the following review of the Green Gaps Report 2019. However, the final policy paragraph (unnumbered) is somewhat at odds with the supporting text to the policy as it now becomes more restrictive. It now seeks a positive impact on landscape qualities whereas at 8.3.13 development must show it sits comfortably within the qualities of the landscape of the Green Gap the latter being, a more benign perhaps neutral requirement on the development. As has been stated, all development has an effect; it is the scale of significance that is the test, the final</p>	<p>Green Gaps policy is part of a wider approach/appropriate strategy to enable sustainable development, consistent with national policy. With reference to the NPPF, it is not necessary for a landscape to be designated for it to be “valued.” The definition of Green Gaps will not prevent the overall development requirement from being met.</p> <p>The Green Gap policy is not about allocating sites, therefore, there is no need to specifically consider whether an area of land has the “least environmental or amenity value.” For some of the intended functions of a Green gap, the current quality of the land may not be an overriding consideration.</p> <p>At a more strategic level, the definition of Green Gaps is part of a wider approach to achieving sustainable development, focusing on brownfield land, new villages and the regeneration of former power station and mining sites. It is not correct to say that the Green Gap policy is intended to prevent all development. The proposed separate Green Gap policy is explicit that if development reflects local landscape and character it may be acceptable within or adjoining a Green Gap</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		paragraph of the policy does not allow the significance to be measured. This anomaly between policy and supporting text should be addressed to avoid confusion.	
REF300	Natural England	Natural England welcomes this policy and particularly the references to the National Character Areas (NCAs) and the links to green infrastructure.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF301	Freeths	The Green Gap allocation in this location would not serve to prevent the coalescence of towns and villages. Given the existing and proposed developments and the existing and proposed infrastructure in this area, the allocation as a Green Gap between Carlton Road Ashes Park Avenue would inhibit the potential to maximise the development potential and infrastructure benefits of linking the proposed distributor road (ST51) with Ashes Park Avenue. The comprehensive development of this area would also allow for a strong defensible urban boundary that would enhance the green corridor along Worksop's northern fringe, defined by the strong mature vegetation, woodland blocks and prominent ridge line.	The identification of this green gap has been supported by an independent report on local landscape quality and the historic environment towards the north of Worksop. There are significant landscape and heritage assets or existing designations that would limit and further manage development in this location.
REF304	Pegasus	<p>5.1 Policy ST34 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan states:</p> <p>"A. Proposals for development should be informed by, and be sympathetic to, the special qualities and features of the District's landscapes as identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Capacity Assessment [*], Bassetlaw Site Allocations Assessment 2019 [**] and Bassetlaw Green Gaps Report 2019, or successor.</p> <p>B. Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that their location, scale, form, design and materials will protect and enhance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The special qualities and features of the landscape in that locality; 2. The visual relationship and environment around settlements and their landscape settings; 3. Distinctive landscape elements including but not limited to watercourses, woodland, trees, hedgerows and field boundaries, and their function as ecological corridors; 4. Visually sensitive skylines, river corridors and significant views towards key landscapes and heritage features; 5. The green infrastructure network supporting health, wellbeing and social interaction. 6. Habitat connectivity. <p>C. Green Gaps, as shown on the Policies Map, are designated between:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GG1: Bircotes - Bawtry 2. GG2: Oldcotes-Langold-Carlton in Lindrick 3. GG3: Carlton in Lindrick – Worksop North 4. GG4: Worksop West – Shireoaks and Rhodesia 5. GG5: Claborough – Welham 6. GG6: Retford East 7. GG7: Retford South – Eaton 8. GG8: Retford West <p>Development of undeveloped land and intensification of developed land in and adjoining the Green Gaps will only be supported where it does, either individually or cumulatively, with other existing or proposed development have a positive impact on the openness, appearance and functionality of their landscape quality.'</p> <p>NB</p> <p>* It is understood that this should state 'Landscape Character Assessment, 2009'</p> <p>** It is understood that this should state 'Bassetlaw Local Plan Site Allocations: Landscape Study 2019'</p> <p>5.2 The Policy is accompanied by supporting text concerning 'Green Gaps' at paragraphs 8.3.8 to 8.3.14. The Green Gaps are illustrated on the Draft Policies Map. This indicates that Green Gaps are collectively proposed to extend around the full extent of the eastern, southern and western boundaries of Retford. It also illustrates the boundaries between the 8 Green Gaps, with the 'Retford West' area extending around westwards from a boundary defined by Ollerton Road. Our clients site lies within this area of the Green Gaps</p> <p>5.3 However, there are inconsistencies between the Green Gaps are illustrated on the Draft Policies Map and the findings of the evidence base which was used to aid with their identification. Specifically, it is understood that there was no evidence in the supporting documents referenced in the Draft Policy to justify the extent of Green Gaps which have subsequently been identified</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34-Landscape	Character		
		on the Policies Map. In particular this concerns the area to the south of Retford in which our client's site is located. 5.4 Each of the evidence base documents which are referred to in the Draft Policy are discussed further below:	
1197220	Resident	Green gaps between settlements have been stated as being very important to the identity of a settlement. The development of Peaks Hill farm opposite Freshfields will completely destroy this identity. As you approach Worksop along the A60 the rural feel gained from the fields and woodland would be lost forever. This amenity view is important to peoples mental health. This development will be visible from the public rights of way in Carlton in Lindrick and completely erode this sense of space and well being.	The identification of this green gap has been supported by an independent report on local landscape quality and the historic enviroment towards the north of Worksop. There are significant landscape and heritage assets or existing designations that would limit and further manage development in this location.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Is welcomed	Noted. Thank you for your comments
REF377	Resident	The other strategy we support is the allocation of a green buffer around the settlement of Retford to maintain its unique geography and minimise the growth of Retford into the countryside (ST34). Our only reservation is with the Bassetlaw Green Gaps report 2019. The settlements close to the west (Babworth), south (Eaton), and east (Little Gringley and Welham) are to be separated from the settlement edge of Retford by green gaps, but the green gap separating Clarborough Parish from Retford is inadequate (it leaves out a large part of Clarborough Parish extending towards Retford), and there is no green gap to separate Retford from Tiln. Clarborough (St John's Drive) is only one mile from Retford (Bigsby Road) at closest, but the proposed Clarborough and Welham green gap covers less than half the distance (approx. 600 yards). Tiln is only one mile from Retford (Linden Homes development on Tiln Lane) at closest. The land extending north-west from Bolham Manor towards Tiln and north-east from Bolham Manor via Bolham Hall and Moorgate Farm (Grade 2 Listed) towards Bolham Cottage Farm provides an attractive landscape of wooded hills, hedgerows and grassland and forms a barrier between Retford and Tiln. The land immediately north-east of Retford and sloping downhill from Bolham Manor eastwards as far as the Chesterfield Canal (SSSI) anmd the proposed Clarborough and Welham green gap is attractive farmland comprising a western area of open arable fields (with excellent long distance views from the proposed Clarborough and Welham green gap towards Moorgate Farm and Bolham Hall visible on the skyline), and an eastern area of grass fields and hedgerows. Indeed, the Bassetlaw green gaps report 2019 acknowledges the attractive nature of the low-lying land to the west of Chesterfield Canal between Retford and Clarborough but outside the proposed Clarborough and Welham Green gap. We hope that Bassetlaw DC will expand the proposed green gaps into the above land areas immediately outside Retford to protect the separation between Retford and Tiln and Clarborough, and to avoid expansion of Retford into open countryside, otherwise a large part of the open countryside within Clarborough Parish and between that village and Retford, as well as a smaller area within the administrative boundary of Retford will not be included in a green gap.	The identification of this green gap has been supported by an independent report on local landscape quality and the historic enviroment towards the north of Retford. There are significant landscape and heritage assets or existing designations that would limit and further manage development in this location. A review of these has taken place following consultation in January and there remains no reason to expand the Green Gap to the north of Retford. This has been based on previous landscape character work at a local and District level. The revised Local Plan however does now include a seperate policy for Green Gaps which helps to clarify their intent.
REF466	Resident	I fully support the green gaps designated on the plan. Its essential that development is balanced and housing isn't allowed to sprawl all over the countryside. I fully support the local plan, it has been well considered.	Noted. Thank you for your comments
REF467	Resident	I fully support the green gap designated area around our town. Retford, so that housing development doesn't sprawl over the countryside.	Noted. Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST35 Green and Blue Infrastructure			
1189777	Resident	Delighted to see that the Chesterfield Canal and Cuckoo Way are recognised as green corridors.	Support noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF054	Resident	would be nice to have a map.	All Green and Blue Infrastructure corridors can be found on the published Policies Map on the Council's website at : www.bassetlaw.gov.uk
REF115	Canal and River Trust	Welcome the specific reference given to 'Blue Infrastructure' in this section, which would make it clearer to decision makers that this section refers to watercourses and canals as well as other areas of green space. Welcome the text of Policy ST35, which should help to ensure that future development takes account of the unique biodiversity and function of waterway corridors in the district.	Support noted. Supporting text has been amended to define blue infrastructure.
REF136	A and D Architecture	Policy ST35 should be modified to omit reference to buffer zones of specific dimension . Specific dimensions are a crude instrument of policy which might distort the relevance of material considerations like topography and planting and historic character. The paragraph "All new development within a 30m value of the corridor" should be deleted and replaced with: "All new development should respect the settings of major and minor green corridors and will be supported provided it conserves and enhances the function, setting, biodiversity, landscape and recreational value of the corridor;"	Policy ST35 reflects the principles of Paragraph 171 of the NPPF which requires Local Plans to take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure and paragraph 174 which seeks "To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by: a) Identify, map and safeguard ... wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them". The identification of green corridors and buffer zones ensures these networks can continue to be maintained and enhanced over the plan period. However, Policy ST35 will be amended to ensure the minimum width is applied on a site by site basis to reflect the functionality of the corridor in that location.
REF187	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	8.5.10 The Council will ensure development within or adjoining the Habitat Network maintains the integrity and continuity of the network and protects the biodiversity value of the land affected. New development within and adjacent to the Habitat Network should consider opportunities to enhance and expand its functionality and biodiversity particularly for the four main habitat networks: woodland, heathland and acid grassland, other grassland and wetland. Proposals that lead to fragmentation will be resisted. Trees and woodland 8.5.11 Bassetlaw benefits from extensive tree cover, including veteran trees and woodland. Trees provide many benefits, such as producing oxygen, capturing and storing carbon, removing pollutants from the air and slowing storm water run-off. On that basis, Policy ST36 protects quality trees which are not protected by statutory designation and resists development which threatens them. Through the Council Plan3, tree planting is part of the Council's commitment to carbon offsetting. New community woodlands will be secured through Policy ST45.	Support noted. Please see new policy in amended Local Plan that addresses concerns regarding carbon offsetting and tree canopy cover.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within policy ST35, and agree that the protection, creation and enhancement of blue green corridors is vital for sustainable development and creating a natural sense of place that is linked into the surrounding Landscape. Note that this approach assist with the development of good SuDS, design and returning water to the natural water system.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.
REF283	Resident	123 8.4 Add minor green corridor between Fledborough and River Trent to A2 list.	Response was submitted without the indication of said minor green corridor and we were unable to identify which one was indicated.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST35 Green and Blue Infrastructure			
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	<p>This policy states: ‘All new development within a 30m buffer zone of the centre line of a major green corridor and within a 15m buffer zone of the centre line of a minor green corridor should, through good design, seek to conserve and enhance the function, setting, biodiversity, landscape, access and recreational value of the corridor.’ Much of the work been done on corridor width/continuity relates to individual species or entire taxonomic groups (e.g. passerine birds, butterflies, bats etc) with a mix of international and UK-based studies. Do not think it is possible to get a general ‘one-size fits all’ figure. Dawson, (1994) states: “corridors should be preserved, enhanced and provided, where this can be cost-effective, as they do permit certain species to thrive where they otherwise would not; Corridors should be as wide and continuous as possible; their habitat should match the requirements of the target species. • Quadrat Scotland (2002) – the model is explained in appendix 1. For connectedness, to be defined as ‘high’ (on scale high, medium, low), the corridor needs to be at least 50m wide for more than 50% of the corridor • 50m buffers recommended for developments in Local Plan in Wakefield Darlington to protect local wildlife sites and / or river corridors etc (this is of course slightly different to what is being proposed). • It could be argued that 50m width would allow a buffer to function as a ‘multi-purpose network’, as defined in NECR 180, so that it could include attributes that are valuable to people, i.e. biodiversity alongside amenity, footpaths, cycleways, sustainable drainage, microclimate improvement, heritage etc The above research supports the following principles in relation to green corridors: o The wider the better o Whilst a broad band of similar habitat may facilitate the movement of some species, each species has its own habitat requirements. Argue that a minimum 50m buffer is required along all green corridors so that grassland, woodland and wetland (ditches/ ponds) can be included.</p>	<p>Policy ST35 reflects the principles of Paragraph 171 of the NPPF which requires Local Plans to take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure and paragraph 174 which seeks 'To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by: a) Identify, map and safeguard ... wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them". The identification of green corridors and buffer zones ensures these networks can continue to be maintained and enhanced over the plan period. However, Policy ST35 will be amended to ensure the minimum width is applied on a site by site basis to reflect the functionality of the corridor in that location.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Policy ST35 seeks to protect, and where appropriate, improve and extend green and blue infrastructure as identified through the policy and the policies map. As indicated on the policies map, land at the former Bevercotes Colliery overlaps with a minor green corridor and the policy requires development proposals through good design, to conserve and enhance the function, setting, biodiversity, landscape, access and recreational value of the corridor. As has been demonstrated through ongoing engagement and previous representation to the Local Plan process, the proposed mixed-use development at Bevercotes Colliery has the ability to be developed in a manner that is clearly reflective of its locality with the distinctive natural elements of its surroundings woven into the fabric of the scheme. Major areas of open space including a country park can be incorporated into the scheme to conserve and enhance the local Green Infrastructure network and in doing so secure wider regenerative benefits.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw District's 2020 Sustainability Appraisal Report has found that the site contains significant Local Wildlife Sites (Bevercotes Colliery Site and Lawn Cover and Fox Covert, West Drayton). The site is also located entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood forest Important Bird Area. Furthermore, the Sherwood Forest ppSPA and the HRA has identified that this site could support ppSPA birds. As such, a significant negative effect is likely if the site is developed. Development of such site would go against the principles set out in ST35.</p>
REF300	Natural England	<p>Natural England supports this policy which adopts a landscape-scale approach to green and blue infrastructure, using and managing land and natural capital for what it is best suited to. The identification of main and minor green corridors within the policy wording is welcome. This approach will allow for an enhanced and extended GI network across the District. Note that other policies have been referenced which demonstrates the wider range of multifunctional benefits that a strong GI network can have.</p>	<p>Support noted, thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST36 -	Biodiversity And Geodiversity		
REF115	Canal and River Trust	The Chesterfield Canal does benefit from a designation as an SSSI within the District. Welcome consideration given towards the protection of SSSI habitats within policy ST36, which should help ensure that consideration is given towards the protection of such habitats. Opportunities exist for new development to provide for net improvements to biodiversity in line with the aims of paragraph 170 (part d) of the NPPF, and part E of policy ST36 could assist in ensuring these aims are met.	Support noted and welcome.
REF187	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	8.5.10 The Council will ensure development within or adjoining the Habitat Network maintains the integrity and continuity of the network and protects the biodiversity value of the land affected. New development within and adjacent to the Habitat Network should consider opportunities to enhance and expand its functionality and biodiversity particularly for the four main habitat networks: woodland, heathland and acid grassland, other grassland and wetland. Proposals that lead to fragmentation will be resisted. Trees and woodland 8.5.11 Bassetlaw benefits from extensive tree cover, including veteran trees and woodland. Trees provide many benefits, such as producing oxygen, capturing and storing carbon, removing pollutants from the air and slowing storm water run-off. On that basis, Policy ST36 protects quality trees which are not protected by statutory designation and resists development which threatens them. Through the Council Plan3, tree planting is part of the Council's commitment to carbon offsetting. New community woodlands will be secured through Policy ST45.	Noted, thank you for your comments.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles behind policy ST36, however given the importance of the underlying Geology and Hydrogeology for providing water for drinking, it is felt that a statement should be added highlighting the need to protect groundwater resources: Any new development must demonstrate that development: · will not result in adverse impacts on the quality of waterbodies, groundwater and surface water, · will not prevent waterbodies or groundwater from achieving a good status in the future · contributes positively to the environment and ecology Where development has the potential to directly or indirectly pollute groundwater then a groundwater risk assessment will be needed to support a planning application.	Protecting water quality for drinking is an important issue for the Local Plan particularly given the District's underlying geology. But it is considered these issues would be more appropriately addressed by Policy ST48: Water Quality.
REF248	Fred Walter & Sons Ltd	Reviewed the 'Policies Maps' and note that there are proposals to further extend the extensive Local Wildlife Site ('LWS') designation, covered by Policy ST36, onto our land. Have not been directly consulted about this and can find no clear justification in the Draft 2020 Plan or evidence base as to why this is deemed necessary. It is our view that the proposed extensions are somewhat arbitrary given the status of the land they affect. 'Policies Map Comparison' attached which shows an extract from the adopted 2011 map and an extract from the draft 2020 map. Annotated the 2020 map extract to show the areas of our land that are affected by the LWS extension. These areas are ringed in orange and numbered 1-4; most of the land comprises commercial agricultural land that forms a vital part of our business and a smaller part is essentially an extension of garden. None of the areas are considered to have a degree of agricultural value that justifies the LWS designation. Specific comments on each area (1-4) are provided below: 1. Known as 'Silt Ponds', this was a silt settling area, which are proposing to return to arable rotation in approximately two years. The nature of the rotation and commercial use of the land means that ecological value is somewhat diminished. 2. This is a small park and fishing lake in front of my home, which is regularly used by my family. The size of the park and nature of the fishing lake means that do not see why any significant ecological value has been attributed and why is included in the LWS. 3. Known as 'Belmore Grassland', this area comprises an agricultural field of approximately 10.5 ha is currently used for grazing. It is intensively farmed and offers limited biodiversity value. Planning permission for development of a solar farm (Ref: 13/01126/FUL) lapsed in December 2016. The ecological assessment that accompanied the planning application concluded that the land is "...a pasture field of negligible ecological value...The species composition is not considered to be of significant ecological value e.g., not classified as local or UK Biodiversity Action Plan habitat." 4. This approximately 11.8 hectare piece of land is currently in arable rotation and, similarly to Belmore Grassland, is intensively farmed. The nature of the farming operation means that ecological value is limited. The extension of the LWS onto the above areas could adversely affect the future commercial productivity of land that forms a valuable part of our farming operation. Given the current focus on carbon reduction and renewable energy, may revisit the solar farm proposal, the stringent requirements of Policy ST36 could be an unnecessary risk to development. Request that the proposed boundaries on the draft 2020 map are amended to remove the additional pieces of land, reinstating the boundaries established by the 2011 map.	Notts Biological & Geological Records Centre try to keep up to date with changes to land use and the boundary has been changed regularly. This site has undergone considerable restoration of former gravel pits and silt lagoons to improved grassland and arable. These areas were mapped as wetland habitats at the time and have in many cases since been restored, while areas been expanded to include new areas of wetland habitat. The boundary has been changed to reflect the representation made. Area 1. the area of improved grassland has been removed from the boundary. Areas 2. and 3. removed. Area 4. This is a lake and part of 5/3470 Tiln North and Conservation Lake designated for bird interest. It does not include any arable land as shown on OS Mastermap and recent aerial photos.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST36 -	Biodiversity And Geodiversity		
REF252	IDP Planning	<p>Policy ST36 seeks to prevent harm to biodiversity and geodiversity from direct impacts such as land take. Indicates the Council will seek to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of Bassetlaw, for International Sites, National Designations, Local Designations and Locally Important Ecological Features. Criterion E relates to 'Biodiversity Net Gain': "All new development of 50 dwellings or more should make provision for at least 10% new biodiversity gain preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution". Support the general thrust of Policy ST36 in seeking to provide protection to designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites and recognise the important role that biodiversity and geodiversity play in delivering sustainable development. Object to criterion (E) of the emerging policy. Do not agree it is appropriate to set a 10% requirement for net biodiversity gain. It is recognised the Draft Environment Bill (2019) proposes the mandatory requirement for net biodiversity gains in development, whilst the NPPF (2019) also references biodiversity net gain, with para 174 noting plans should protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by pursuing opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. It is unclear how the proposed 10% net biodiversity gain has been reached. The NPPF does not necessitate a percentage requirement for net biodiversity gain and the proposal to do so appears to be at odds with the NPPF in setting an arbitrary figure with little justification of how this figure has been reached and no flexibility in recognition of where this may be unachievable on certain sites. The 10% net gain requirement goes significantly beyond the requirement in both the Draft Environment Bill and the NPPF and sets an onerous requirement for development. The Draft Plan sets out that this requirement has been considered as part of the Bassetlaw Whole Plan Viability Assessment, a review of the Assessment it is unclear where the requirement for 10% net biodiversity gains has been factored into development costs. The NPPF requires that local plans are aspirational but 'deliverable' (para 16) and that to be 'sound' they are effective and justified, providing an appropriate strategy which is based on proportionate evidence (para 35). Unclear whether Policy ST36 is justified or viable - of the view that it proposes an onerous and arbitrary approach which offers little flexibility for consideration of site characteristics or viability, whereas the provision of an element of net gain would still be in accordance with the NPPF. Not of the view that Policy ST36 is deliverable, particularly given viability considerations for many new development. Reference to 10% net biodiversity requirement should be removed from Policy ST36 which should be amended to reflect the wording of the NPPF to provide flexibility to ensure that development is deliverable. Suggest the following wording: "All new development of 50 dwellings or more should seek to promote opportunities for securing net biodiversity gains preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution".</p>	<p>Policy ST36 is in line with the latest update to the forthcoming Environment Bill which requires development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity. It is expected that the bill will become legislation before the Local Plan is adopted. So that the Local Plan is not out of date Policy ST36 will continue to include the requirement. The policy requirements have been taken into account in the viability assessment but as measures can be incorporated through good design and other Local Plan requirements it is not considered that this will add such a significant cost to development to adversely affect viability.</p>
1196824	Resident	Please think about adding as many wildflower areas as possible, and also keep in mind that drainage will be needed to help alleviate flood water	Comments noted.
REF273	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is generally supportive of the principle of development proposals providing biodiversity net gain. The policy as drafted says this would apply to residential developments of 50 dwellings or more only. However the Environment Bill refers to all development requiring planning permission and is not limited to residential developments. Policy ST36 should be amended for consistency with the provisions of Environment Bill.	Policy ST36 will be amended to reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill, and will refer to all development.
1197036	Woodland Trust	Support the strong protection given to ancient woodland in this policy although would prefer to see the wording used as in Para175c of the NPPF; rather than saying "usually be protected", say "protected other than in wholly exceptional circumstances." Like to see ancient or veteran trees given the same level of protection, which again would be in line with the NPPF.	To be found sound, it is important that the Local Plan aligns with national policy. As such the Local Plan will ensure the provisions of Para 175c and other requirements for trees are appropriately reflected.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST36 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. There may need to be a slight adjustment in relation to ancient woodland which may not be considered a national/statutory designation, but is nevertheless classed as irreplaceable and should be highlighted as of major importance.	To be found sound, it is important that the Local Plan aligns with national policy. As such the Local Plan will ensure the provisions of Para 175c and other requirements for trees are appropriately reflected.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST36 -	Biodiversity And Geodiversity		
REF285	Home Builders Federation	Policy ST36 Bullet Point (E), all new development of 50 dwellings or more should make provision for at least 10% net biodiversity gain preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution. The Government's Environment Bill requires a mandatory 10% biodiversity gain from development. The Council should not deviate from Government proposals. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST36 should be modified to align with Government proposals. The Council's viability evidence set out in the Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy dated August 2018 does not include any costs for Policy ST36. The DEFRA Impact Statement estimated an average cost of £19,000 per hectare to achieve 10% biodiversity gain. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the Council should undertake further viability work.	Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, and will refer to all development. Policy ST36 has been viability tested - this is set out in the 2019 Whole Plan Viability Assessment (which is the most up to date assessment of viability and not the 2018 document) - which shows that 10% net gain can be achieved on sites of 50 or more units as part of a deliverable scheme. However, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be updated prior to Publication to ensure all development requirements are deliverable.
1197091	William Davis	Policy ST36 Bullet Point (E), all new development of 50 dwellings or more should make provision for at least 10% net biodiversity gain preferably on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution. The Government's Environment Bill requires a mandatory 10% biodiversity gain from development. The Council should not deviate from Government proposals. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST36 should be modified to align with Government proposals. The Council's viability evidence set out in the Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment August 2018 does not include any costs for Policy ST36. DEFRA Impact Statement estimated an average cost of £19,000 per hectare to achieve 10% biodiversity gain. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the Council should undertake further viability work.	Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, and will refer to all development. Policy ST36 has been viability tested - this is set out in the 2019 Whole Plan Viability Assessment (which is the most up to date assessment of viability and not the 2018 document) - which shows that 10% net gain can be achieved on sites of 50 or more units as part of a deliverable scheme. However, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be updated prior to Publication to ensure all development requirements are deliverable.
REF293	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Section 8.5.14 states: 'Biodiversity net gain aims to leave the District's biodiversity assets in a better state than currently exists. All development in Bassetlaw will be encouraged to deliver measurable improvements for biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats through development.' and, Section 8.5.15 states: "Reflecting the emerging principles of the draft Environment Bill 2019, developments of 50 or more dwellings will be expected to secure a 10% net gain in biodiversity." Welcome that BDC are leading by example by setting a target of 10% net gain in biodiversity for developments of 50 or more dwellings. This indicates real intent and shows BDC in a positive light. Wish to see BDC establish an even more ambitious target of 20% in order to deliver greater habitat creation and climate change resilience in the face of a climate and biodiversity crisis.	Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, and will refer to all development. Using 'at least' means that should a development wish to provide for more than the 10% requirement it will be supported by policy. The 2019 Whole Plan Viability Assessment shows that 10% net gain is the maximum level that can be achieved as part of a viable development in the District, when other policy requirements are taken into account.
REF299	Gladmans	5.5.1 Whilst acknowledging the good intentions of Policy ST36, submit criterion E requires further modification prior to pre-submission. Concerned that Policy ST36(E) as drafted deviates from the Government's Environment Bill which requires a mandatory 10% biodiversity gain from development. Policy ST36 should therefore be modified to align with Government proposals.	Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, which requires all development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST36 -	Biodiversity And Geodiversity		
REF300	Natural England	Support this policy which comprehensively covers the protection of designated sites, species and ecological and biodiversity interest across the District. 8.5.4. The Sherwood ppSPA has not yet reached the stage of a “candidate site” which is why it is termed a possible potential SPA. 8.5.9. Welcome the paragraphs on the Bassetlaw Habitat Network and the reference to the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Opportunity Maps. Suggest this section should refer to the Nature Recovery Network which is a major commitment in the government’s 25 Year Environment Plan and is intended to expand and connect habitats to address wildlife decline and provide wider environmental benefits both for nature and people. 8.5.11. The commitment to tree planning in this paragraph is welcome though it should be ensured that the right tree species are planted in the most appropriate locations for maximum benefit to biodiversity. 8.5.14. The paragraphs covering Biodiversity Net Gain are welcome. Acknowledge that the 10% net gain development of 50 or more houses reflects the emerging principles within the Environment Bill, however net gain is likely to be relevant to all development that requires planning permission. 8.5.16. Note the use of the new Defra metric 2.0 has been included which is advocated by Natural England. Welcome the intention to provide a Greening Bassetlaw SPD and would welcome the opportunity to work in partnership with this document. 8.5.7. Would also be happy to work proactively with the Council, stakeholders and developers to ensure Biodiversity Net Gain is achieved. 8.5.18. The inclusion of this paragraph on Ecosystem Service is welcome but suggest that natural flood management should be specifically mentioned. Have the following detailed points on Policy ST36: B – The Sherwood ppSPA has not yet reached the stage of a “candidate site” which is why it is termed a possible potential SPA. D(a) – The mitigation hierarchy should be applied to all sites not just local designations. E – Biodiversity Net Gain we understand will apply to all development. D(b) – With mandatory net gain being introduced this sentence should ensure net gain is achieved (i.e. no net loss is no longer acceptable).	Comments made in relation to the supporting text and Policy ST36 are noted. Changes will be made accordingly and will reflect the principles of the update draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain relating to biodiversity net gain, which requires all development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity. The Council would welcome the opportunity to work with Natural England on the Greening Bassetlaw SPD and the approach to biodiversity net gain.
1197222	Resident	The construction of the Peaks Hill site will mean the destruction of some woodland which will contradict the councils policy on biodiversity ,air quality and climate change	Policy 15 seeks to retain woodland and trees on site. But inevitably there will need to be the selected loss of some trees to ensure the site can be appropriately planned. The loss of any trees, woodland or hedgerows will need to be replaced on site as part of the development. There will also be a requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain to be secured on site. Together this should reinforce the approach to biodiversity, air quality and climate change advocated elsewhere in the Local Plan.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Paragraph 8.5.2 states that the NPPF seeks net gains in biodiversity where possible. It is considered that this not in line with the NPPF (para 170 including point d). This needs strengthening by removing the phrase ‘where possible’. Paragraph 8.5.15 and Policy ST36 point E states a threshold of 50 dwellings before applications will be expected to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity. This is a very high threshold, as sites of 49 dwellings could easily result in very significant losses in biodiversity. This threshold should be lowered substantially. The reference to dwellings does not allow for potentially significant impacts on biodiversity from other types of development which could equally be damaging to biodiversity. The scope of how net gain principles will be applied to other types of development should be explained.	Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain, and will refer to a 10% requirement from all development. Paragraph 8.5.2 will be amended to reflect comments made.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Section D should be strengthened by removing the reference to ‘no net loss’. The NPPF is clear in its requirement for a net gain in biodiversity and at present the policy contradicts this.	Policy ST36 will reflect the principles of the updated draft Environment Bill or any subsequent relevant legislation relating to biodiversity net gain. As such reference to ‘no net loss’ will be deleted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST37 and ST38	Conservation and Heritage Assets		
1197023	Resident	Bassetlaw Council are completely untrustworthy in term of environment and heritage protection. I am disgusted that Jo White purports to support the green agenda. She along with other councillors have allowed mass destruction of trees and protected species in Mr Straws Conservation Area. It is derisory to claim any green credentials. Habitat regulations are already in place they are ignored. The proposed commitment to woodland cannot be achieved without a radical rethink of housing at Peaks Hill and by adhetement to National Laws.	Heritage relates to the built environment and to the historic significance of man-made landscapes. Any applications relating to the loss of trees and impacts on wildlife are carefully considered to ensure loss/impacts is consistent with national legislation and planning policy.
1197036	Woodland Trust	If ancient/veteran trees and the need to give them strong protection are not included in Policy ST36, as we suggested, then they could be included here under heritage assets. They need to be in one or other of the policies, as they are irreplaceable natural habitats.	Heritage relates to the built environment and to the historic significance of man-made landscapes. Trees and woodland will be covered by a new policy in the next version of the Local Plan.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST37 Conservation and Enhancement of the Historic Environment.	Support noted and welcome.
REF282	National Trust	Part A.2. states that a proposal should 'use materials, building technique(s) and detailing that reflect the local vernacular'. Suggest that this needs to be adjusted to recognise that some modern details and finishes, such as glazing panels, may work well if used carefully within a historic context. Suggest that Part 6 should refer to 'significant views' rather than all views. Part D more or less reiterates the wording of the NPPF and may therefore need to be excluded from the Local Plan policy. Suggest that Part C.3. should be extended slightly to say that a non-designated asset can only be lost if it 'has no viable use now or in the foreseeable future'.	a) Designated, Part A.2. - Wording amended to reflect the approach suggested. b) Designated, Part A.6. Policy wording amended accordingly. c) Acknowledge this is repetition of national policy and will be deleted. d) Part C.3. Policy wording amended to reflect comments made.
1197221	Resident	Wigthorpe and South Carlton are designated conservation areas meaning that they have historical significance. The proposed development H51 erodes their sense of rural historic landscapes.	Peaks Hill Farm is a considerable distance from the Carlton in Lindrick Conservation Area, of which both South Carlton and Wigthorpe are within. With regard to development east of the woodland at Peaks Hill, this would be well screened from the A60 behind the existing trees. Therefore, it will have no impact on the setting of Broom Farm and Peaks Hill Farm. A memorial relating to the Wellington Bomber crash in the area in May 1944 will be required. With regard to the area of land between the A60 and the woodland, this site does form part of the countryside setting to Peaks Hill Farm, a non-designated heritage asset. In addition, it forms part of the wider setting to Broom Farm (grade II listed). This open countryside setting is an important part of this setting, and large scale development across this part of the site would likely cause harm to that setting. Development be limited to the land east of the trees. Any road through this part of the site should be constructed as close to the edge of the woodland as possible and with as small a gap in the woodland as possible, to help minimise the visual impact.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Whilst this covers relatively large assets, the smaller rural environments have many areas / buildings of equal if not more historic significance. These must be afforded the protection of Policy ST37	Policy ST37 does relate to the heritage assets of all scales and types, not just the larger ones.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST37 and ST38	Conservation and Heritage Assets		
REF346	Doncaster Council	Doncaster Council fully supports Policies ST37 & ST 38. Policy ST37 is in keeping with the significance led approach of the NPPF and particularly the requirement in part 2 that proposals affecting heritage assets or their setting be informed by a proportionate heritage statement. Policy ST 38 distinguishes between the treatment of designated and undesignated heritage assets as required in the NPPF.	Acknowledged and agreed
REF347	NJL Consulting	Caddick are concerned that ST37 and ST 38, as currently drafted, set an overly onerous requirement on applicants where heritage and historical matters are relevant. The statutory approach to heritage, conservation and historic environments is set in the 'Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990'. The National Planning Policy Framework provides further policy requirements for heritage matters. However, ST 38 goes significantly beyond the established statutory and national policy principles yet there is no evidence to support the proposed policy. For example, Part A(6), in the context of designated heritage assets, requires proposals ensure '... views away from, through, and towards, the heritage asset are preserved or enhanced...'. This is an entirely different approach to that taken in recent decisions regarding the setting of listed buildings and conservation assets. ST 38 then applies different criteria to non-designated heritage assets. It is considered that a number of these criteria go unnecessarily beyond stature and national policy requirements. At this stage there is no evidence to support the council's position and the policy should be revised. As such the policies are unsound.	With regard to the preservation of views and setting, there is clear legislation, policy, guidance and caselaw on this. Setting (to which views are a key contributor) is often an important part of the significance of a heritage asset - legislation, NPPF, the PPG and Historic England guidance (especially Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets, Dec 2017) clearly set out how this should be assessed and interpreted. The new Policy ST38, which includes reference to views towards, through and from assets, is very much compliant with national policy and guidance. The distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets as set out in ST38 is fully compliant with the policies in the NPPF. The ST38 requirements set out for applications affecting non-designated heritage assets merely express a sensible interpretation of the 'balanced view' approach (NPPF Paragraph 197), which will give greater certainty for both developers and the Council. ST38 does not in any way give non-designated heritage assets greater weight than the NPPF does.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST39 - Promoting Healthy,	Active Lifestyles		
REF030	North Leverton Parish Council	Has BDC considered the risk to the wellbeing of the populous of the district with regard to access to adequate local health facilities? Both Retford & Worksop hospitals are suffering from chronic staff shortages and are unable to offer full time cover in several key departments. The above situations should be recognised and addressed in any final version of the BDC plan	Provision of health facilities does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Council. NHS Bassetlaw CCG are responsible for health care provision in the District. The CCG have been involved in the preparation of the Local Plan and have confirmed that subject to new development making provision for new or improved health facilities the Plan is appropriate. Such infrastructure will be secured through Policy ST52. Through Duty to Cooperate BDC will continue to engage the CCG to ensure the provision is fit for purpose. Further details will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
REF047	Sport England	Support policy ST39. Should point 3 have a reference to the playing pitch strategy? Link to section 9.4, Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process. In addition Strategic Objectives 8 and 9 would be supported and implemented by the use of Active Design.	Policy amended to include a reference to Active Design and the existing Play Pitch Strategy.
REF115	Canal and River Trust	Our towpaths provide public access to the Green Infrastructure network, which can promote active lifestyles and benefits to wellbeing. The Trust believe that access to our waterways can provide multiple economic, social and environmental benefits to local communities, which has been supported by the findings by our towpath surveys (Kanter TNS, 2017). Welcome the aspirations of the Local Plan, set out in paragraph 9.1.4 to ensure that facilities and infrastructure exist to give everyone the opportunity to live in a healthy place. This would include access to the blue infrastructure network of the Chesterfield Canal. Welcome the consideration in parts B (1) and B (5) of the policy, to increase opportunities for access to leisure facilities and for walking and cycling. Our network can play an important part in ensuring that future (and existing) residents can benefit from access to such facilities, which could assist in promoting healthy lifestyles. Wish to highlight that significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure and it is essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers, where necessary, in order to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust's assets. Examples could include the need for towpath improvements to accommodate the needs of new development to prevent excessive erosion of the path, that could otherwise render it impassable to users. Would welcome additional reference within the supporting text to the potential need for contributions to support improvements to existing leisure resources to accommodate any future demands.	Policy amended to include towpaths and waterways.
1194992	Resident	Need to be more facilities in rural areas eg Tuxord and East Markham	Comments noted. This can be achieved through Neighbourhood Plans.
REF136	A and D Architecture	10) Policy ST39 BS should be modified to safeguard the health and safety of pedestrians against inappropriate cycle speeds on multi-use footway/cycleways as follows: "B 5 "increasing opportunities for walking, cycling and encouraging more sustainable transport choices whilst safeguarding pedestrian users of multi-use footway/cycleways by the incorporation of barriers and other means to calm cyclist speeds."	This point is more appropriately covered by the Transport section.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST39 - Promoting Healthy,	Active Lifestyles		
1195884	Resident	Whilst better health care is an essential part for any community, the systematic reduction of services at Bassetlaw Hospital by the management at D.R.I, and overstretched surgeries we have at the present is a major problem. Need Bassetlaw to be better equipped and staffed and stop being run down	Provision of health facilities does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Council. NHS Bassetlaw CCG are responsible for health care provision in the District. The CCG have been involved in the preparation of the Local Plan and have confirmed that subject to new development making provision for new or improved health facilities the Plan is appropriate. Such infrastructure will be secured through Policy ST52. Through Duty to Cooperate BDC will continue to engage the CCG to ensure the provision is fit for purpose. Further details will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
REF187	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Quotes the entirety of Policy ST39. This sets out why Sandhills could be retained and improved as open Green Space area. Along with the following extracts from our guidelines, the other other options offered to avoid building houses on Sandhills can be seen to supported within these Policies.	Sandhills is no longer being considered as a housing allocation in this Local Plan. It will be protected as a publicly accessible open space.
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	The plan refers to “working in partnership with the health authorities to maintain and where practicable improve access to the full range of health services for residents” – it is likely that this extent of development would impact on primary, community and secondary care services. For secondary care this will have an impact particularly on the Bassetlaw Hospital where we are already seeing increases in urgent and emergency care attendance levels. There is already an increasing pressure on estates for delivery of primary care services. Encourage the view that we need to collaborate more as local public sector organisations to make best use of our collective estate and promote improved access to appropriate services. Would be helpful to understand if there are any proposals/developments that include increase in residential care home/specialist housing as this will clearly need to be profiled against increasing health needs. This is pertinent given the existing projections for increases in population over 65 and aged over 80 year (43.1% increase in over 65's and 83% of over 80's) over the plan period- and any additionality resulting from the developments in this regard. The Plan identifies: The SHMA Update15 identifies the need for specialist housing for older people, which projected forward is 64 dwellings per annum or 1273 units for the plan period. There is also a requirement for the delivery of 335 wheelchair accessible dwellings or 18 dwellings per annum by 2037. The SHMA Update15 need (projected forward) identifies 663 care home units over the plan period Residential, Nursing and Close Care Homes. In order to fully understand the implications of the Plan would therefore ask for further detail in relation to specific expectations and locations of such specialist housing as well as the likely demographic characteristics of new housing stock. Welcome support from BDC in the development of a standard formula or approach to support our shared understanding of the correlation between demographic characteristics and demand on health services. Primary Medical Services and Community health provision is vital to ensure services are provided close to home, primary care is increasingly working across primary care network footprints to deliver more services in the community, population increases inevitably increase the number of people registered at a GP practice that requires additional GPs and space from which to deliver services. There is already considerable pressure on this space. Keen to ensure any new housing scheme took full consideration of the impact on demand for services. Given the development plans in some of the more rural locations it is vital that infrastructure is in place to support delivery of health services and would welcome plans for connectivity and Wi-Fi/connectivity to enable remote health care management in some circumstances. It is important in respect to ill health prevention and wellness promotion that support residents who are lonely or socially isolated (whatever age) to remain as connected as possible to supportive networks which may often be through digital channels of communication. Where there are wider	Policy ST28 details the plan's requirements for specialist housing and thus the requirement of care homes as well. The policy details a requirement on schemes of 50 or more dwellings to provide at least 20% accessible and adaptable dwellings. The policy goes on to detail that proposals which would result in the loss of specialist accommodation will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for such accommodation in the District, or alternative provision is being made available locally through replacement or new facilities. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 updates the need for older people. The Local Plan includes numerous strategic housing sites. The majority of these will contribute towards the supply of further specialist housing in the District. The scale of these strategic development sites will also enable further funding to health care provision in the District as well. Discussions will continue with the CCG to ensure that there is a clear understanding of the location of specialist housing, as well as agreeing an approach to securing developer contributions from new development for primary and Hospital facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST39 - Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles			
		developments in more rural locations consideration needs to be given to the provision of pharmaceutical services and would welcome consultation with local pharmacy providers as part of individual consultation on developments in the area. Health services and facilities do appear in the plan as both 'infrastructure' and 'community facilities' depending on the section. Would the Plan benefit from providing some clarity on the definitions of this? Examples of this are sections 2.3 and 5.4.23.	
1197036	Woodland Trust	Access to woodland has been shown to promote active lifestyles and improve both mental and physical health. Would like to see woodland included as one of the types of open space that the plan seeks to promote for their health benefits.	Please see policy amended to include woodlands.
REF283	Resident	ST39 133 9.1.4 Needs clear link to active travel modes and infrastructure provision to facilitate everyday trips (as ST49 page 154 11.1.2 bullet point 3) to deliver Strategic Objectives 9 & 13 and to accord with illustrations on page 132. Not just a step-change, but also a pedal-change!	Policy ST50 makes clear reference to the provision of active travel modes. Please see the policy amended to refer to this section.
REF285	Home Builders Federation	Policy ST39 requires all schemes of 50 or more dwellings to submit a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as part of the planning application. The general expectations of the 2019 NPPF is that planning will promote healthy communities. The NPPG (ID53-004-20140306) confirms that a HIA can serve a useful purpose at planning application stage and consultation with the Director of Public Health as part of the process can establish whether a HIA would be a useful tool for understanding the potential impacts upon wellbeing that development proposals will have on existing health services and facilities. The requirement for a HIA for all schemes of 50 or more dwellings without any specific evidence that an individual scheme is likely to have a significant impact upon the health and wellbeing of the local population is not justified by reference to the NPPG. Any requirement for a HIA Screening Report and / or a full HIA should be based on a proportionate level of detail in relation the scale and type of development proposed. It is suggested that HIA Screening Report should only be required for applications for large strategic residential developments. If a significant adverse impact on health and wellbeing is identified only then should a full HIA be required, which sets out measures to substantially mitigate the impact. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, Policy ST39 should be modified.	The Council support Nottinghamshire County Councils' Spatial Planning and Health Framework 2019-2022 which includes a Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix. The purpose of this Matrix is to 'quickly ensure that the health impacts of a development proposal are identified, and appropriate action is taken to address negative impacts and maximise benefits'. Policy ST39 has been amended to clarify developments of 50 or more to submit the required Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix.
1197091	William Davis	This policy requires schemes of more than 50 dwellings to submit a Health Impact Assessment (HIA). HIAs can be complicated and costly to prepare and are not likely to be proportionate for most types of development. It is understood that Bassetlaw have signed up to Nottinghamshire County Councils' Spatial Planning and Health Framework which includes a Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix. This is considered to be a more proportionate way to assess the health impacts of development and Policy ST39 should be amended to refer specifically to the Matrix.	Please see policy amended to require the Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix for ST39 as suggested.
REF300	Natural England	Natural England welcomes the reference in this policy to access to open space and opportunities for walking and cycling.	Support welcome and noted.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Policy ST39 notes the council will, where practicable, improve access to a full range of health services for residents; improve the quantity of sports facilities; and encourage the co-location of facilities so that sports facilities can be located in close proximity to other facilities for education. BDC places an emphasis on creating healthy lifestyles. The aspirations of Worksop College in delivering a new athletics track, accessible to the local community, will help BDC meet this aim. As such, Worksop College are supportive of this policy and its emphasis on supporting applications which help deliver healthy lifestyles.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST40-Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities			
1189264	Resident	Have many of these been closing down over the last few years?	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan Baseline will have a detailed breakdown of the available community facilities in the District and the future provision that will be needed in the District.
1190067	Resident	This policy will not protect allotment sites being reclaimed by the council and use for new build dwellings on site HS7 page 91 .	Site HS7 has been taken out of the Local Plan. The provision of allotments identified in Retford can be found in the Open Space Needs Assessment 2020. Furthermore, Policy ST41 references all open space requirements/future provision in the District as well.
REF003	Rhubarb Farm	Rhubarb Farm CIC is a horticultural social enterprise (non-profit) located on a 2 acre site in Nether Langwith, owned by the Langwith Society. Sometime prior to 2009, a speculative planning application was submitted for a housing development on this land, by an applicant who did not own the land. This application was rejected by Bassetlaw Planning Department. While Rhubarb Farm welcomes the Policy that in small rural settlements new housing of up to 10% of the housing stock of that settlement will be considered, Rhubarb Farm wishes to raise concern in case a future application would be submitted on the site which the Farm occupies. Rhubarb Farm falls within the Local Plan's Policy ST40: Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities, for the following reasons, and therefore the Farm would wish the Planning Authority to take these into consideration:- 1. Rhubarb Farm is unique in Bassetlaw district for its work supporting people with a wide range of multiple and complex needs. We take a lot of people from Bassetlaw, in particular long term unemployed, people with mental ill health, recovering substance misusers and ex-offenders, and we support them to turn their lives around. We have a good reputation for our work. 2. Rhubarb Farm is recognised by Bassetlaw District Council for its impact and effectiveness, and has been receiving grant-funding from the Council for some years, including a current Food Project. In addition, Nottinghamshire County Council also grant-aids Rhubarb Farm, as do national funders like the Big Lottery. 3. Rhubarb Farm provides local employment and currently employs 21 people. This is contributing economically to the local economy. 4. In the near future, Rhubarb Farm plans to submit an application for the construction of a strawbale building as office, training rooms, rental space, café, kitchen and composting toilets. This will enhance our offer of support and employment, could contribution to the visitor economy, and be of significant interest in Bassetlaw District because a strawbale building is a unique heritage construction and has very strong environmental credentials.	It is important that planning applications are considered on balance, taking into account the merits of the proposal including any loss of existing facilities. As such the provisions of ST40 would apply.
REF047	Sport England	Policy ST40 should the ref to community facilities advise that sports facilities are specifically covered in St42	The Local Plan states that the user should ensure all relevant policies are taken into consideration when considering a proposal. It is clear from the contents that there is a specific policy for sports facilities.
1193104	Resident	Cannot emphasise enough the contribution that the Sandhills is already making to these policies Designating it as a Local Open Space would protect the legacy of these policies for future generations	Thank you for your comments. Sandhills is no longer a housing allocation in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. It will be protected as open space.
REF218	Central Lincolnshire	Note the repeated sections B and C in policy ST40.	Please see policy amended based on comments.
1196860	Sheffield City Council	In particular ST40 is supported.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Good to see being promoted the use of Village Halls, etc., as shops, PO's, etc. However, that must not always be if the Village Hall stops being used, it is equally positive if they are used as both together.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Policy ST40 supports proposals which deliver new community facilities, including where they are located adjacent to an existing settlement, meet a need for the use, and are accessible for all members of the community. This policy also supports Worksop College's aspirations in delivering an athletics track, which would meet the requirements for new community facilities. As such, Worksop College are supportive of this policy.	Support noted, thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST40-Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities			
REF387	Resident	Upgrade for Retford fire and ambulance facilities within Retford 24/7 as it use to be. Retford Hospital to be upgraded for re-use as Hospital and small accident department as it use to be when Retford was half the size.	Provision of fire and ambulance facilities does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Council. The Local Plan would provide the framework should either service wish to upgrade. The Council will continue to work with Bassetlaw CCG in the preparation of the Local Plan. An approach to securing developer contributions to improve primary and hospital care as a result of new development has been agreed. Further details will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
REF428	Resident	Could someone explain what as a Council you seem to have no common policy with the provision of children's play areas. Why have you as an authority failed to deliver a plan in time. Do you intend to make sure the next plan will be delivered before the old one expires. Policy ST40 Community Facilities There are no community facilities to the South East of Retford Town Centre, why?	The children's play area provision is covered under Policy ST41 whereby 0.14 ha of children play space per 1000 children will be the requirement District-wide. These figures have come forward from our Open Space Needs Assessment. The Council is producing a Local Plan in accordance with national legislation and national policy, and will have a Local Plan in place by December 2023, as required by the Government. New housing sites in Retford will make provision for new community facilities in Retford.
REF471	NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS)	Policy ST40 B. The supporting text makes reference to the NPPF and the importance of protecting and maintaining community facilities. NHSPS supports the principle of maintaining and improving community facilities within the borough. Whilst NPPF Paragraph 92c states that planning policies and decisions should 'guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services', the overarching objective of this same paragraph is to ensure the delivery of facilities and services of the community. Paragraph 93b also states 'planning policies and decision should...take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community' Where health centres and other medical facilities are included in this definition of community facilities, believe the wording of any future policies should allow for the loss within the context of estate regeneration. NHSPS works with local commissioners to establish the needs within the local area and how this can be maximised and efficiently used within the estate. This can include the redevelopment of surplus properties for other uses (often residential) to release capital to be recycled back into the system. Policies that prevent the loss or change of use of 'community facilities' and include healthcare facilities within this definition can prevent or delay required investment in alternative facilities and work against the aim of providing essential healthcare services for the community. It is important to note that there are separate, rigorous testing and approval processes employed by the NHS to ensure the right facilities are in the right place at the right time. The policy is overly restrictive and would not provide a sufficiently flexible and positive policy basis for the delivery of NHS facilities. The policy and supporting text do not recognise estate rationalisation programs carried out by public service providers. NHS estate reviews are aimed at improving the provision of healthcare services by increasing efficiencies, including through the disposal or development of unneeded and underutilised properties. NHSPS recognises the need to guard against the loss of important community facilities. It is considered that the policy risks having a negative effective on the NHS and Council to deliver services locally. Community infrastructure policies where NHS facilities are included in the definition, often prevent or delay required investment in new/improved services and facilities, especially those which require substantial periods of marketing. In some cases, other funding streams that are needed to pay for new facilities (in addition to the receipt from the land) can be lost over time or simply because development opportunities fall through as a result of delay. Where NHS commissioners can demonstrate that healthcare facilities are no longer required for the provision of services, there should be an acceptance that such sites are suitable for housing, or other viable uses. Concerns with this proposed policy can be very easily be addressed to ensure policy ST40 does not inadvertently impose further evidential requirements or marketing periods on the NHS beyond its own internal processes.	Thank you for your comments. It is considered that policy ST40 is flexible enough for the rationalisation of NHS assets.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST40-Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities			
REF471	NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS)	Proposed Amendments in blue: Proposals to change the use or redevelop existing community facilities will only be supported if: 1. It can be demonstrated that there is no longer an existing community need for the facility and the building or the site is not needed for an alternative community use as confirmed by service providers and; or 2. It can be demonstrated that the current use is not viable and marketing evidence is provided which demonstrates the premises has been marketed for its lawful use for sustained minimum period of 12 months; and or 3. the loss is part of a wider public service transformation plan which requires investment in modern, fit for purpose infrastructure and facilities to meet future population needs or to sustain and improve services. 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; and or it involves the provision of an equivalent or better replacement community facility either on site or within that settlement or locality which meets the needs of the local community. In the case of proposals where the loss of the use would form part of a wider public estate rationalisation program, evidence of such a program would be sufficient as a form of evidence that the site is surplus to requirements and as such would not be required to submit marketing information. NHSPS's proposed amendments to Bassetlaw's Plan would ensure that ST40 is justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Further to this, the inclusion of conjunctive words (or) will ensure that Part 3. will operate independently from the rest of the policy, meaning that policy as a whole, will be targeted and effective.	Thank you for your comments. It is considered that policy ST40 is flexible enough for the rationalisation of NHS assets.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	Officer Response
ST41-Delivering Quality, Accessible Open Space			
1190067	Resident	This proposal will reduce access for allotment holders. Policy 21 is at odds with ST41; Site HS7 is a quality space used well and productively within walking distance of residents.	Due to further research and consultation responses, the Leaffield Allotment site has been removed from the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and is not included anymore.
1193104	Resident	Designating Sandhills as a Local Green space will contribute to this	Thank you for your response. Sandhills has been removed as an allocation site from the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.
REF187	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	The representation chose to support and is in favour of delivering quality open space.	Thank you for filling out the yes and no questions on the feedback form.
1197036	Woodland Trust	We support the use of access standards to determine need for additional greenspace of various kinds. We would like you to consider using the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard: this aspires that everyone should have a small wood of two hectares within 500m of their home and a larger wood of at least 20ha within 4km.	Our standards have been set up based on quantitative data collected by Officers. You can view all surveyed sites in the Bassetlaw Open Space Assessment 2020. Unfortunately, available community woodland sites have not been assessed separately in this report. They have been included in the Semi/Natural classification. As many strategic sites are requiring a provision of community woodland, this could be something that is changed in the update report to 2020 assessment. Please see policy amended as requested. ST35 also makes reference to green infrastructure provision and expected standards.
REF300	Natural England	Access to open green space is supported by Natural England. We refer to our own Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards which may be of interest. http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/65021	Support noted and welcome, thank you for your comments. Please refer to the Bassetlaw Open Space Assessment 2020 for our assessment methodology which is in line with Natural England guidelines.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	Officer Response
ST41-Delivering	Quality,	Accessible Open Space	
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Tennis in Bassetlaw I was surprised to see a specific reference in this high-level strategic plan to North Wheatley's tennis club and its need to expand. I wish the club well – as an ex member, but, it seems odd to mention them, as, with the exception of the Welbeck Club, there is an absence of the same in Worksop, Harworth and the surrounding areas.	Thank you for your comments please see ammended changes. As part of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan evidence base, currently a Built Facilities Study is taking place to assess exact provision of sport facilities and usage within the District. The findings of the study will inform any future policy decisions and requirements for expansion of facilities/provision.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST42- Promoting	Sport and Physical	Activity	
REF004	Rhubarb Farm	Rhubarb Farm also requires protection within ST42: Promoting Sport and Physical Activity	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF047	Sports England	Sport England supports section 9.4 in particular policy ST42 however should the hierarchy reflect the priorities in the action plan of the PPS?	Noted, thank you for your comments.
REF047	Sport England	Para 9.4.9. Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process.	Use of Active Design in the development process is essential to promote healthy place-making. Active Design is therefore referenced in Policy ST39. It would also be appropriate to make reference in Policy ST32: Design Quality.
REF282	National Trust	The adopted Core Strategy Policy DM9 Part D includes similar provisions in relation to sports pitch protection, but provides the flexibility that exceptions may be made if a contribution towards new or improved facilities elsewhere would be preferable. We request that this flexibility is incorporated into new Local Plan Policy ST42.	The Core Strategy Policy DM9 Part D includes similar provisions in relation to sports pitch protection, but provides the flexibility that exceptions may be made if a contribution towards new or improved facilities elsewhere would be preferable. We request that this flexibility is incorporated into new Local Plan Policy ST42.
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	The Policy acknowledges that new outdoor sports facilities to help achieve the target set out in the Bassetlaw Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) 2019 will be provided according to a hierarchy, including school, college and sports clubs' sites. In assessing the need for a new athletics track, the PPS states 'there is a case for the improvement of quality of provision in order to increase the capacity available for Workshop Harriers'. The PPS notes that Workshop Harriers have aspirations to create a floodlit synthetic track and accompanying ancillary facilities within BDC. The PPS makes some recommendations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploring the case for the potential development of a synthetic track facility within the District. • Support Workshop Harriers with any plans to increase membership and community engagement. Worksop Harriers are dedicated to providing a new synthetic 8 lane running track and athletics facility. As well as being in use by Workshop Harriers, the facility would be available to the local community and Workshop College. The provision of a new athletics facility at Workshop College will therefore meet the aims of the PPS, and thus Policy ST2. The principle of the policy is therefore supported, but as above, a more flexible policy approach is required elsewhere within the BLP to secure this aspiration.	Worksop Harriers have aspirations to create a floodlit synthetic track and accompanying ancillary facilities within BDC (Ranby site of WC)
REF387	Resident	More provision for Reford and area for sports centre upgrade and promoting more sports areas within Retford.	Noted, thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
1189264	Resident	If you wanted to address climate change you wouldn't be aiming to build a load of new houses, regardless of how supposedly sustainable they are. Neither would you trying to increase the volume of traffic in the area.	The Local Plan has to provide a balance in delivering more homes and jobs, whilst also protecting and enhancing the environment of the District. The Local Plan also encourages the use of renewable energy, encourages public transport, tree planting and protects local wildlife.
1189633	Resident	I do not think it is possible to agree to this crucial aim and support your housing allocation plan. They are in direct conflict.	The Local Plan has to provide a balance in delivering more homes and jobs, whilst also protecting and enhancing the environment of the District. The Local Plan also encourages the use of renewable energy, encourages public transport, tree planting and protects local wildlife.
1189633	Resident	You appear to have a policy in place which does not make sense. In ST45 you state that you need to develop housing in: -locations which minimise the need to travel and maximise the ability to make trips by sustainable modes of transport. -You want to see higher densities of development in the most accessible sites. This does not match with policy ST2, which recommends adding 20% to the housing stock in rural settlements. As a resident of one of these settlements, and a committed environmentalist, confirm that it is impossible to commute from the village in a non wet/muddy way unless you have a private vehicle. Our public transport provision is not fit for purpose. It is also incorrect to assume that just providing EV points for new housing will solve this issue. We all know the total number of private care journeys needs to reduce, even if they are made by EV, and also that the majority of people are unable to afford EVs. I am worried that this lack of alignment between ST2 and ST45 is an indication that BDC are just paying lip service to our current climate and biodiversity emergencies. Your policy regarding offsetting development by tree planting also demonstrates a woeful misunderstanding of the value of established ecosystems. Please reconsider - you should be placing housing in towns, whether these be in existing location or new town developments - not adding to our climate issues by placing housing in completely unsuitable areas. Whilst I support any effort to improve in this area, in my opinion you need to revisit this area of the plan. Your proposals are weak and unambitious and fail to reflect the severity of the situation in which we find ourselves.	The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. The Local Plan also supports the Government's climate change agenda by promoting sites for renewable energy development, protects the environment such as those areas around existing towns, protects public spaces, encourages tree planting and promotes the use of sustainable construction and renewable energy technologies on new developments.
REF005	Rhubarb Farm	In addition, Rhubarb Farm is playing a small part in addressing climate change, as per Section 10.1: Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation: The Farm's current composting toilet (funded jointly by Nottinghamshire County Council and Four Winds Energy Co-operative) saves approx 86,000 litres of water a year, based on Farm users, staff and visitors), so is making a small contribution to climate change measures. For all the above reasons, Rhubarb Farm wishes to ask the Planning Authority to give cognisance to the value of the work of Rhubarb Farm at Nether Langwith, and ensure that our work is supported and enabled in the future through the work of the Planning Authority.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
REF043 (INCLUDES PDF)	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	<p>In general, I would say that the aims of the plan are commendable, but I strongly feel that small changes are needed to the plan to maximise the chances of achieving the environmental and economic aims. I also think that The Council could use its powers to better effect to achieve the aims. The response outlined in this document is intended to provide changes which I hope would help The Council to (a) achieve the aims set out above (b) do so in a way which sets a leading example to other districts in Nottinghamshire and across the UK and (c) utilise mechanisms available to The Council to affect change. Specific recommendations with respect to the plan are outlined below. You may wish to incorporate these into existing or new policy measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan has a focus on new housing developments and on the sustainability of those projects. That is commendable given the significant embedded carbon emissions associated with new homes. However, given the large existing housing stock in Bassetlaw, and the long term emission reductions possible within these properties, it would be beneficial to residents to see measures to reduce carbon and improve the environmental performance of existing homes. Measures to do so may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Expanding green village proposals to encourage tree planting within existing communities in Bassetlaw. Education programmes surrounding retrofitting to improve insulation in existing properties – a measure which has significant impact on carbon emissions due to the high use of gas and oil for heating in the district as well as impacts on energy poverty in social and non-social housing stocks. o Incorporating tree planting schemes in residential areas which will improve the amenity of existing communities, offset carbon emissions and provide an opportunity for residents and businesses to help steer tree planting in Bassetlaw. - The UK Committee on Climate Change has stated clearly that new homes need to meet highest standards today in order to meet carbon targets. Without achieving the highest standards today, homes will need to be retrofitted at great cost to councils AND residents. I would also highlight how the building of a new home is the most economic time to implement standards and to minimise carbon emissions from first occupancy. The plan does not enforce the highest standards on new developments. As such, I would want to broaden the remit of planning to ensure homes are only built where they achieve the highest energy standards and that the council utilise the new (as of January 2020) national standard for solar generation and energy storage on new homes – which I helped to draft - There is growing interest in low carbon energy and decarbonisation which includes new technology, new business and new research. This presents an opportunity for Bassetlaw and the Local Plan – especially when we consider that through power stations and mining that we are historically an energy based economy. As such, I would recommend the following to attract and grow these activities within the District <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Specific planning areas within the district allocated to businesses associated with sustainability. This should not just be limited to electricity generation with a policy remit extended to low carbon heat and transport. It may also extend to the manufacture products associated with sustainability. I note that a significant proportion of Bassetlaw jobs are in the manufacturing sector and as such, we should be encouraging further manufacturing which takes advantage of local skills and of wider sustainability opportunities. o The creation of a low carbon energy manufacturing park on the former power station sites/expansion of the existing zoning to encourage manufacturing. To achieve low carbon generation, enforce solar generation on all roofs, rather than allocating land parcels for exclusive use of solar assets. Zone D is reserved for solar generation assets here which at best could power around 20,000 homes. I would highlight that the closure of Cottam and High Marnham has resulted in the loss of electricity generation which could power around 7 million homes. Expanding Zone B to encompass a larger area of zone D could achieve the same aim and: Have a much larger impact on international decarbonisation through creating low carbon products- Link to wider investments such as manufacturing of batteries which are key strategic areas for the UK economy and electric vehicle sectors - Take advantage of strong electricity grid infrastructure existing on site which are necessary for manufacturing and often a high cost burden on developers - Incorporate low carbon energy generation (such as rooftop solar) as outlined in the policy i.e. achieving a similar electricity generation and gain multiple uses from the land. - Create jobs and wealth in the area which align to how the Bassetlaw economy is structured. - Potentially attract outside impact/environmental funding to support developments. 	<p>The Local Plan is providing a balance between the need for development and the protection of the environment. In addition, the plan has to be deliverable in terms of what the policies are intending to deliver. Although the Plan is providing a strong emphasis on renewable energy and low carbon technology it also needs to be mindful about the added costs to development in an area that traditionally has low viability rates. The environment is a key objective in the Local Plan and the Council believes proposed environmental policies strike the most appropriate balance in protecting and enhancing the natural environment, promoting sustainable development and enabling development to occur in the most efficient, clean and sustainable way. The Local Plan is also promoting biodiversity net gain through the creation of new community woodlands and allocating a large former power station site for the energy and low carbon technology sectors to promote clean energy and provide a step change within the low economy. This will be detailed in a Local Development Order for the site in close consultation with key stakeholders and education settings.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	There is no direct comment relating to measures to extract energy from sewage treatment works in the District. I note that these have a carbon benefit through reduced methane production and also through producing low carbon electricity which can be dispatched when the grid needs it. I note that 10.2.9 states energy from waste is a county matter. However, I would questions whether local planning mechanisms can be used to encourage energy from waste and encourage them to do so if possible. I would encourage how the local plan can facilitate or encourage energy from waste within the District in support of low carbon energy generation, low carbon heat or sustainability objectives. Seven Trent water already promote this and tangible projects in our district could impact our decarbonisation/sustainability	This is a commercial activity and will be down to the individual water authority to consider.
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	Policy ST45 does encourage tree planting and mentions the Sherwood Forest Reforestation Project. However, the tree planting remit could be expanded to improve tree cover within other areas – specifically in urban areas – with benefits such as: - Improved air quality - Improved environments for residents - Better visual environment - Designation of Bassetlaw as a “Forest District” - More scope for finding areas for tree planting if areas cannot be found in the existing replanting scheme - Links to other schemes such as Tree planting with the Mayflower Pilgrim commemorations. Although air quality is mentioned, there are limited air quality monitoring stations online such as DEFRA online map3 Installation of air quality monitoring in urban areas to permit reporting and evidence based assessment of air quality in The District. Key areas include: - Traffic junctions where there is extensive idling of engines - Outside schools and areas where air quality has disproportionate impacts on children. - Areas where air quality should be high such as in parks and conservation areas. The District should seek these through EA and DEFRA programmes	The Local Plan is striving for better design of new developments which should include appropriate levels of open space and other methods to help our urban areas adapt to the threat and challenges of climate change. This includes improving air quality through the use of more sustainable materials, renewable energy technology and tree planting.
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	Although the plan places a minimum number of EV charging, it could extend further by specifying the types or rate of charging. The policy risks allowing developers to install slow charge units which would: - Potentially not encourage EV ownership as they do little more than a standard 3 pin plug - Expose the district to significant retrofitting costs to improve charging rates and infrastructure I would specifically expect ST45 to include either: - Minimum charging rates for EVs in alignment with national standards. Specifically, I would recommend “Fast Chargers” which can fully charge in 3-4 hours and are most common across the UK. - Require 3 phase as opposed to single phase connections at all new dwellings. This is commonplace in Europe and recently recommended by Western Power Distribution/Renewable Energy Association in response to EV5s.	The Local Plan is supporting the Government's agenda to be a zero carbon economy by 2050. However, the plan period is until 2037 and the measures included in the plan provide the necessary step-change and framework for the district to adapt appropriately towards a low carbon economy with the aim to meet the Governments 2050 target.
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	10.2.1 This statement does not reflect the latest Net Zero target from Government Update this statement to include the latest “net zero carbon” objectives. 10.2.5 It is not correct that wind/solar need to be located close to the source of power. This statement is actually quite misleading. Perhaps you mean “close to the source of consumption”? Regardless, the advantage of wind/solar is that they generate electricity which can be transmitted over the electricity network to a point of consumption. It is possible and viable to wheel electricity over the power network and there are numerous examples where this is commercially viable. As such, proximity is not necessarily a technical or indeed commercial advantage.	Thank you for your comment. Amendments have been made to the supporting text.
1191455	Resident	Given the need to reduce carbon emissions, the Local Plan should mandate that all dwellings in new developments in the Plan should be carbon neutral and be built with solar panels & heat exchangers (for cheaper than retrofitting them). Also all new dwellings should have electric car charging ports built in to encourage the move away from the internal combustion engine. Similarly, any commercial development should also have solar panels and at least 50% of the parking should have electric charging points	A new development proposed will be subject to other environmental policies in the Local Plan. In addition, the Plan support the use of sustainable construction materials and methods. The Plan also identifies a site for the location of renewable energy development to support the Governments aim for the UK to be a low carbon economy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
REF066	Resident	These are mainly in respect of the 'innovative green agenda' of the plan. According to the UN IPCC the planet is facing catastrophic and irreversible climate and ecological breakdown unless drastic changes are made within the next 10 years and starting NOW. These changes need to be at an international, national and local level. It is in this context that your plans must be viewed and judged. Whilst it is positive that it speaks of green issues and infrastructure, I feel strongly that it needs much more ambition, urgency, commitment, and creative detail in responding to the greatest crisis that mankind has ever faced! The plan repeatedly mentions the phrase 'low carbon' in respect of development (e.g. 4.1.5, 4.1.10, 4.2.12, 7.10.10) but surely we should be aiming for carbon neutral. The heating of homes is one of the biggest contributors to climate breakdown, so all future developments need to be as highly insulated and energy efficient as possible. Finally, whilst it is good to hear about the securing of new community woodlands, billions of trees will need to be planted nationwide to help offset carbon emissions, and it would be great to hear the details of ambitious local targets and sites that can make a really significant contribution to this.	The Local Plan is supporting the Government's agenda to be a zero carbon economy by 2050. However, the plan period is until 2037 and the measures included in the plan provide the necessary step-change and framework for the district to adapt appropriately towards a low carbon economy with the aim to meet the Governments 2050 target.
REF066	Resident	Section 10.2.3 speaks positively of the old power station sites' providing significant potential for renewable energy. However this is then undermined by talk of low carbon production and the need to balance this with the impact on landscape and ecology (10.2.5). More worryingly 10.2.2. talks of the Government block on onshore wind generation unless in an area suitable. There is no mention of any such areas and yet Bassetlaw is full of potential sites. If we are to stand any chance of avoiding catastrophic climate breakdown then there needs to be a massive increase in renewables and onshore wind is the most cost effective. Old power station and pit sites e.g. Bevercotes and Bircotes would seem ideal. I regularly pass the large turbines on the old Bilsthorpe pit site and they are quiet and not unpleasant to look at. They are much less intrusive than the original power stations and mines. If we do not grasp these opportunities now then the science tells us that future generation will pay a terrible price. The impact on communities will be far, far greater than that of wind turbines and solar panels!!	National Policy on onshore wind has changed over time. There are constraints on existing power station sites for large scale wind turbines such as the existing electricity grid and cables. High Marnham is being promoted for the energy and low carbon technology sectors and more detail will be provided through the development of a Local Development order for the site.
1193104	Resident	In addition to the 5 trees you intend to plant for each new house there are already 100 plus oak saplings thriving on the Sandhills plus other quicker growing natives like birch and elder. You already have a quick win towards your aspirations in this area With most of the householders in Ordsall paving and tarmacking their front gardens the Sandhills as it stands with its young forest will help to mitigate this, both as somewhere for the water to go and the flora and arboreal to soak it up	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF118	Lound Parish Council	Many of the small rural areas identified in the Bassetlaw Spatial Assessment Background Assessment paper are listed as being without a 'Doctors' or a 'Shop' and will be wholly reliant on private transport to facilitate everyday necessities including employment. This is in direct conflict with ST45 1a and 1c: In addition, many of the Small Rural villages have recently experienced extreme weather conditions, some of which may be attributable to climate change. On many occasions, this has resulted in the temporary loss of public transport. resulting in isolation for some demographic groups for days, with no access to hospitals, groceries/convenience stores or physical social networks. As the Draft Local Plan covers a period of 20 years these considerations should be factored into the Plan especially in those areas that are susceptible to such conditions. ST45 Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption, does little to enforce its recommendations. The policy is a list of recommendations or encouragements that developers are likely to disregard due to their own cost implications. This policy should clearly define standards and requirements that must be met without exception and in conjunction with other policies. All planning proposals should clearly demonstrate that sustainability and climate change have been clearly addressed and all such issues mitigated to ensure that these problems are not compounded for future generations in SRS' thus leaving some residents without the means to support everyday requirements.	A new development proposed will be subject to other environmental policies in the Local Plan. In addition, the Plan support the use of sustainable construction materials and methods. The Plan also identifies a site for the location of renewable energy development to support the Governments aim for the UK to be a low carbon economy.
1195911	Aspbury Planning Limited	Criteria d) relating to providing electric vehicle parking in new residential schemes is too vague and the policy sub text does not set out what is expected within new residential developments in respect of domestic connections.	The policy states that development need to provide the necessary infrastructure i.e. the provision of a capable socket or electricity point at the parking space/garage. It will then be

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
			up to the householder to provide the electric point that can connect to the socket or electric provision provided.
REF198	Consultant	Policy ST45 page 145 The climate is something we can all do something, no matter how small, about. This policy, however, includes criteria that is not planning based including references to Building Control and also retrofitting of existing buildings. Laudable as these are, they are not planning issues. The promotion of carbon neutral development throughout the district would be greatly enhanced if there was a dedicated officer with the relevant qualifications that could engage in early discussions with applicants, agents and energy consultants so that the project has the correct starting basis.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF222	Notts CC - Public Health	It is recommended that the relevant polices mention the need to minimise risk of construction impacts on residents including dust, noise, vibration and odours. It is recommended that the Plan references to improve air quality rather than maintain air quality. As any improvement in air quality is positive for human health. It is recommended that the title of Policy ST45: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. be amended to include Improving Air Quality or Reducing Air Pollution whichever is relevant. In addition, that policy point 3h be amended. This is because air pollution and climate change are separate issues but with a similar primary cause – the burning of fossil fuels. For technical guidance see reference in the HIA included within appendix one.	A clearer reference for air quality and air pollution has been included within the revised text of the Policy. There remains reference to air quality in the supporting text to the policy.
1196560	Resident	Yet again, the proposed mega builds will have a damaging effect on the environment. Large new builds are not the way forward. This is already recognised in Europe. The proposed development at Cottam will have a substantial negative effect on wild life, on the existing community, on road use and the damaging effect from many extra cars being driven on small rural roads which are inadequate for them.	A new development proposed will be subject to other environmental policies in the Local Plan. In addition, the Plan support the use of sustainable construction materials and methods. The Plan also identifies a site for the location of renewable energy development to support the Governments aim for the UK to be a low carbon economy.
REF253	Fisher German	There is no evidence provided to justify the requirement for five trees per dwelling to be planted. The supporting text states that “The Council’s Plan supports the Sherwood Forest Reforestation Project” however neither document discuss a requirement for five trees per dwelling to be planted. There is no justification for this policy requirement and as such it should be deleted. If evidence can be provided for a specified number of trees to be planted per dwelling, it is considered that an offsite contribution option should also be offered. This would ensure that the most efficient use of land is implemented on development sites and that tree planting across the District can be undertaken in a comprehensive and planned manner (similar to that of the National Forest).	Further supporting information is provided in relation to the various types of carbon off-setting schemes the local plan is encouraging. Tree planting is an important part of this and new developments should contribute physically towards climate change mitigation. Large scale developments will be expected to accommodate the trees on their sites, but there will also be the opportunity to contribute towards off-site new community woodlands.
REF255	Sheffield City Region	Importantly, the Draft Plan also set economic and housing ambitions within the broader challenge of climate change and the need to reduce carbon emissions as well as adapt to the effects of a changing climate. In November 2019 the MCA took the decision to declare a climate emergency. Since then we have undertaken work to develop our approach to responding to this and committed to reach 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2040. As such, I particularly welcome the Draft Plan's acknowledgement of these challenges and the ambition for Bassetlaw to transition to a low carbon district. In line with the MCAs commitment to net zero, I strongly support the development of renewable and decentralised and low carbon energy at High Marnham (Policy ST7) as well as the approach set out in Section 10 on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption . I also note that the principles of low carbon design and energy efficiency are also reflected in other policies, particularly Policy ST32 on design, which is to be welcomed. Overall, it will be important for the Draft Plan to continue to develop these aspects so that it is in a position to reflect the net zero carbon commitment announced by Government.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF270	Barton Willmore	Object to the imposition of a tighter Building Regulations standard for water consumption than required nationally. There is no evidence within the Local Plan to suggest that Bassetlaw experiences water management conditions that present challenges in excess of those experienced nationally and, therefore, what evidence there is for requiring that development goes beyond national standards.	Information and advice on water consumption and standards in relation to this policy have been provided by the water authorities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
REF273	Anglian Water	Policy ST45 refers to developments being required to minimise water consumption by meeting the optional requirement of 110 litres/per person/per day. Anglian Water and the Environment Advice has issued advice to local planning authorities (copy attached) stating that there is evidence to demonstrate a need for optional water efficiency standard to be applied in the Anglian Water supply area. As such we fully support the inclusion of this standard in the policy. The standard is intended to apply to residential development proposals rather than other types of developments. As such we would suggest the wording of Policy ST45 be amended for clarity as follows: ' 3. e) Promoting water efficiency.....by residential development proposals meeting the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per person/per day' Opportunities for a more holistic and integrated approach to water management should form part of the plan, to encourage multi-functional water management assets which support other community objectives. This approach combines different elements of water management (e.g. combining SuDS with a water re-use system to both manage runoff and provide an alternative non-potable water supply) together with town planning and design (e.g. integrating the planted SuDS features throughout a development to contribute to 'greener' streetscapes). Fully support the reference made to development proposals incorporating water re-use measures wherever possible to reduce demand on existing water supply.	Noted. A change to part 3 of the policy has now been reflected in the revised Policy.
1197036	Woodland Trust	Strongly support the policies on tree planting in new development outlined in para2 of this policy. Setting targets in this way is an excellent means of securing developer contributions towards new tree planting, which will both absorb carbon and enable adaptation to climate change through shading in summer and flood alleviation in winter months. We also support the reference in the supporting text to creating new community woods as part of larger new housing development. We would like to see the policy improved by also mentioning the need to protect existing trees and woods, to preserve the climate benefits that they already deliver. Also, we would like to see the Council do an audit of its own land holding and those of partners to look for further opportunities for tree planting and woodland creation (eg in parks or on underused areas of open space).	Noted. Thank you for your comment. The Council will produce a "green audit" where it will look at how the Council can become more low carbon and introduce additional renewable energy technology on its assets and explore the opportunities for new tree planting.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST45 Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. If Part 2 of the policy relates to onsite provision of 5 trees per dwelling and/or a contribution towards woodland planting elsewhere then it may be helpful if this was made explicit in the policy or supporting text.	Noted. Thank you for your comment. The policy does support off-site provision on the identified newly designated "community woodlands" identified across the District.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
REF285	Home Builders Federation	<p>Policy ST45 requires all new residential developments with off-road parking to ensure that infrastructure provided is capable of connection for electric vehicle charging. (This requirement is also repeated in Policy ST50 – Promoting Sustainable Transport). The HBF is supportive of encouragement for the use of electric and hybrid vehicles via a national standardised approach implemented through the Building Regulations to ensure a consistent approach to future proofing the housing stock. Recently the Department for Transport held (ended on 7th October 2019) a consultation on Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential & Non-Residential Buildings. This consultation set out the Government's preferred option to introduce a new functional requirement under Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010, which is expected to come into force in the first half of 2020. The inclusion of EVCP requirements within the Building Regulations 2010 will introduce a standardised consistent approach to EVCP in new buildings across the country. The requirements proposed apply to car parking spaces in or adjacent to buildings and the intention is for there to be one charge point per dwelling rather than per parking space. It is proposed that EVCPs must be at least Mode 3 or equivalent with a minimum power rating output of 7kW (expected increases in battery sizes and technology developments may make charge points less than 7 kW obsolete for future car models, 7 kW is considered a sufficiently future-proofed standard for home charging) fitted with a universal socket to charge all types of electric vehicle currently on the market and meet relevant safety requirements. All charge points installed under the Building Regulations should be un-tethered and the location must comply with the Equality Act 2010 and the accessibility requirements set out in the Building Regulations Part M. The Government has estimated installation of such charging points add on an additional cost of approximately £976. The Council's viability evidence is set out in Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment by NCS Nationwide CIL Services dated August 2018. This assessment excludes any costs associated with the provision of EVCPs. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the Council should undertake further viability work to fully test the cumulative impacts of all policy compliant requirements. The Government has also recognised the possible impact on housing supply, where the requirements are not technically feasible. The Government's consultation proposed introducing exemptions for such developments. The costs of installing the cables and the charge point hardware will vary considerably based on site-specific conditions in relation to the local grid. The introduction of EVCPs in new buildings will impact on the electricity demand from these buildings especially for multi-dwelling buildings. A requirement for large numbers of EVCPs will require a larger connection to the development and will introduce a power supply requirement, which may otherwise not be needed. The level of upgrade needed is dependent on the capacity available in the local network resulting in additional costs in relation to charge point instalment. The Government recognises that the cost of installing charge points will be higher in areas where significant electrical capacity reinforcements are needed. In certain cases, the need to install charge points could necessitate significant grid upgrades which will be costly for the developer. Some costs would also fall on the distribution network operator. Any potential negative impact on housing supply should be mitigated with an appropriate exemption from the charge point installation requirement based on the grid connection cost. The consultation proposes that the threshold for the exemption is set at £3,600. In the instances when this cost is exceptionally high, and likely to make developments unviable, it is the Government's view that the EVCP requirements should not apply and only the minimum Energy Performance of Buildings Directive requirements should be applied. The Council has not recognised the technical feasibility and viability impacts as identified by the Government. It is the HBF's opinion that the Council should not be getting ahead of Government proposals for Building Regulations. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the requirement for EVCPs should be deleted from Policies ST45 and ST50. Policy ST45 also requires new developments to minimise water consumption by meeting the Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per person per day. If the Council wishes to adopt the optional standard for water efficiency of 110 litres per person per day then the Council should justify doing so by applying the criteria set out in the NPPG (ID 56-013-20150327 to 56-017-20150327). The Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) dated 25th March 2015 confirmed that "the optional</p>	<p>Connection for residential and commercial electric vehicle standards are set out within the supporting documents to the Local Plan and are recommendations from Nottinghamshire County Council's residential and commercial parking standards.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
		<p>new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". The NPPG refers to "helping to use natural resources prudently ... to adopt proactive strategies to ... take full account of water supply and demand considerations ... whether a tighter water efficiency requirement for new homes is justified to help manage demand" however the Housing Standards Review was explicit that reduced water consumption was solely applicable to water stressed areas. The Council's own evidence states that areas in Bassetlaw covered by Severn Trent Water are not classed as water stressed. Bassetlaw District is only partially in the area covered by Anglian Water classed as an area of serious water stress. Under current Building Regulations, all new dwellings achieve a mandatory level of water efficiency of 125 litres per day per person, which is a higher standard than that achieved by much of the existing housing stock. This mandatory standard represents an effective demand management measure. Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, this requirement should be deleted from Policy ST45.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate	Change Mitigation	and Adaption	
1197091	William Davis	<p>Overall the aims of the policy are supported as they are consistent with national policy (NPPG paragraphs 148 and 149) as they support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and support the transition to a low carbon future. As with other policies, consideration will need to be given to the potential impact on viability of higher policy requirements. Clarification is sought regarding Part 1d of the Policy as it is unclear exactly what would be required of developers. It is considered the use and implementation of Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP) is complex as the notion is relatively new. As such, there are several differing charging sockets and no standardised format is currently available. Therefore, any charging point installed on a dwelling by a developer may not suit the purchaser's or end user's vehicle, or beyond this, even become obsolete as advancements within this field continue. As Government funding is available for homeowners to install EVCP within any given dwelling it is considered an appropriate option that enables choice for the end user for the developer to install a suitable feed and spur to the point of charging, allowing the homeowner to purchase the required EVCP socket. Moreover, it must be noted that until technology has suitably advanced EVCPs are not achievable on all dwellings. Homes with frontage parking would represent safety hazards should cables be fed from dwellings across car parking spaces. This is of particular concern when the dwelling built is to meet Part M4(2) or (3) standards. Therefore, until such time as a viable solution to this issue has been established any emerging Policy should allow for flexibility for developers to install EVCP "where suitable"; or alternatively the policy seek provision of a dedicated electric spur to be conveniently located for future EVCP provision by the occupier. In addition to this, the installation of charging point hardware will have implications on the local electricity network. Government recognises that the cost of installing EVCP will be higher in areas where significant capacity reinforcements are required. In certain areas grid upgrades may be required which will place viability burdens upon the developer. Any impacts these costs may have on housing supply should be mitigated through EVCP exemption so as not to affect the delivery of homes. The Department of Transport (DfT) undertook a consultation on EVCP (ending 7th October 2019.) This set out the Government's intentions to standardise EVCP within the building regulations. This is expected to come into force in 2020, therefore any Local Policy shift in advancement of this may immediately become out-dated and considered unfeasible or unviable. Therefore, in order to be effective and meet the test of soundness, it is proposed that part 1d of the Policy be amended to read "requiring that all new residential developments that are providing off-road parking ensure that a suitable feed and spur to an appropriate location for a charging point are provided". The requirement for five trees to be provided per dwelling is not supported. This requirement is considered to be overly rigid and not justified by the evidence. It is noted that the Council Plan aims to encourage tree planting and seek to rejuvenate the Sherwood Forest area although no specific project is referred to. It is unclear how this requirement will be delivered, join up with the requirement for biodiversity net gain or whether it will meet the tests for obligations. As such it is proposed that the wording of the Part 2 of the policy be amended to; "The provision of trees onsite will be supported where feasible and consistent with landscape character and context of the site. Where offsite net gains are being provided under the Government's biodiversity net gain scheme, support will be given to schemes which increase the number of trees and extent of woodland in Sherwood Forest." An SPD on biodiversity net gains, green infrastructure or design and landscaping could potentially be used to provide further guidance on tree planting.</p>	<p>Connection for residential and commercial electric vehicle standards are set out within the supporting documents to the Local Plan and are recommendations from Nottinghamshire County Council's residential and commercial parking standards.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption			
REF299 (LAA) Bevercotes	Gladmans	Policy ST45(A) requires that all new residential developments that are providing off-road parking ensure infrastructure are capable of providing connection for electric vehicle charging. 5.6.2 Before requiring electric vehicle charging points in residential development through planning policies, the Council should engage with the main energy suppliers to determine the network capacity to accommodate any adverse impacts if all dwellings were to install a charging facility. If recharging demand became excessive, there may be constraints to increasing the electric loading in an area because of the limited size and capacity of existing cables, and new substation infrastructure may be necessary. Furthermore, such costs should be included in the Council's viability testing otherwise there may be an adverse impact on housing delivery. The requirement for all new residential developments to provide infrastructure capable of connection for electric vehicle charging is repeated in Policy ST50. The Framework is clear that policies should avoid unnecessary duplication ¹¹ and in this regard the duplication of a policy requirement should be removed from the Plan. Policy ST45 also requires new developments to minimise water consumption by meeting the Building regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per day. Any such requirement should be justified having applied the criteria set out in the PPG12.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF300 -	Natural England	Natural England welcomes this policy and considers that it is a positive step to tackling climate change. Whilst we welcome the provision for planting 5 new trees per dwelling or 5 trees per 1000sq metres of non-residential we would emphasise that planting should result in the right trees in right places (as discussed above). Advise that other habitats e.g. wetlands, grassland and heathlands can also offer valuable sequestration. Tree planting must be carried out in a coordinated way to create valuable areas of woodland which should be part of the wider approach to the Nature Recovery Network. In addition you may want to consider areas which could be left to "re-wild" to allow natural regeneration of woodlands. Welcome section 3 of the policy wording which includes nature-based solutions to climate change.	Agreed. We will continue to work with relevant partners to identify the best places and types of trees to support the local environment.
REF323	Emery Planning	This Section of the Plan seeks to promote opportunities to improve energy efficiency and minimise CO2 emissions. Policy ST45 seeks to secure the reduction of greenhouse gases in accordance with the provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008. Support the aims and objectives of this policy as well as, the recognition at Paragraph 10.2.3 of the significant potential for renewable energy and low carbon generation on site at High Marnham. This positive strategy, to be delivered through Policy ST46 (and ST7), supports the NPPF emphasis to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources, with policies designed to maximise the development of low carbon energy. The Former High Marnham Power Station site provides an excellent opportunity to positively and actively meet the aims of this Section of the Plan with its accessibility to the national Grid connection and critically, potential for reuse of excess power, heat and hot water from J G Pears Low Marnham CHP. Again, this is supported at paragraph 151 of the NPPF which states Local Plans should "... identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for collocating potential heat customers and suppliers." Pleased that this unique opportunity has been recognised and is being grasped by the LPA to realise the opportunity for sustainable reuse of this existing energy efficient site which already provides opportunities for decentralised energy.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	In Rural Villages the build / installation of equipment (Solar Panels, Wind Turbines, Water, Waste Water Treatments, etc.) should not be allowed to have a major detrimental effect on the nature and character of the village and its environs. Additionally, the efficient husbandry of the trees in and around rural settlements should not be blocked or mismanaged by any contra tree planning applications. Current	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST45-Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption			
		pruning and felling applications, all based on sound agricultural and wildlife reasoning, have been currently blocked or refused by the Tree Preservation Order procedures and rulings.	
1197287	Resident	It should be taken into account that each newhouse has a carbon footprint of up to 80 carbon tonnes. Instead of 5 trees per house a more realistic figure would be 50 bearing in mind that it takes many years for a tree to grow to a size to have a significant effect on carbon absorption. Once planted trees need to be properly maintained and monitored for five years.	The level of trees per property has also considered the viability of such an ask and the size of the land needed to accommodate the trees.
1197290	Resident	I support this policy. It could be more ambitious. We must improve insulation and efficiency in existing housing stock dramatically to meet the 2050 target. Focusing more on re-developing existing buildings would help with that.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF428	Resident	Still allowing development on land that floods and increases risk to other homes as seen 'yet' again in the Grove Lane, Blackstope Lane, Braken Lane, Retford Beck situation.	Any new development proposed on land that is identified as being in a "flood zone" will need to justify why it needs to be developed in that location and what appropriate mitigation is required. This is identified within National Planning guidance and the revised flooding policies in the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST46- Renewable Energy Generation			
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	10.1.4 The methods/regulations noted for assessing energy efficiency of buildings do not include standards specifically related to on-site generation and storage of electricity. The UK released a new standard for low carbon generation in February 2020 which outlines how to assess and safely install low carbon generation and storage. It should be noted that, when installed with a new build, solar electricity generation offers strong returns to home occupants, impacts energy poverty, has carbon savings (even when embedded carbon is considered), allows a home to supply power to the grid and allows a home to become increasingly electricity independent. Installing a new build removes key costs associated with sales, construction and roof access which can comprise more than 30% of the cost of solar. 1. Bassetlaw adopts MCS Standard 30121 to assess the benefits of low carbon energy generation on all new housing. This is to measure: a. Payback/ROI. b. Carbon saving. c. Energy poverty impacts. d. Energy independence. 2. To enact this: a. All new homes are installed with solar generation which provides a minimum 50% electricity independence over the year against domestic electricity consumption. b. A developer must show how this meets minimum economic returns. Where they cannot meet this criteria, other developers are permitted to bid for the solar generation aspect of building where they can meet minimum economic hurdles. 3. Bassetlaw considers adopting the standard to perform an assessment of solar generation on existing homes and identifies price points where this makes economic sense to The Council.	The use of solar pannels on dwellings or other structures will only be supported where they are appropriate to their setting i.e. character of the building and place. This is reflected in the revised Design policy.
REF043	Director, Advance Further Energy Ltd	The policy does not consider impact of renewable generation on energy poverty, energy independence or carbon saving. A new policy line is measured whereby: o "renewable energy generation will be supported where it can be shown to have a demonstrable impact on local energy poverty/energy independence or an impact on national carbon savings" - To reflect that another beneficial measure of low carbon energy is on local consumption, line four should be changed to read: o "the proposal includes details of expected power generation based upon yield OR on local self-consumption of electricity"; - To encourage renewable energy on new housing: o "New developments will be supported where they include on site generation which provides a significant contribution to local energy needs – particularly through rooftop solar PV"	Noted. Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST46- Renewable Energy Generation			
1195350	Resident	At Marnham, (see p 56) you have identified an area shaded in blue (Development Zone C) for warehousing and open storage. The other side of the railway are properties in Fledborough, not shown on your map who will have full view of these and yet you say in this policy ST46 sect A this will not happen. A suggestion would be to put the solar panels you have earmarked for Development Zone D into this area and continue with the planting scheme at Higher Marnham. Also, at the time of writing this a large part of Development Zone C is under water.	The proposed allocation will now be managed through the development of a Local Development Order. This will enable more detail to be provided and it will set a legal framework for its delivery.
1197036	Woodland Trust	You could also mention in this policy the potential of sustainably grown and harvested wood used as a fuel to generate renewable energy.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST46 Renewable Energy Generation.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.
REF327 -	Scrooby Parish	Good to see assessment is to be based on real yields and performances, not capacities which we all know are way above what you ever achieve. · However, large scale use of roof installed solar panels should not be allowed to detract the character of the rural settlement or its current buildings.	The use of solar pannels on dwellings or other structures will only be supported where they are appropriate to their setting i.e. character of the building and place. This is reflected in the revised Design policy.
1197289	Resident	I support this policy. More of this would be great for Bassetlaw.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST47-Flood Risk			
1177309	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Given recent flooding and the likelihood that this will continue to be a problem, I think there is a strong onus on the Council to look at all drainage-related activities across the district and ensure that drainage board coverage is adequate. This may not be the right mechanism to review this but I am conscious that some villages in the east of the district DON'T fall into an internal drainage board catchment area BUT will deliver more housing under the plan terms and ALREADY flood. All our drainage channels need proactive management in future, and we should be seeking to put relevant arrangements in place over the lifetime of this plan to enable this.	The Local Plan is supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) that looks at the risk/threat of flooding across the District. The SFRA assesses how the potential growth, identified in the Local Plan, could affect, or be affected, by the risk of flooding. The Local Plan also includes a policy to manage flood risk across the District and development that is proposed in areas with a high-risk of flooding will also be subject to the legislation identified in the National Planning Policy Framework.
REF030	North Leverton Parish Council	There are several issues for the Parish of North Leverton and your proposed plan. Before any significant developments are allocated by BDC there should be proper consideration given as to how you propose to deal with the following significant risks that will only be made worse by the influx of more housing; The exiting foul & storm water drainage infrastructure is unable to cope with existing flows, especially during periods of prolonged heavy rain. Any increase in foul discharge or rainwater run-off from more hard paving/roof areas will only make a bad situation worse!	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.
1196060	Resident	Flood risk is it a good idea to build 1650 houses in zone 3 and zone 2? if it flood defenses are upgraded were will the displaced water go. up stream, down stream further inland putting the surrounding villages at risk.	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST47-Flood Risk			
REF198 (LAA)	Consultant	Policy ST47 page 150 Much more work has to be done within this section. Once again it is the old policies trotted out that appear to view water as an enemy and run away from it rather than embracing it. Bassetlaw, Notts County Council and the Environment Agency have relevant technical officers and it should be incumbent upon this Council to ensure engagement by these 3 authorities with developers to look at innovative ways to address these issues. There should also be an event for authorities, other stakeholders and members of the general public to air their views in a way that may lead to some progress. History has a lot to teach us about flooding and how in the past it was contained and allowed and dealt with. It is incorrect to simply place the whole blame on development. There is a strong argument that agricultural practices in the last 10+ years have had an impact, in particular the increase in “no till” farming where the use of the plough has been reduced considerably.	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are generally supportive of Policy ST47, in particular the inclusion of a statement to promote the use of SuDS, to manage surface water flows. As detailed above it is also key that surface water is directed to sustainable outfalls. Sewers are developed with a design capacity, this limited capacity can result in flooding where a storm exceeds the design criteria for the sewer. We therefore recommend that developers follow the drainage hierarchy, keeping flows out of the foul and combined sewers where possible.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1196559	Resident	All steps must be taken to avoid the risk of flooding from any new development by not permitting such development on land that has a flood risk.	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.
1196560	Resident	These proposals say one thing, but proposed developments say another. The site at Cottam is extremely close to the Trent and flooding area. It is also a contaminated site, and the gas station there will continue to operate for years ahead and new residents will be placed close to pylons and cabling, which may well affect their health. This risk has been recognised outside the UK and within it.	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.
1196658	Resident	our house was flooded in 2007 and had a narrow escape in November 2019 (porch and outbuildings only). The recent floods nationally indicate that not enough is being done with regard to new developments to reduce flood risks generally and we would be concerned that the plan pays insufficient attention to these issues;	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.
REF258	Environment Agency	We'd like to see the following text added to bullet point 2) under section A; 'where the exception test is not required, such as for change of use applications, the Flood Risk Assessment must still demonstrate that the development and future occupants will be safe from flood risk without increasing flood risk elsewhere'. We'd also recommend that you make an addition to part B, to state that 'in areas at risk of surface water flooding opportunities should be sought to reduce runoff rates to lower than greenfield rates'. Whilst we are mindful that responsibility for surface water management sits with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), it's our opinion that this aspiration would help alleviate some of the existing surface water flooding problems in areas such as Retford and Worksop. If you have any questions about the comments made in our response please feel free to contact me using the details below.	Agreed. Thank you for your comment.
1196860	Sheffield City Council	In particular policy ST47 is supported.	Noted. Thank you for your comment
1196914	Resident	with recent flooding flood risk and mitigation should be top priority	Noted. Thank you for your comment

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST47-Flood Risk			
REF270 (LAA)	Barton Willmore	We support the requirement of the above policy for an appropriate Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) where necessary. 4.14 We object to the requirement at Part B for SUDs unless there is clear evidence that would be inappropriate. We consider that there should be a requirement only to provide a betterment in surface water run-off rates at development Sites. The Local Plan should not seek to dictate how that will best be achieved through a Drainage Strategy.	The Council will be led by the advice and the requirements as identified by the appropriate flood authority and other water and drainage organisations.
REF273	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is generally supportive of the requirements of Policy ST47	Noted. Thank you for your comment
1197036	Woodland Trust	We welcome the reference in part B of this policy to the role which green infrastructure can plan in helping alleviate surface water flooding. You could mention that there is strong evidence to show that trees are particularly good at this: research at Manchester University showed a reduction of upto 60% in run off of rain onto hard surfaces where trees are present. It is believed that trees intercept rainfall and trap water temporarily in the tree canopy, thus slowing the speed at which the water reaches the ground and hence reducing the likelihood that drains will be overwhelmed. Trees planted upstream in appropriate locations can also slow down the rate of fluvial flooding (from rivers).	The Council will be led by the advice and the requirements as identified by the appropriate flood authority and other water and drainage organisations.
REF282	National Trust	While National Trust generally supports Policy ST47 we feel that it could be more aspirational in promoting rural and urban land uses and developments (not just major developments) that will help to reduce flood risk in vulnerable areas such as towns and cities.	Any development within identified flood zones or is within an area of problematic surface water flooding will be subject to the existing and proposed national and local policy requirements of a sequential approach. Where schemes are acceptable, appropriate mitigation will be required and this will be agreed with the necessary flood authority.
REF300	Natural England	We welcome the inclusion of B6 regarding Sustainable Urban Drainage schemes resulting in biodiversity net gain.	Noted. Thank you for your comment

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST48-Protecting Water Quality			
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles behind policy ST48. Especially the protection of ground water which has a significant impact on the water resource availability within Nottinghamshire. We are also supportive of the approach of water re-use, minimising consumption. See example wording and comments within our Protecting Groundwater Section of the response.	Thank you for your comments
REF273	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is generally supportive of the requirements of Policy ST48 in relation to safeguarding potable water sources from the potential risk of pollution arising from new development proposals. We also fully support the reference made to development proposals incorporating water re-use measures wherever possible to reduce demand on existing water supply.	Thank you for your comments
REF282	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST48 Water Quality.	Thank you for your comments
REF300	Natural England	Natural England welcomes this policy.	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport Infrastructure			
1180212	Resident	At the moment it appears (I might be wrong) that attention to the development of adequate roads, public transport, town centre shops, schools and other public goods follow population and very significant housing growth. It seems to me that these public goods are required before significant housing development is begun. I therefore think it is very important for the Council to demonstrate to residents that required improvements are being addressed before intrusive housing developments begin. In Retofrd, for example, it would make sense to begin the North Road development as or after transport and all the other developments also begin to improve. As North Road provides many houses, it makes sense to allow that site to develop and not to build more houses in the town until adequate infrastructure is in place. At the moment I think it is very likely that many residents see housing development but no new employment, improvement to roads or transport or shops in the town centre.	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.
REF030	North Leverton Parish Council	There is a recognised risk of traffic accidents/incidents at the village crossroads. A petition is to be presented to NCC in the very near future asking for them to review the situation and provide a safer junction for both road users and in particular for children going to and from school. Until this situation is resolved BDC should acknowledge the current risk and the increased risk as a consequence of increased housing both in the village of North Leverton and indeed surrounding villages.	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.
REF198 (LAA)	Resident	Policy ST49 page 155 This section deals solely with projects for highway improvements. It does nothing to suggest there may be better forms of transport. It should because the next policy is all about sustainable transport. These 2 policies should be intertwined.	This should read in connection with other policies and evidence that forms the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport Infrastructure			
1196559	Resident	None of the proposals give concrete evidence of what Road Improvements are to be made, or indeed insisted upon by the developers. All too often it seems that the resultant works are inadequate and Developers are not taken to task or controlled to ensure that sufficient heed is paid to local residents concerns over increased traffic on already inadequate roadways in a very poor state of disrepair.	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust has significant concerns about the scope and scale of proposed transport upgrades along the A57 corridor. These have potential not only for significant disruption associated with road works in the medium-long term, but also a major change in the character of the surrounding area as a result of the cumulative impact of major development, transport upgrades, traffic increased, congestion and pollution.	The A57 is constrained and the Council is working with Highways England and Nottinghamshire Council Council on an A57 Improvement Plan which will detail how this stretch of road can be improved in the future.
1197223	Resident	The link road from the A60 to the B6045 would dramatically increase vehicle traffic on already congested roads. The construction of a new road will undermine the councils stated commitment to woodland coverage with the associated significant benefits in terms of biodiversity and air quality.	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Sections 11.1 and 11.2 Providing Transport Infrastructure to Promote Growth and Sustainable These sections need a reference to the extremely limited provision of public transport to and from rural locations, including a zero service at the weekend. The arbitrary nominal requirement to increase housing in the rural settlements without the commensurate public transport will only serve to drive the increased use of private, personal, vehicles, electric or not.	The Council promotes the use and improvement to public transport. The Council is working with transport providers to make sure the larger new development have the capacity to incorporate public transport services.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport Infrastructure			
REF333	Resident	This submission OBJECTS to the draft LP's refusal to acknowledge the importance of the A631 and the relevance of links to South Yorkshire and Lincolnshire – other than in pictorial form at pg28. It must be demonstrated, in writing, with policies INCLUDING settlement hierarchy/allocations. This submission also contends that the Bassetlaw Local Plan will not be compliant with NPPF11 and the requirement to be “sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change”, if new government directives reference electric cars are not acknowledged. Since the drafting of the subject document and the voting in of the new government, targets for the removal of all internally combusting engines have been brought forward to 2040, just three years after the lifespan of the proposed Local Plan. This is not “rapid change” and the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan must REFLECT the reality of sooner-than-anticipated electric car use through policies connected to settlement hierarchy and allocations. Limiting development in locations where electric car use will become the norm, is not credible.	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.
1197287	Resident	The provision of transport section is too focussed on extending road access. 10 out of 12 of the proposals are around increasing road use. This is not in line with plans to be carbon neutral by 2050, and indicates that the plan needs to be more focused on developing sites with existing or viable public transport systems.	The Council promotes the use and improvement to public transport. The Council is working with transport providers to make sure the larger new development have the capacity to incorporate public transport services.
REF343	Gainsborough Town Council	The principle comments related to transport and the need for the plan to address issues relating to congestion on The Flood Road. Members would also welcome proposals for an additional bridge over the Trent to reduce congestion and traffic problems on both sides of the River Trent.	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport Infrastructure			
REF346	Doncaster Council	2. Growth at Harworth and the impact on the local highway network in Doncaster It is considered that that Policy ST49 – Transport Infrastructure should also include the required junction improvement/mitigation measures in Doncaster as well as Bassetlaw junctions listed. This would reflect the junctions listed in the White Young and Green Mitigation Strategy for Junctions. Para 8.4.1 of the Strategy states “This study identifies the nature and scale of highway improvements required at key junctions to mitigate the cumulative traffic effects of possible Local Plan development. It is beyond the scope of this study to identify all locations where improvements will be required and further assessment will be required as developments come forward through the planning process.” Para 8.4.3 states that, “The above mitigation measures (which include the Doncaster junctions) will assist in ensuring that existing transport infrastructure does not constrain plans for Local Plan development.”	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.
REF346	Doncaster Council	Paragraph 11.1.3 – Doncaster Council welcomes the commitment to work closely with neighbouring authorities to develop transport infrastructure to support delivery of the Local Plan. Paragraph 11.1.6 – Doncaster Council supports this paragraph which states that a Transport Assessment will be required to accompany a planning application. It further states that an Assessment should be agreed with the relevant authorities. Does this include neighbouring authorities? If so, it should be stated explicitly and should include Doncaster Council to reflect the duty to cooperate conversations and correspondence which have taken place regarding the Doncaster Local Plan. Paragraph 11.1.7 – this paragraph identifies a need to increase capacity along the A57 corridor. In light of the transport modelling results (undertaken by AMEC for the Bassetlaw Local Plan and part funded by Doncaster Council), this section (11.1) should also refer to A631 corridor.	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.
REF347	NJL Consulting	9.8 The overall ambitions of ST49 are supported where they improve access and accessibility in and around Bassetlaw. We also welcome the acceptance in ST49 that infrastructure delivery will require a co-ordinated approach which should not be left solely to individual developers. 9.9 As we outlined in the context of ST6, ST8 and SEM1, it is important that the policy does not place the full infrastructure burden on any one individual development as such an approach would be unreasonable and unviable. Similarly, development should not be unnecessarily held back through phasing if there is no infrastructure constraint. 9.10 ST49 should therefore be clear on these points.	Viability of new infrastructure for sites is factored into the deliverability of the Local Plan. In some cases infrastructure will require both private sector and public sector contributions where there is a benefit to the wider area and it secures the delivery of the scheme.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport Infrastructure			
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	The minor country roads serving the villages and Parishes throughout Bassetlaw but especially in the East were developed from horsetracks and agricultural traffic accesses. There is an abundance of dangerous corners and awkward junctions. A risk assessment has not been carried out as part of this draft plan, so the exact risk to the existing communities and proposed influx has not been assessed. Just because it has not been tackled in this draft, does not mean the proposes of this scheme are not complicit in the deaths and injuries which follow. Over the years the proposal of the draft , and in particularly the 20% increase in planning permissions in rural areas with unsuitable dangerous roads, or at least more dangerous than the main road alternatives, could cause as many deaths on Bassetlaw roads as the Grenfell tower disaster. The injury and risk of death per mile and per person using these parish and rural minor roads is much greater than the A roads and other improved routes. Notts County Council is and has, spent considerable sums on road safety. The return per pound spent on reducing deaths and injuries, is so much greater on the A roads where, for instance , many expensive speed monitoring camera schemes have been installed in the last few years. The cost to install these cash demanding schemes cannot be justified on the minor roads at present, even though many measures have been included by the CC on the minor roads , the safety cannot come near to the ideals aimed for on the busier A roads where more lives can be saved and accidents reduced per pound spent. Average speed cameras have been introduced on the Clarbrough Bole road. The Markham Moor to Retford old Great North road. Retford to Barnby Moor and Grinley to Everton road. IT appears therefore that the Bassetlaw District Plan is ignoring safety to achieve building targets and jettisoning responsibility for the rural well being. If the populations proposed , and the industrial and commercial additions were restricted to the main towns and thus to the majority using improved main roads, many accidents, injuries and deaths could statistically and then into reality be prevented. The expensive technology improvements installed would then reap a double dividend, of existing users, and the influx expected to use the monitored and improved roads. Concentrate people on these monitored and improved roads, save lives.	When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.
REF378		I am concerned about bus services in town. Town is dead at 6pm. Some areas (Tiln lane) non extent. I am concerned about removal of allotments in Hallcroft and for people to use cars to travel to wherever you choose to send them. Retford travel by car in and around Retford in horrendous. Takes me sometimes 20 minutes to travel through town from one end to the other. I am also concerned where A1 traffic will be sent via Retford when there is an accident on the A1. Why are lorries sent via Tiln Lane to avoid low bridge before before Clarbrough? Why not lower the road under the bridge? Tremendous long traffic on Tiln Lane via the local school. Some lorries would obviously fit under the bridge. I would like a better rail link to Nottingham, please.	The Council promotes the use and improvement to public transport. The Council is working with transport providers to make sure the larger new development have the capacity to incorporate public transport services.
REF387	Resident	Transport Infrastructure to be built upon for Retford Station and area behind station for repairs and infrastructure upgrade for main line with cross over of Sheffield/Lincoln line.	Thank you for your comments
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	EMPC recognises the need for better transport infrastructure but would question BDC's ability to deliver. At the time of the plan, East Markham has plans for 59 houses in and around the Mark Lane / Beckland hill area with little evidence of any thought as to how to provide safe routes in and out of the village for residents.	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST49-Transport Infrastructure			
REF428	Resident	<p>Why are you not considering and planning for improvements to help the flow of traffic in Retford? Improvements are necessary due to the large number of houses you have given permission to build in Retford. Rail Links More services are required on the main line. A service to Nottingham is needed from Retford. Policy ST49 Infrastructure Transport Why no planned improvements in Retford?</p>	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>
REF486	Councilor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>I welcome the extension to 'infrastructure' to include CCG needs. This is in keeping with the wishes of local people and now features much more frequently in objector's comments at Committee. Yet, it's unclear if this is an additional ask or whether it will be accommodated through cutting the cake slices even thinner. If it's the latter then I oppose that as the result will be to cut affordable housing funding.</p> <p>Five specific comments here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed new rail station is a great idea and 'ask'. It will be a direct link to the proposed new station for the AMP in Sheffield – a 25 minute journey. 2. Cottam – If, as we expect, people look in Lincoln for work and leisure we could argue for a cycle way across the Trent. This would connect to the Lincoln –Gainsborough bus route and, for the hardy, Saxilby rail station. 3. Shireoaks station car park. There are about 1500 houses with permission within two miles of the station. Peaks Hill will bring another 750 and another 1000 due in Carlton and Langold. Making that station more attractive with a car park and in due course additional stopping trains would alleviate pressure in Worksop station and A57 traffic. 4. Rail connection in Harworth. The freight only line from Worksop to Doncaster via Dinnington, Maltby, Tickhill and Rossington could become a passenger service again. A Tickhill/Harworth parkway station would certainly gain the support of Doncaster and SCR ought to be interested in opening the other locations. 5. Traffic flows across Worksop. One benefit to the redevelopment of the current warehouse site on Canal Road is a reduction of heavy traffic in the vicinity. To that end should we have a policy that supports businesses to move to a 'better' location if it reduces traffic in an otherwise residential environment. If Peppers moved from Blyth Road that would reduce traffic along Thievesdale/Raymouth lanes and High Hoes road; if Flying Fridges moved from the centre of Shireoaks that would ease traffic in the village and over a busy level crossing. 	<p>When planning for new development, it is important that there is an understanding of the capacity of existing transport infrastructure and what impact, if any, new development will have. Bassetlaw District Council commissioned a series of Transport Assessments either at a District or local level to assess the impacts to transport infrastructure from the proposed growth in the emerging Local Plan. These are available on the Councils website. Where there are impacts, proposed mitigation is recommended. The proposed mitigation is then costed and forms part of a requirement to the affected site or strategic policy. This will enable to new transport infrastructure to be delivered alongside the development identified in the Local Plan and contributing towards the delivery of sustainable development across the District.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Sustainable Transport			
REF047	Sport England	Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process. In addition Strategic Objectives 8 and 9 would be supported and implemented by the use of Active Design.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF136	A and D Architecture	12) Policy STSO should be modified to safeguard pedestrians against inappropriate cyclist speeds on shared networks by modifying the text of subsection BI as follows "B 1 Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot including measures to calm cycle speeds where these might otherwise endanger pedestrians"	The revised policy also includes a reference to "highway safety" which has also been raised by NCC.
1195060	Resident	Improved , affordable, frequent and well run public transport needs to be a key feature in any further housing development as key roots in and out of Retford are already under severe pressure and certain times in the day	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1195216	Resident	Each new house built should have mandatory 2 off road car parking spaces	This will depned on how many bedrooms are proposed per dwellings as are the stardards of Nottinghamshire County Council
1196005	Resident	Cycleways should, wherever possible, be provided in separate lanes to vehicular traffic in order to improve user safety and to encourage greater use of bicycles and e-bikes in and around Bassetlaw's urban areas. While there is obvious merit in providing recreational routes, a strong emphasis should be given to connecting residential areas to the town centre and areas of employment, along with connectivity between Worksop/Retford and their respective outlying settlements. The terrain in the district means that if the infrastructure is in place, cycling could be a far more viable mode of transport.	Noted. Thank you for your comment. Cycle and pedestrian infrastructure is an important contribution towards sustainable development. The Local Plan will support appropriate new cycle and pedestrian infrastructure within new development and linking to other areas such as town centres or regeneration sites.
REF198	Consultant	Policy ST50 page 157 With the exception of item 3, there is nothing other than lip service paid to the overwhelming issue/blight of the rural areas. That is the lack of a workable, sustainable and fit for purpose public transport system. There is no thought on how this can be achieved, just a hope that public transport enhancement can be achieved. As we all know, public transport is in the private sector and there is nothing developers can do about this. We live in a socialist led Council and have done for many years but there has never appeared to be the slightest hope that investment/subsidy by the Council, possibly Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist – February 2020 Page 7 partially through the ratepayers, could bring forward a public bus service that serves our rural areas as they need. With such a service in place the rural areas will once again begin to thrive and not become what they now are which is no go areas for younger couples/families who can only find work in the towns and outside the district. A well thought out local bus service using, wherever possible, buses that suit the route and occupancy levels would be a flagship for other areas and make rural living so much more affordable. It would open up the possibility of having better and larger employment opportunities district wide. It is for this Council to seize the initiative and promote rather than hope for such a system.	Bassetlaw is considered a rural District where 80% of it is open countryside. The level/options of public transport is limited and some communities have very few bus services. The Local Plan is supportive of improved public transport in the rural area and the redevelopment of large sites in this area will support the need/ viability for additional services being made or existing services being improved. The potential for a new train station in Bassetlaw is also of benefit as this could improve connectivity between the town and to neighboring places such as Sheffield.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Sustainable ST50-Promoting Transport			
REF222	Notts CC	A Rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) has been conducted using the Nottinghamshire Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix which is detailed in Appendix One. The HIA has highlighted 5 elements which will need to be considered as specific recommendations, these are outlined within the relevant section and again within appendix one. In relation to accessibility and active transport, it is recommended that the relevant policies set the requirement to ensure there are accessible buildings and places to enable access to people with mobility problems or a disability.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to transport we also appreciate the significant impact this can have to support people to remain active, in employment, promote community connectedness, support economic growth etc. We would encourage BDC to ensure there is extensive community transport links for all developments which are also compatible with environmental sustainability and limit air pollution. We would also encourage any new housing growth to be based on the concept of adaptability and fully incorporate the 'Internet of Things' so that all new housing offers flexible adaptation for residents as they transition throughout their life rather than creating additional demand for specialised housing in the future. 	The District Council has an active role in support community transport operations throughout the District. The Council also works closely with NCC and transport providers to make sure the services provided are the most effective and accessible to rural communities and those that need it.
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>We welcome this policy, especially "B. All developments of 10 or more dwellings and non residential development of 1000sqm or more floorspace, will be supported subject to the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot; Protection of, connection to, and extension of where practicable, existing pedestrian, cycle and equestrian routes as part of a convenient, safe and attractive network for users; Public transport enhancement where justified, including measures to encourage public transport use". <p>The recognition in 3. that measures to encourage public transport use will (often) be needed is welcome. Rigorous assessments independent of applicants and developers will, however, be necessary to ensure that the "where justified" condition in 3. is not used as a reason not to provide public transport alternatives.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF283	Resident	ST50 156 11.2 Whilst recognising the need to prioritise walking and cycling infrastructure in the Main Towns and Large Rural Settlements, it omits potential links between them which could form components of longer-distance routes, eg. Retford – Sutton-cum-Lound; and Worksop – Carlton-in-Lindrick – Langold. The Context (3.19) has expanding the network as a priority.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1197288	Resident	Developing a railway station at the Bassetlaw Garden Village is a brilliant plan. There must be careful thought given to make sure that train providers are incentivised to provide decent services to Bassetlaw stations. At the moment, for example there is an unworkable gap in trains between Doncaster and Retford at the end of the working day - no trains between 16.26 and 17.46. LNER say this is because they design schedules for cities like Doncaster, with millions of passengers, rather than the thousands from Retford. To make the Garden Village station work, train providers must be required to consider the needs of town commuters who need the trains to work. This is essential to this strategy working without increasing Bassetlaw's carbon debt.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF404	Resident	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Propose that the District Council presses for a continuation of the Robin Hood rail route (Worksop – Nottingham) as far as the growing town of Retford. Cycle routes in Retford cycle routes are not safe and have not been maintained or developed. Markings and covered tarmac defining the edges of roads as dedicated to cyclists peter out, have worn away, are 	The Local Plan supports the improvement to and creation of new sustainable transport modes over the plan period. The proposed new train station at the Garden Village provides sustainable transport infrastructure to accommodate and

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Sustainable Transport			
		<p>parked on and are unsafe and inadequate. There has been no action to extend any cycle routes to recent housing developments.</p> <p>3. Proposal to build a devastating development of zero energy housing we don't need any more devastating units that have been done for years. I propose that BDC takes a stand, shifts up a gear and insists that all new housing is built to zero energy efficiency we have ran out of time.</p> <p>4. No housing without infrastructure – radical upgrade of schools, public transport, cycles ways, public spaces, medical provision in advance of further population growth.</p>	support the development of th site and reduce the traffic on the A1. It is important that the train station is delivered early on to encourage people to use the facility rather than their car. A new public transport hub will also be created to provide additional bus services to Retford and Worksop. The site, along with other large allocations will also need to provide green infrastructure and improved connectivity to other areas. This could be in the form of footpaths and cycleways.
REF222	Councillor, Notts CC	<p>The plan does not incorporate any community safety policies and should reference issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan should prescribe the size of car park spaces which are large enough to use. • Car parking facilities should be designed to have CCTV installed in them as part of the design of a development. • Housing developments should be built with key safes and safes as part of the development process. 	The size of car parking bays and their standard will be subject to the Nottinghamshire County Council parking standards and the advice from the Highways Department.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST51- Safeguarded Land			
1177432	Resident	The creation of a railway station in the new garden village is fully supported. Would make a significant difference to many people.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways Can the policy include the need to safeguard links suitable for all traffic where a site abuts land likely to come forward for development or come forward for development in the future in order to safeguard connectivity.	Noted. A reference has been made to other forms of traffic i.e. cycle/footpaths.
REF484	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	The existing, disused branch line from the South Yorkshire Joint Line and its former alignment along the edge of the industrial estate should be protected so that a future light rapid transit could connect the area with Doncaster.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST52 - Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
REF115	Canal and River Trust	As explained previously, significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure and it is therefore essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers, where necessary, in order to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust's assets. We welcome the account given in paragraph policy ST52 that developer contributions will be required to meet the infrastructure requirements of new development, which should account for the potential demands on the wider walking and cycling network in proximity to new development sites.	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST52 - Provision	and Delivery of	Infrastructure	
REF116	Network Rail	<p>It is important that the policies within the Bassetlaw Local Plan reflect the aspirations of Network Rail and the wider rail industry as far as they are known at this stage, and that the plan provides suitable flexibility to support future growth of the railway for both passenger and freight services. The railway network is a vital element of the country's economy and a key component in the drive to deliver the Government's sustainable agenda. Passenger growth of 40% is predicted to 2030 and freight tonnage moved by rail is expected to double in the same period. In addition, Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining, operating and developing the main railway network and its associated estate. Our aim is to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure; therefore any proposed development which is in close proximity to the railway line or could potentially affect Network Rail's specific land interests will also need to be carefully considered. In relation to the overall plan, we note the policies of the transport chapter and the references in particular to the provision of a new station at Bassetlaw Garden Village, on which we comment separately below. Two general points in relation to the transport policies concern the opportunities for third party enhancements to station facilities in particular (especially where the rail industry is not funded to provide as such, including step-free access at stations) and it is noted that such additional funding may be available through the Community Infrastructure Levy. As such the Policy ST52 is supported but we would ask for some additional comments such as the inclusion of Network Rail as a partner in paragraph 11.4.3, and reference to railways in paragraph 11.4.9 where it should make reference to the need for level crossing safety improvements in particular to be captured through an appropriate S106 mechanism. However we would appreciate further thought as regards the provision of policy wording surrounding level crossings. Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications proposing development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order). It is important that policies within the plan acknowledge the need for the impact of new development to be assessed and mitigated, both on an individual site by site basis, as well as the cumulative impact of multiple site allocations and/or windfall sites brought forward in the plan period. Within the plan area, there are over 20 level crossings (both pedestrian and vehicular); although it is encouraging to note the commitment to look at the possibility of rationalisation at Bassetlaw Garden Village, the principle applies to development close to or affecting all our level crossings. As such we would advocate a slight change to Policy ST52 to emphasise that there may be some safety related works at crossings also required (this could be covered by a simple alteration to point B2 of ST52, viz. off site capacity and safety improvement works of infrastructure)</p>	<p>Agreed. The Council is working closely with Network Rail through the development of the proposed Garden Village and the associated new Rail Station. The Council has produced technical notes with regard to the proposed Rail Station and understand that Network Rail have been part of its preparation. The Council will continue to closely engage with Network Rail and others through the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Part C. Where off site transport infrastructure is not named on a list of CIL funded schemes then infrastructure will need to be wholly funded by the developer and secured by planning condition i.e. rather collecting money.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>5.7.1 Gladman note the proposed approach towards infrastructure provision that is set out through Policy ST52. It is intended that the identified infrastructure set out in the Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be provided through a combination of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Developer Contributions, and appropriate funding assistance from Council's, central Government and funding partners. 5.7.2 The allocation of Bevercotes Colliery as an additional Priority Regeneration Area can provide the necessary mitigation 'across the board' and mitigation measures can be included as part of appropriate conditions or planning obligations associated with the redevelopment of the site where necessary.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST52 - Provision	and Delivery of	Infrastructure	
REF310	P&DG	Policy ST52 sets out the Council's draft Planning Obligations. Within the Draft Charging Schedule January 2020, it states that a draft charge of £25 per m ² for residential development. The NPPF states the importance of small and medium sites in meeting housing requirement of an area, however it is expected that small-to-medium housebuilders would operate on these smaller sites and it is these smaller developers which may be disproportionately effected by the implementation of a standard CIL charge on residential floorspace at the currently specified thresholds. We are also aware that the implementing a review mechanism within the Section 106 agreements is becoming more widespread within Local Plans. However, P&DG would suggest that this review process needs to be mutually operative to both the applicant and the local planning authority. Part F of Policy ST52 states that the "council will consider a review mechanism in a S106", however the wording of this implies the right to exercise this is for the local authority.	Agreed. Thank you for your comments.
REF346	Doncaster Council	This Policy states that "The Council will work with neighbouring Local Authorities and infrastructure partners to ensure that the growth over the plan period is supported by necessary infrastructure in a timely manner". This should also apply to Doncaster Council as agreed as part of the discussion regarding the Doncaster Local Plan Statement of Common Ground.	Agreed. Thank you for your comments.
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	Provision and delivery of infrastructure needs to be based around size of the housing in any given development rather than amount of housing. 10, 3 bed room houses fall within ST52 but 9, 5 bedroom houses do not. Yet the latter will have a bigger impact on the infrastructure of the village.	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
1180445	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Sustainability Appraisal Appendices	The Sustainability Appraisal Appendices – supporting evidence document for the Local Plan, states on page 145: ‘The focus of 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. ’ https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5316/bassetlaw-sa-appendices.pdf This is simply untrue, any local cyclist will tell you that statement is untrue and I don’t think the County would make such a claim. The ‘cycling infrastucture in Worksop and Retford is extremely limited and patchy and County officers have acknowledged that to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee task and Finish Review on Cycling. There are few quiet streets that Aare easy to cycle around safely. Cycles are banned from the pedestrianised main streets. I suggest that you should not rely on this week evidence base!	Where new walking and cycle infrastructure is required as part of a new development, then this will be identified within the site specific policy and detailed through a Section 106 agreement through the planning application process.
1189264	Resident	Other comments	Overall, there seems to be a disconnect between conditions on the ground and the ideas being put forward. The aim of increasing employment opportunities in the area is laudable, but the question needs to be asked where do most people work already? For the existing population size it certainly can't be in Bassetlaw. That being the case, is the intention to simply become a housing estate for the larger urban hubs? How do you see Bassetlaw in the future? You currently have an attractive rural district, which seems like it is going to be swamped with warehouses, industrial units and urban sprawl. The approach put forward in this plan seems to be short sighted and lazy approach to a long term problem.	The location of new employment development is guided by the Local Plan evidence base. It is often the case that employment land is allocated where the market prefers for that specific use.
REF004	Rhubarb Farm	Other comments	Furthermore, Rhubarb Farm also requires protection within the following Policies of the Bassetlaw Plan:- ST41: Delivering Quality, Accessible Open Space ST42: Promoting Sport and Physical Activity ST43: Protecting Amenity	Noted.
REF022	Resident	Other comments	After over 25 years as a Director in the NHS I am reasonably familiar with public sector documents but found this 200 page plan very difficult to understand yet alone make intelligent comments about. It is obtuse, uses technical jargon to extreme and archaic English. I see little point in asking for comments from any but those technically, politically or commercially interested. Even so I would ask – How many councillors could answer any but the broadest question about the plan? I recognise you may be limited by legal or other extraneous constraints but if you want to initiate genuine consultation somebody is going to have to seive the gold out of this mountain of dross. Sorry not to be more helpful.	Noted.
REF029	Torworth Parish Council	Bassetlaw Spatial Startegy	Within the Spatial Stategy Document (Jan 2020) Torworth has been incorrectly identified as having a Village Hall – which therefore determines it as being classed as	This has been corrected within the latest version of the Plan. Torworth

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
		Background paper	a small rural settlement. We don't have one, or any of the other facilities that would class it as being a small rural settlement. How can this be corrected ?	is no longer listed as a Small Rural Settlement.
REF047	Sports England	Play Pitch Strategy	Clearly the recently completed Playing Pitch strategy will enable an understanding of sports pitch needs across the district and if new development should be provided with new facilities on-site or contribute to the improvement of existing facilities off-site. The Playing Pitch demand calculator can help to understand the demands generated by new development and how it can be met. It is important to keep the PPS up to date with regular reviews to check the action plan and priorities.	Noted.
1192494	Resident	Other Comments	The Council and Planning Department should be proud of this excellent piece of work	Noted.
REF085	Retford Civic Society	Other Comments	Retford Civic Society is pleased to see that progress is being made towards the adoption of an up-to-date Local Plan. This is badly needed so that there can once again be proper control over the location and scale of development. We urge the Council to progress this work through all the statutory stages as quickly as possible, subject of course to full consultation and, where appropriate, amendment. The Society has carefully studied the latest Draft Plan and has several concerns about its content which we trust will be considered by the Council as the work proceeds.	Noted.
1193617	Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council	Other comments	Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council has no major concerns, and has no specific objections to any of the proposals outlined in the draft plan. However, the proposal for development of the Cottam Power Station site does raise two matters.	Noted.
REF093 (NO UPDATES/E MAILS)	NP Examiner	Green Gap Study	I have examined several neighbourhoods plans recently elsewhere which have included Green Gaps (or similar sounding designations). In many cases they are effectively seeking to introduce semi-strategic policies which were either not included in the associated local plans or which were removed at examination. In your case it is heartening to see a well-researched and detailed strategic approach to the matter. The Study is both well-detailed and comprehensive. Plainly I do not know the nature of the wider District. However, in the parts that I do know the proposed Green Gaps have a close and functional relationship to well-defined landscape types (Green Gaps 2/3). The summary/overview in paragraph 4.6 is a particularly good analysis. The general commentary about Green Gaps demonstrates how a different approach is justified beyond that which would normally apply in the countryside. This is an important point. Other Plans have either failed to grasp its significance or have not produced the evidence to justify the approach taken. In terms of the details: Paragraphs 5.5-5.8 – it is good on the one hand to distance Green Gaps from Green Belts. However, paragraph 5.7 appears to go into too much detail on Green Belts. Some elements of Section 5 do not naturally	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			follow on from section 4. In particular: • Paragraphs 5.12-5.15 could be extended/refined so that they would directly address the point in paragraph 4.6 (5) about Green Gaps being the minimum size to achieve the desired effect; • Paragraphs 5-5.9 could usefully be amended to address the point in paragraph 4.6 (3) about complementing growth proposals. As currently drafted their focus is mainly on an academic comparison between Green Gaps and Green Belts.	
REF114	Ranskill Parish Council	Draft CIL Charging Schedule	Ranskill Parish Council are concerned by the proposed reduction in CIL from £55 per square metre currently in place in rural East Bassetlaw to £25 per square metre. The Plan requires that rural villages with very limited infrastructure and facilities take on increased population at the same time as the existing financial climate has led to fewer and fewer grants being available. Although there will be a corresponding increase in Precept from new residents this does not provide sufficient finance for new projects and enhancements to village facilities. Ranskill Parish Council notes that there is no evidence that the current CIL rate has put off potential developers in rural East Bassetlaw. Paragraph 3.16 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule requires clarification. It implies that any development of 50 houses or more will not be charged CIL. The Parish Council has sought clarification that this only applies to sites specifically allocated in the Local Plan (these include sites in the towns and the five large rural settlements). They understand that this means that small rural settlements – including Ranskill will not be impacted by this change. However, we believe that this needs to be made completely clear in the CIL Charging Schedule.	The proposed CIL charge is based on Whole Plan Viability Assessment and is the maximum that can be achieved in balance with affordable housing and developer contributions.
1194992	Resident	Other Comments	Development should be based around expansion of existing settlements not creating new ones which are less cost effective. Needs to be quality employment in the area not for it to become a dumping zone for warehousing.	Noted.
REF136 (LAA) (PDF)	A and D Architecture	Evidence Base	1) The Council should supplement its Evidence Base by assessing for itself the needs of the group in the community aspiring to living in a Park Home static caravan. The statement below in Subsection Coffers both primary and secondary research data that the Council might use for this purpose without investing disproportionate resources.	Noted.
REF136 (LAA) (PDF)	A and D Architecture	Duty to Cooperate	The Council has a Duty to Provide for the Needs of People wishing to Adopt Static Caravan or Houseboat Lifestyles in the District and should allocate land in the Local Plan to serve these Groups in the Community and the Developers wishing to serve it.	Noted.
REF136 (LAA) (PDF)	A and D Architecture	SHMA-OAN	There is no evidence in the SHMA-OAN update 2017 or the DBLP to indicate that the needs of people aspiring to live in static caravans or house-boats in the District or the need amongst developers for land to meet the needs of this group in the community have been studied and assessed and provided for. The duty extends to people resorting to the District. This shortcoming in the evidence is reflected in the	The local Plan provides policy mechanism for the type and mix of new homes across the District. This includes homes for older and younger people and the need for

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Local Plan which makes no allocation of housing land to meet the needs of this group in the community (whether living inside the District now or resorting to it). Many of the people in this group in the community fall within the group of older people that are expressly mentioned in paragraph 61 of the NPPF and deserve specific housing land allocation accordingly. The SHM A-OAN 2017 appears to consider only those older people who become ill and disabled and have design-related housing requirements and makes no specific recommendations for retired older people who do not have design-related needs in their housing. The SHMA-OAN 2017 likewise excludes this group from the category of people in need of an affordable home despite the fact that there is a clear link between their aspiration for equity release and the affordability of property they aspire to own (SHM A -OAN 2017 appears to understand "affordability" in terms only of entry level to the housing market instead of considering the question more broadly- as the PPG requires - and considering the needs of down-sizers; consequently it overlooks this group in the community whose needs are frustrated by the housing market but for the reason that demand is not balanced by supply : the price may or may not be right but the product is simply not available in sufficient quantity. However that failure in this part of the evidence base to capture the needs of this important minority group in the community does not mean it is justified or positive planning or consistent with national policy for the DBLP to make no provision for increased housing choice for this group in the community. People in this group do not necessarily wish to build their own homes or pay someone else to do it for them. They pick their homes from the market or more rarely choose a factory-built product for their plot with the agreement of the Site Owner. Simply because the SHMA-OAN 2017 overlooks this group in the community does not relieve the Council of its duty to support them by " significantly boosting the supply of homes" (Paragraph 59) that meet the needs of this group. By the phrase "including but not limited to" (our emphasis) Paragraph 61 orders the Council to provide for the needs of identifiable groups in the community and not just those groups that the SHMA-OAN identifies as having a monetised or design-related or DIY need for increased housing choice. Paragraph 61 mandates a broad and inclusive evidence base and policy response. By explicitly stating that a "wish to commission or build"(our emphasis) a home generates a valid need for housing land the Paragraph broadens the traditional concept of housing need and makes it clear that a Council duty to provide housing land exists wherever an identifiable group in the Community has a particular life-style aspiration that demands allocation of land to meet it. The lifestyle aspirations of people wishing to take advantage of the static caravan Park Home Lifestyle model are entirely valid and should be recorded, assessed and</p>	<p>accessible homes for those with disabilities or specific needs. In addition, the provision of affordable housing also seeks to provide the housing market with low cost homes to help meet the affordability need across the District.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			provided for in the Evidence Base but are not. Consequently, informed housing Policy in the DBIP should but does not significantly boost the supply of housing land for people aspiring to live in a static caravan or in a houseboat. The evidence base fails to capture the needs of this group. This makes the local Plan defective on three counts - lack of justification, lack of positive planning and lack of conformity with national policy (Paragraph 35). The local Plan is also of questionable legality because inadvertently it discriminates against a group in the community without justification. The lack of evidence of joint cross border working - especially in regard to the question of cross-boundary working to meet the needs of people resorting to static caravans in the District - casts doubt on the effectiveness of the DBIP too . Therefore, the Local Plan should make provision for proportionate growth in the Static Caravan Sector and in the different Houseboat Sector.	
1195060	Resident	Other comments	Improved , affordable, frequent and well run public transport needs to be a key feature in any further housing development as key roots in and out of Retford are already under severe pressure and certain times in the day	Noted.
1195216	Resident	Other comments	Who will maintain any trees planted to ensure survival? There should be a passenger rail link into Cottam upgrading the existing line No houses should be built on any flood plain. The A1 junction with the B6387 at West Drayton should be improved to facilitate the development of the Bevercotes site. Each new house built should have mandatory 2 off road car parking spaces	Noted.
1195356	Resident	Community Infrastructure Levy	You quote this yet following your review , we find out this has now been scrapped so no money for infrastructure , so your planning on building 1500 houses (Peaks Hill Farm ST15 HS1) , 3000 people minimum and 3000 potential cars but not doing anything to the roads or creating schooling or doctors or dentists to cope with demand which is currently at its max 6 week wait for doctors appts and 8 week ait for standard dental check up.	Sites of more than 50 dwellings will be exempt from CIL charge due to their viability. But infrastructure will be provided for through developer contributions and planning conditions.
REF169	Highways England	Transport Assessment	We welcome that the Plan acknowledges the need for all major developments in the area to be supported by Transport Assessments to demonstrate the impacts on the highway network and determine the need for mitigation. We have no further comments to provide at this stage but reiterate that it would be beneficial to continue to engage with the Local Planning Authority in order to agree an approach for any future mitigation needed on the A1 to support the delivery of the planned growth.	Noted.
REF171	Bawtry Town Council	Duty to Cooperate	The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 says very little about the Duty to Cooperate. It is acknowledged at paragraph 1.11, and at paragraph 1.11.4, regarding infrastructure, there is a statement that Bassetlaw District Council has worked positively with infrastructure partners such as Nottinghamshire County Council, the	The Council has worked closely with Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council on the production of the Local Plan and cross boundary issues

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			Integrated Care Partnership, Anglian Water and Severn Trent Water. Unsurprisingly this list does not include Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, which has said “Substantial development has already occurred in Harworth & Bircotes without adequate consultation with DMBC.” To date, we have heard nothing from Bassetlaw District Council about exploring the “potential of a Statement of Common Ground with Bawtry Town Council”. In the light of the above, we must re-iterate it is the statutory duty of Bassetlaw District Council to comply with the Duty to Cooperate. We need to receive assurance that the impact of the expansion of Harworth & Bircotes upon Bawtry will be satisfactorily mitigated. We also feel there is a need for clarification regarding the significance of the reference to the Doncaster Sheffield Airport Corridor in paragraph 6.1.2. The context is about economic planning, especially for manufacturing and logistics, with Bassetlaw being described as a “key location” for increased business productivity and growth. Are there development plans in this Corridor which may adversely impact upon Bawtry? We look forward to hearing from you further.	such as Highways. This has been addressed within the Council’s Bassetlaw Transport Assessment.
1195879	Hamlin Estates TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services	Other comments	Overall it is considered that the Plan tries hard to identify and deliver the level of growth required - it needs to ensure delivery and, in this regard, the minimum housing target should be increased. There is also an inherent conflict within the draft Plan in that overall housing targets are, correctly, set as a minimum whereas the housing distribution is set as absolute upper targets. There has to be flexibility built into policies to ensure delivery so that needs are met.	Noted.
1195884	Resident	Other comments	I think the councils should liaise with the coalboard about reclaiming land under the spoil heaps. The spoil could make good foundations for housing or roads and the subsequent land used for housing and industry. My main concern is for the available land for food growing in the future, for future generations. I hope my points will be taken seriously especially about using the land at Peak Hill Farm which is good growing land	Noted.
1195889	Resident	Other comments	To safeguard future disagreements on the local plan, it is essential that all wording is clear and precise so that the plan is implemented as envisaged.	Noted.
REF182 (LAA)	DHA Planning	Policies Map	Further to the discussion above in relation to policy ST10, we have some concerns about the way this policy has been annotated on the Policies Map. In particular: • There are inconsistencies in the mapping. EIP has been identified as an Existing Employment Site on the Workop map on page 16 of the Policies Map booklet. However, Existing Employment Sites are not shown at all on the district-wide plan on page 4 of the Policies Map booklet. Whilst this may matter less on other sites, in the case of EIP it means that the site appears to be located in open countryside without any formal designation, making it appear as if development would be	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			prohibited there. • Furthermore, the shading applied to the Existing Employment Sites designations is very light and difficult to read on the screen. A darker hue should be used for greater clarity. I would be grateful if the above points could be taken into account in the next draft of the Plan. If you would like to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to contact me.	
REF182 (LAA)	DHA Planning	Explore Industrial Park LAA	<p>These representations are prepared on behalf of Laing O'Rourke in respect of the Bassetlaw District Council Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation held in January and February 2020. Our client controls Explore Industrial Park and has been developing it for industrial development over the last few years. It is essential that the site is properly recognised as forming an important part of the Council's economic development strategy in the emerging Local Plan. Background Explore Industrial Park Our client controls Explore Industrial Park (EIP), a major cross-boundary employment site to the west of Worksop. The EIP site is a large former quarry, colliery and brick refractory site which was acquired by Laing O'Rourke in 2007. The site area is divided almost equally between Bolsover (Derbyshire) and Bassetlaw (Nottinghamshire). However, the area within Bassetlaw district comprises the most developable land. Planning permission was granted in 2007 for the existing pre-cast concrete manufacturing facility,¹ followed in 2010 by outline planning permission for a master-planned class B1/B2/B8 off-site manufacturing hub on the wider EIP site.² Due to the nature of the proposal, 10 years were allowed for the submission of reserved matters. Our client has invested millions of pounds into the site to date. A new off-site manufacturing facility making pre-cast concrete products was constructed in 2008 together with a new access road onto the A619. In addition, other enabling works have taken place, including decontamination of the entire site, ecology translocations and the creation of a substantial new ecological mitigation area, interim drainage works including the realignment of part of Darfoulds Dyke in accordance with the approved masterplan and structural landscaping across the site. Development platforms have also been created across the entire site. The site has therefore been subject to substantial investment to ensure that it is ready and available for development. Planning permission has since been granted for a further large-scale manufacturing facility (the "AMF") to the west of the current factory, within Bassetlaw district. Development has formally commenced on that site. There are two further development parcels available for development within the part of the site falling within Bassetlaw district, both of which are currently used on an interim basis as open storage and car parking in association with the existing factory use, for which planning permission was granted in 2018. However, the longer-term plan is to develop further industrial buildings on these parcels. Overall, around 16ha</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>of employment land is available at the site within Bassetlaw. Two prototype buildings (an apartment block and a large house) have been constructed on one of the Bolsover plots, for testing and marketing purposes in order to showcase the company's products. Around 270 people are employed at the existing manufacturing facility. Once developed in full, the permitted masterplan scheme is likely to employ in excess of 1,000 people overall (including the sites within Bolsover as well as those in Bassetlaw). Current Bassetlaw Local Plan The site does not benefit from any specific designations on the current 2011 Proposals Map. As a result, in planning terms, the site is treated as being in the open countryside. The adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD 2011 is silent in relation to the site. As a result of the site not being formally recognised as an employment site, and being located in the countryside, Policy DM1 (Economic Development in the Countryside) applies. This policy is aimed at rural employment uses generally, rather than a major employment development site such as EIP. Scope for future development As noted in our previous representations, contrary to the incorrect summarisation of the site in Table 17 of the Council's latest Economic Development Needs Assessment, EIP is not yet a fully-developed employment site. The statement that there is no vacant area remaining does not paint a fully accurate picture.³ Whilst all of the plots within Bassetlaw are either in permanent or temporary use, some of the existing plots are being currently used for external storage on an interim basis rather than the more intensive and substantial uses proposed in the permitted masterplan. These plots remain available for longer-term development for B1, B2 and B8 uses. Laing O'Rourke regularly bids for major construction projects, some of which may require further facilities to be constructed at EIP, depending on the nature and location of the project. Laing O'Rourke has previously undertaken pre-application discussions with Bassetlaw District Council about plans for such potential buildings, although to date the buildings have subsequently not been required. However, in the event of a successful bid requiring a new facility to be constructed, it will often be necessary to erect the building quickly. As a result, whilst at present there are no detailed proposals for any of the under-utilised Bassetlaw plots, that position is liable to change rapidly should a particular contract require development of these plots. Off-site manufacturing restriction The current masterplan permission is limited to uses which form part of an off-site manufacturing hub concept. Condition 4 states: The Reserved Matters submitted in accordance with conditions 1 and 2 shall be accompanied by a Statement demonstrating the way in which the proposal forms part of the off-site manufacturing hub concept as described in the application documents (i.e. a centre of manufacturing excellence that will benefit from efficiency and sustainability gains</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>through the use of shared resources on a single site". The site is now a well-established employment site with substantial investment having taken place as set out above. If the current restriction of off-site manufacturing uses was to be lifted and a general B1/B2/B8 allocation confirmed, this would allow greater flexibility, assist with investment decisions and encourage further job growth at the site. In this scenario, the landowners could market parts of the site for alternative employment uses where this would not conflict with the smooth operation of the existing site, further enhancing employment prospects. As set out further below, Bolsover District Council has agreed that it would be appropriate to lift this restriction in its emerging Local Plan. Emerging Bolsover Local Plan Bolsover District Council is at a very advanced stage in preparing its own Local Plan, with the Inspector issuing her report in January 2020. Bolsover's Planning Committee has recommended that the Full Council now proceed to adopt the Local Plan, and the plan is expected to be adopted in March 2020. The new Bolsover Local Plan allocates the developable parts of EIP within its jurisdiction for general B1/B2/B8 employment uses. These are not restricted to off-site manufacturing uses. To date, Bassetlaw and Bolsover District Councils have worked closely on all strategic matters relating to the EIP site. For example, the Councils collaborated closely on the outline planning permissions, which include the same conditions and wording on both permissions. We have welcomed the support of Bolsover District Council in allocating their part of the site for general employment uses, and we request that Bassetlaw takes the same approach in its emerging Local Plan. This would be appropriate, especially given that paragraph 9.9 of the Council's latest Economic Development Need Assessment recognises that EIP is one of eight important employment sites within the district.⁴ It goes on to note that: "These are good quality employment sites and there should be a presumption of retention for continued employment uses. However, it is recognised that some operational flexibility may be required."</p>	
1196000	Resident	Other comments	<p>I haven't responded to all of the issues covered because I have no strong feelings either way. I also have little faith that these words will be turned into action because the local authority will be undermined by national government unless there is a serious commitment on the part of government to support the councils across the country. As a result, some of the points I've made under specific sections can be seen more generally. If we want to minimise the impact on the environment, we need to deal with having appropriate infrastructure in place and incentives for people to stop using cars and either have facilities in easy walking distance, or have public transport that is cheaper than the car and, more importantly, reliable and</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			gets people where they want to be at times they need to be there. Just building houses evenly scattered across the district won't achieve any of that.	
1196005	Resident	Other comments	I am writing to offer general support for the overall direction and growth ambitions set out in the latest draft of the Bassetlaw Plan. In recognition of the challenges faced by the District in its urban and rural areas over the course of the plan period, the ambitiousness of the planned levels of housing and economic growth are to be applauded, yet also, on the evidence of the Housing Delivery Test Data, considered realistic and deliverable.	Noted.
1196005	Resident	Other comments	In addition to the above matters the revised location of the proposed Garden Village is sensible, along with the proposed development at Cottam (Policy ST5). Furthermore, cycleways should, wherever possible, be provided in separate lanes to vehicular traffic in order to improve user safety and to encourage greater use of bicycles and e-bikes in and around Bassetlaw's urban areas. While there is obvious merit in providing recreational routes, a strong emphasis should be given to connecting residential areas to the town centre and areas of employment, along with connectivity between Worksop/Retford and their respective outlying settlements. The terrain in the district means that if the infrastructure is in place, cycling could be a far more viable mode of transport.	Where new walking and cycle infrastructure is required as part of a new development, then this will be identified within the site specific policy and detailed through a Section 106 agreement through the planning application process.
1196060	Resident	Other comments	A major problem is trying to understand the jargon. As a layman I had difficulty in understanding and getting through such a hefty document. I would have preferred more debate and discussion and less toothless consultations	Noted.
REF199 (LAA)	Cushwake	Land Availability Assessment	4.14 In Chapter 7 of the draft Local Plan, a limited number of housing sites are identified as allocations. In the 2017 Land Availability Assessment: Housing Paper (2017) a wider range of sites were assessed including those included in 'rural settlements'. The most recent Land Availability Assessment prepared to support this iteration of the draft Local Plan only assesses land available for residential development in the three main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes together with the larger rural settlement of Tuxford. This approach is considered to be unsound as sustainable sites in locations that are well related to main towns are not assessed, for example Shireoaks. In the 2017 LAA, Land South of Woodend Farm (Ref: LAA364) was assessed as being suitable for housing and the site was considered achievable in the long terms subject to the that site and neighbouring sites achieving planning permission. As previously advised the adjacent site is already under construction and subject to a positive outcome either through the appeal process or resubmitted application on Land South of Woodend Farm, this site will be completed within 5 years and is considered a suitable site for residential allocation. 4.15 Although we have not undertaken a District wide assessment it is	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			likely that there will be other similar sites that have not been assessed in the latest LAA and that have the potential to make a contribution to the housing requirement of the District up to 2037.	
REF200	Notts CC	Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment October 2019	Page 2, Paragraph 1.2 Refers to paragraph 34 of the NPPF 2018. Whilst the paragraph number is the same it is considered that this should be amended to refer to the 2019 NPPF.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment October 2020	Page 9, Paragraph 2.3 Refers to paragraph 34 of the NPPF 2018. Whilst the paragraph number is the same it is considered that this should be amended to refer to the 2019 NPPF.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment October 2021	Page 32, Paragraph 4.28 The paragraph states that CIL has been in operation in the District since 2011. According to paragraph 2.3 of the Draft Charging Schedule, CIL was introduced in the District on 1 September 2013 The paragraph should be amended to reflect this.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment October 2022	Pages, 34-36 Paragraph 4.34 This relates to the Strategic Site Assessments which have been undertaken and refers to possible S106 contributions from the sites Whilst it is acknowledged that that these costs will change as negotiations take place; clarification on how these costs have been calculated would be welcomed especially for those which relate to NCC infrastructure. Such contributions should be calculated based on the approach set out in the County Council's Planning Obligations Strategy (or any document which may supersede this)	Costs have been calculated through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Some of infrastructure figures have also come from the Local Plan evidence base and from infrastructure partners.
REF200	Notts CC	Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment October 2023	Page 43, paragraph 5.6 It is noted that, as a result of the appraisal, the imposition of a CIL charge on the various strategic sites proposed in the Local Plan would make these sites unviable. As a result, it is proposed to have a zero CIL charge on the 9 proposed strategic sites. The County Council note this but is concerned that the lack of any CIL receipts on large strategic sites will prejudice strategic infrastructure provision. It is not clear what projects the CIL is intended to fund. It is assumed that S106 obligations will still fund matters directly related to the impact of the strategic site development which are necessary to make the development acceptable This is to help ensure that the site-specific infrastructure which is required, and which may	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment states that as a result of the site specific infrastructure required at the strategic sites, these sites should be CIL exempt. Infrastructure can be provided by a range of mechanisms including CIL, developer contributions and planning conditions. The Council will continue

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			be delivered by the County Council, is identified, secured and delivered in a timely manner to meet the needs of residents of these sites. Details of the infrastructure which may be sought by the County Council through Planning Obligations can be found in its Planning Obligations Strategy	to work with NCC to ensure that impacts upon strategic infrastructure are mitigated appropriately.
REF200	Notts CC	Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment October 2024	Page 48, Paragraph 6.15 The table underneath this paragraph sets out the potential CIL revenue. The CIL regulations state that, depending on whether there is a Neighbourhood Plan place or not; either 15% or 25% should be passed to the neighbourhood in which the CIL liable development takes place. The County Council would welcome clarification as to whether the potential CIL revenue takes account of the need to pass a proportion of the monies collected to the neighbourhood in which the CIL liable development takes place.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2020	Page 3, Paragraph 1.4 The document refers to the discussions which have taken place with various partners, including the County Council which have help the District Council gain an understanding of the infrastructure which will be required to support the Local Plan The County Council would wish to continue to work with the District Council as part of the ongoing production of the IDP. This is to help ensure that the District Council is aware of the County infrastructure that will be required to support the delivery of the Local Plan.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2021	Pages 9 & 10, Paragraph 3.1.2 The estimated costs for each junction improvement are too precise and should be rounded e.g. Junction 1 estimated cost in the table is £2,124,867 should be given as £2,125,000. It is not credible to give an accurate a figure as has been included in the IDP table at this time, since all the suggested improvements are based on notional preliminary design sketches and the costings make a number of simplifying assumptions. Amend costs of highway projects as per comments.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2022	Pages 9 & 10 Table in paragraph 3.1.2. In this table junctions 1,2 and 3 are the same junctions that appear on the CIL Regulation 123 list given in the table attached to paragraph 3.0.3. It is not clear if the junction improvements are the one and the same at these locations or whether a different scheme of improvement is identified in the Bassetlaw Transport study Part 2? If the same junction improvement scheme is required, then the costs of the improvement should be identical too? The costs estimates differ significantly between the two tables. The County Council request that clarification be provided on the various points raised about the transport schemes referred to in the table.	Noted. The Bassetlaw Transport Study has been updated to reflect proposed amendments.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Page 11, Paragraph 3.1.8 The total costs cited are overly precise and should be rounded accordingly, in accordance with any revisions made to table 3.1.2. In addition to the change requested in its comment on this paragraph; the County	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
		(IDP) January 2023	Council consider that the 'm' needs to be removed from the figure given as it is already given in millions.	
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2024	Page 11, Paragraph 3.1.8 This paragraph says that the total costs attributed to growth sites within the Local Plan is between £18,817,985m however it does not give another figure to show what this range is. The County Council consider that this paragraph needs amending to include another figure so that the range of infrastructure costs can be given and be made clear.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2025	Page 11, Paragraph 3.1.9 See comment above about the over precise nature of the costs of projects The County Council request that the figures contained in the table be rounded.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2026	Page 11, Paragraph 3.1.9 The County Council as local highway authority haven't committed/allocated any LTP funding to the monitoring referred to in the table. The County Council request that clarification be provided in respect of the reference to the £10,000 monitoring figure.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2027	Pages 11& 12, Paragraph 3.2.3 The County Council question why there is reference to the LTP as the County Councils transport programme is a series of capital projects. It doesn't fund any bus services or concessionary fares (these are funded from revenue streams). The County Council request that this paragraph be amended to reflect this.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2028	Page 13, Paragraph 3.2.11 The paragraph advises that "the distributor road should be designed to accommodate a bus lane" This is not the case; it should be designed to be served by buses, the detail of which will be established through the masterplan as mentioned in paragraph 3.1.4. on page 10.	Noted. The IDP will be amended accordingly.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2029	Page 13, Paragraph 3.2.12 The paragraph refers to bus service provision, but it states the costs (£590 per dwelling) are estimated from recent bus infrastructure costs. Bus service provision and bus infrastructure are two very different things and the costs aren't comparable in any way. It is considered that this needs to be checked and rectified as required. It is not possible to use bus infrastructure costs as a method of calculating likely costs of bus service provision. NCC will be happy to discuss further.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Pages 13 – 17, Section 3.4 Recent audits of the existing cycle routes (undertaken in late 2019) don't reflect the statements about the cycling networks included in Worksop and Retford (and elsewhere in Bassetlaw). Whilst there are existing cycle	Noted. The Council would welcome NCC's data.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
		(IDP) January 2030	routes, a number of them were introduced a long time ago and require improvements. The County Councils recent audit of existing infrastructure also identifies that in places the existing network is fragmented and suggests a number of potential improvements to it. NCC have up to date information regarding cycle routes which they would be willing to share with the District Council to allow the IDP to reflect the current position.	
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2031	Pages 13 – 17, Section 3.4 This section should also make reference to the D2N2 Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) currently in development which will help identify and prioritise future strategic cycling routes. This strategic network takes into account potential future development so should Amend this section as required. It is considered that provision of the network and funding of the network by developers should be referenced in the document.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2032	Pages 13 & 14, Paragraph 3.4.1 The County Council does not consider that Worksop and/or Retford have comprehensive cycling infrastructure (see comments above) The County Council would wish to work with both the District Council and site promoters to identify opportunities for improving the network where this is required to mitigate the impact of development.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2033	Pages 14 & 15 The maps showing cycle routes are from 2008. The County Council consider that these need to be updated using the most recent audits from 2019	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2034	Page 15, Paragraph 3.4.3 How does this calculation take into consideration national and/or local targets to increase cycling which should have an impact on both the capacity of the existing network and the likely future requirements for provision? Further clarification on this is sought by the County Council.	Walking and cycling infrastructure will be enhanced by new development where required.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2035	Page 15, Paragraph 3.4.4 As stated elsewhere in this response; – the County Council wouldn't agree with the statement that "Generally, Worksop and Retford, as well as the eastern edge of Bassetlaw towards Gainsborough, are well catered for in terms of cycling infrastructure" The County Council would wish to work with both the District Council and site promoters to identify opportunities for improving the network where this is required to mitigate the impact of development.	Walking and cycling infrastructure will be enhanced by new development where required.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Page 16, Paragraph 3.4.10 The County Council wouldn't fund walking or cycling improvements required to link to new developments through the LTP, it would be expected that these would be funded by the developer. The County Council would wish to work with both the District Council and site promoters to identify	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
		(IDP) January 2036	opportunities for improving the network where this is required to mitigate the impact of development	
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2037	Page 16, Table Under Paragraph 3.4.10 The table details three schemes that have already been delivered (in 2018/19 or earlier). The integrated transport programme is developed annually, and the final 2020/21 integrated transport programme will not be approved until April 2020 so it isn't currently possible to state if these schemes can be replaced with others. Remove table	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2038	Page 17, Table 5 Table 5 will need to be revised to reflect any changes to the prior tables, especially rounding of estimated costs. It is requested that the table be amended as required.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2039	Page 17, Table 5 As detailed earlier in this response; there is no LTP allocation to Worksop town centre monitoring; and there are no outstanding allocations to the last three schemes on the list (these have already been funded). The County Council request that further clarification be provided in respect of the reference to the LTP monitoring. The last 3 schemes listed on the table have already been completed in 2018/19 or earlier. Therefore, they can be removed as they are not outstanding.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2040	Page 40, Para 6.4 The last sentence sets out that where a new school is required, the base level of contribution will be an area of land for the required size of school, as defined by the DfE, plus the cost of building the school. Should there be a case where the cumulative impact of a numbers of sites generate the need for a new school; an equalisation agreement will be required which ensures that each developer will only pay for their proportion of the impact. There will also be a need for a school land contribution which will also be based on the proportion of the impact.	Noted.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2041	Page 42, Paragraph 6.14 In the first bullet point there is reference to 22FE. Amend to say 2 FE.	Noted. This will be amended accordingly.
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2042	Page 42, Paragraph 6.14, Page 43 paragraphs 6.23 and 6.26 The costs per place for permanent expansion and new schools is provided. This figure will be subject to change and the actual cost per place will be confirmed at that the time that a formal application is submitted to the District Council. It is recommended that a footnote be inserted to confirm that the costs per pupil place is subject to change / final confirmation at the time a planning application is submitted.	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2043	Page 55, Paragraph 8.1.8 and Page 58 Paragraph 8.2.15 These paragraphs state that NCC have not provided any evidence to justify the requirement for additional library stock / waste and recycling provision The County Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with the District Council to identify any physical infrastructure / financial contributions which may be required to mitigate the impact of the growth proposed in the Local Plan.	
REF200	Notts CC	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) January 2044	Page 61, Paragraph 10.6 It is noted that there are a number of options for the delivery of infrastructure and at this stage, no assumptions have been made as to how this will occur. The County Council would wish to discuss with the District Council its Infrastructure Delivery Plan noting the need for strategic plans to contain an Infrastructure Funding Statement to identify the ways in which NCC infrastructure, including education and highways will be funded, as required both at a site specific and strategic level i.e. through S106 contributions or the District Council's CIL.	Noted.
1196242	Resident	Other comments	As a rural district, we should be looking to protect and keep as many of our rural communities and small towns/villages as they are. Nature is great for people wellbeing and we need to make sure we protect that.	Noted.
1196338	Resident	Other comments	There will not be enough secondary school places in Worksop if the amount of proposed new homes are built. Outwood Academy Valley has been over subscribed for the past 3 years and Outwood Portland does not have the capacity to take many more students. Neither school was built with the intention of expansion and extending these schools could have a negative impact on the safety of students as corridors and stairwells become even more crowded. The way that the council has let residents know about this plan at the very last minute by posting leaflets through doors is highly disappointing and shows a lack of care for existing residents. Meetings were at times when people are at work or have children to collect from school. I feel this has been done to ensure that as few people as possible object. Many people in Bassetlaw are unaware that this plan even exists.	NCC are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan and advise on education provision in Bassetlaw. Where new education provision is required from new development, then this will be included within the Local Plan.
1196339	Resident	Other comments	There will not be enough secondary school places in Worksop if the amount of proposed new homes are built. Outwood Academy Valley has been over subscribed for the past 3 years and Outwood Portland does not have the capacity to take many more students. Neither school was built with the intention of expansion and extending these schools could have a negative impact on the safety of students as corridors and stairwells become even more crowded. The way that the council has let residents know about this plan at the very last minute by posting leaflets through doors is highly disappointing and shows a lack of care for existing residents. Meetings were at times when people are at work or have children to collect from	NCC are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan and advise on education provision in Bassetlaw. Where new education provision is required from new development, then this will be included within the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			school. I feel this has been done to ensure that as few people as possible object. Many people in Bassetlaw are unaware that this plan even exists.	
REF215 (LAA)	John Hunt on behalf of the Trustees of H S Wallis	Site off Harworth Road, Blyth	<p>1. The land is shown edged red on the attached 1/2500 scale plan and extends to around 2ha 2. As can be seen it sits between the A614 Bawtry Road on the east side to which it has a very short frontage and Harworth (Blyth?) Road to the west from which in the event of it being developed access would be taken. 3. The north-east boundary is defined by a very deep surface water drainage dyke with long established dwellings beyond. 4. The land is reasonably level has only been used for grazing horses and would drain towards the south-east corner. Surface run-off if required would go to the dyke after attenuation and foul drainage would go to the existing pumping station immediately on Bawtry Road. 5. There are no known ecological or environmental issues raised by the development of the site and the site is not subject to flood risk. 6. The site fits very well into the pattern of existing development of "North Blyth". 7. This fact is further emphasised when taking account of sites in the vicinity that have secured planning permission for residential development - these are shown edged brown on the attached plan with the number of dwellings approved noted. The sites edged with a broken brown line have been or are still subject to planning permissions for residential development and the purple edging defines land with permission for commercial/industrial development. 8. The site extends to about 2 hectares but not all of the land could be developed. That is partly because of the shape of the site but also the presence of the deep dyke along its boundary and the need to leave land available for its maintenance. 9. Also the owner is concluding negotiations with the purchaser of the adjacent land (which has permission for 10 dwellings) to enable a gas main to be laid from Harworth Road through the site along the southern boundary to Bawtry Road thus fulfilling a wish held by the Parish Council. 10. But there is also a further reason in that the drainage study commissioned for the site suggests that there may be a need to retain some of the site undeveloped in order to attenuate the run-off of surface water. 11. The developable area possibly extends to no more than 1.6ha about 4 acres but that area still remains triangular in shape. As a consequence the north-west and south-east corners would continue to present obvious difficulties in terms of sensible housing layout and design. Allowing for appropriate landscape treatment especially on the two road frontages and making assumptions about the amount of land that might need to be set aside for surface water run-off attenuation (probably at the south-eastern end) then the net area for housing could well be no more than 1.5ha or about 3.5 acres - perhaps some 35 dwellings. 12. That total would represent an appropriate density in this location, offers scope for a variety of dwelling design and</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			satisfies both the need to make the most effective use of land and remain sustainable.	
REF224	Notts CC	Policies Map	Registration Authority for Common Land and Village Greens: The Policies Map 1. Blyth Certain registered commons and village greens (Refs: CL50, VG30, VG31) exist inside the Development Boundary (ST1). Statutory rights of recreation and restrictions to works/development apply to this land i.e. consent for building works on Common Land falls under S.38 Commons Act 2006. Village Greens also carry very high levels of statutory protection. Unlawful works on Village Greens constitute both a public nuisance and a criminal offence. It is advised that the development boundary be amended. 2. Everton The Local Wildlife Site (ST36) north-west of Harwell 'The Barrow Hills' is registered as a Village Green (Ref:VG70). Statutory rights of recreation apply to this land. It is noted that the key to the Policy Map includes the category 'Registered Park or Garden'. It is suggested that all Registered Village Greens within Bassetlaw are included on the Policy Map under this category. 3. Harworth The Harworth Village Green (Ref: VG41) is shown as being within the Development Boundary (ST1). Unfortunately unlawful works have recently been carried out on this land. To avoid future breaches of the law, it is suggested that the boundary be slightly amended to exclude the Village Green. 4. High Marnham Part of the land designated for the High Marnham Energy Hub (Site EM0007) is registered as Common Land (CL54). Common Land in England and Wales is subject to both private rights of common and to public rights of access under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Accordingly, it is advised that formal procedures are undertaken (s.38 Commons Act 2006) for the deregistration/exchange of common land.	Noted. Policy amendments will ensure there is appropriate recognition of village greens and common land.
1196687	Resident	Other comments	Overall the document does not address the issues that bassetlaw suffers from . It does little to support existing amenities. The document is not fit for purpose. When existing policies are in place they are often ignored and no one is accountable. Sites are chosen for development and yet little is taken into account of the existing amenity etc such as NP11 and NP18. There are other examples throughout Bassetlaw.	Noted.
1196694	Resident	Other comments	Draft plan comments are in full here because this submission has taken so long to put in the various sections of the form, the form is not user friendly, there are matters which do not come under any of the questions yet relate to sections of the draft plan. There seems to be no mechanism for saving the form as I go back to the plan to check page numbers etc. There will doubtless be many submissions you have lost because the process is not user friendly. Submission in full is below	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF249 (LAA)	Pegasus Group on behalf of Edward Fisher	Land at Chestnut Road, Langold	<p>The area covering the site is predominately arable fields with limited landscape features within its boundaries. There are limited features which define the site, with the exception of a field boundary hedgerow to the west of the site and the A60 with adjacent field boundary hedgerow to the east. Intensive agricultural practices have eroded any notable landscape features or boundaries to the north, where field patterns have been lost. The illustrative masterplan proposals as set out in (ref: YOR.2473.020) provide an extension to the committed housing site on its northern and western edges. These proposals would extend approximately 165m further northwards and 140m westwards within the GG2 Green Gaps area to the north of Langold. 5.16 The development offers an opportunity to provide a robust landscaped edge to the north of Langold which would deter any future development towards the ancient woodlands of Dyscarr Wood to the west. Over time, the landscaped edge surrounding the development would provide new defensible boundaries to the edge of Langold and would prevent further reduction of open land between Langold and Oldcotes. Importantly, this new boundary would prevent development extending towards Oldcotes in a manner that would undermine the objectives of the Green Gap between the two settlements. 5.17 It is therefore understood that there is no reason why the Green Gap area be reduced in size to match the landscaped boundaries of the proposed development. Whilst this may be a reduction in the area of Green Gap between Langold and Oldcotes, this approach would not have any further impact upon the openness, appearance and functionality of the Green Gap, or of the landscape quality in the area when compared to that which will already come about from the committed housing site. 5.18 The extent of the reduction of the Green Gaps area to the north of Langold which it is understood could come about without any reduction in the objective of the Policy to prevent coalescence between Langold and Oldcotes, is conveyed on the plan below. As is demonstrated by the plan above, the reduction of the Green Gap would be minimal, and would still allow the Green Gap to function as it was intended without sterilising the site from being able to deliver future sustainable development.</p>	
REF249 (LAA)	Pegasus Group on behalf of Edward Fisher	Land at Chestnut Road, Langold	<p>The land subject to this representation comprises three parcels of land to the north of the existing settlement of Langold. Parcel A was granted outline consent for residential development (for approximately 300 dwellings) in November 2018 under application reference 15/01605/OUT. This application established number of principles on the site, including the principle access point. 6.3 Parcel's B and C have been submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' and are identified within the SHLAA under references LAA 209 and LAA 312. Development Opportunity 6.4 The above</p>	<p>The Local Plan is not proposing allocating any sites other than in Tuxford in the rural area. The Langold Neighbourhood Plan is considered to be the preferred route to consider sites in Langold.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>references land parcels represent an opportunity for a sustainable extension to the existing sustainable settlement of Langold. The below referenced masterplan (Ref. YOR.2473.020), whilst not covering the entirety of the land promoted, provides a conceptual illustration of how the land could be development for residential use with associated works and supporting services. 6.5 The submitted Illustrative Masterplan (YOR.2473.020) responds to the site's opportunities and constraints to show how the site may be developed in a sustainable manner to provide new homes for Langold. This masterplan is illustrative and any future development and the location of features, particularly the community hub and school, will be subject to further discussion with the Council and relevant stakeholders, namely the Parish Council. 6.6 It is understood that the local school, Langold Dyscarr Community School, is toward capacity and is certainly heavily constrained to accommodate any expansion within its existing site. The submitted illustrative masterplan includes provision for a school and community facilities within the future development of the site. The ability to facilitate a school within the development site offers the flexibility for: 6.7 The existing school to remain as currently operating and the creation of a further school to support the future residents of the proposed development site and a wider catchment area; or 6.8 The consolidation of the existing primary school with larger premises that allows provision for the future expansion as necessary. 6.9 Furthermore, a community hub is proposed which would support the sustainable growth of the village, providing a space for future investment of services and facilities. A number of areas of public open space are proposed within the site, both as standalone areas within the development, and as an extension of the existing playing fields provision to the south of the site. Policy Compliance 6.11 The future development of the land in question responds positively to the emerging development management policies of the Bassetlaw Plan. 6.12 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), states at paragraph 67 that planning policies should identify a supply of: 6.13 a) specific, deliverable sites for years on to five of the plan period; and 6.14 b) specific developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan. 6.15 By definition deliverable is: "To be considered deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. In particular: a) sites which do not involve major development and have planning permission, and all sites with detailed planning permission, should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within five years (for example because they are no longer viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			plans). b) where a site has outline planning permission for major development, has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.” 6.16 For developable this means: “To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.” 6.17 As discussed above, Parcel A of the Site is subject to outline consent as granted in November 2018 (ref. 15/01605/OUT) and is considered suitable to deliver approximately 300 residential dwellings and is attracting developer interest. All of the land promoted as part of this representation is under the same landownership and is considerable to be available and suitable for development across the plan period with Parcel A forming Phase 1 of a wider deliverable scheme.	
REF249 (LAA)	Pegasus Group on behalf of Edward Fisher	Landscape Study	This Site Allocations Landscape Study was identified directly in the text of Policy ST34 as one of the documents which have informed the creation of the policy (albeit the Policy text appears to erroneously refer to this as the ‘Site Allocations Assessment’). 5.8 The site is not considered within this report, and it should be noted that part of the site is already a committed housing site. There is therefore no evidence from this study which would suggest that the proposed site should need to lie within the area identified as Green Gaps.	The Landscape Assessment and Green Gap Report provide detail about the landscape quality on and around the development sites and/ or on areas of landscape in between or on the edge of existing settlements. These assessments will help inform the potential development of land from a landscape quality perspective.
REF249 (LAA)	Pegasus Group on behalf of Edward Fisher	Green Gap Study	This Green Gaps Report was identified directly in the text of Policy ST34 as one of the documents which have informed the creation of the policy. 5.10 The report gives limited explanation as to why certain areas within the local authority boundary are considered as green gaps over other areas. The initial sieving exercise as to what the local authority deems important to protect over other areas, is not included. Instead, the report only offers the following explanation of its approach at paragraph 1.2:.... Our client’s site lies partly within Green Gap 2 Oldcotes, Langold and Carlton in Lindrick, with most of the site already excluded from the Green Gaps Area, due to it being designated as a committed housing site. 5.12 The conclusions in relation to Green Gap 2 Oldcotes, Langold and Carlton in Lindrick, states: “The need to regenerate Firbeck Colliery, coupled with other planned and reactive commitments for new housing in Langold and the northern side of Carlton in Lindrick is leading to pressure on the open land that separates these distinct communities. The Green Gap enables these commitments to be fulfilled but will	The Landscape Assessment and Green Gap Report provide detail about the landscape quality on and around the development sites and/ or on areas of landscape in between or on the edge of existing settlements. These assessments will help inform the potential development of land from a landscape quality perspective.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			prevent further reduction of the open land between the three settlements..." 5.13 The primary purpose of the Green Gap in the vicinity of the site is therefore preventing the perception of coalescence between Langold to the south and Oldcotes to the north. It is not however considered that in order to achieve this aim a Green Gap designation would need to cover the full extent of the landscape between the two settlements. Rather it is understood that given the extent of the existing separation, it would be possible for further development to come forward to the north of Langold without undermining the objectives of the Green Gap policy. With this in mind the following section considers how the development at the proposed site could come forward in this manner.	
REF255	Sheffield City Region	Duty to Cooperate	Overall, Elected Members and officers from Bassetlaw District Council have played an active and participatory role in strategic cross boundary policy and project delivery at the SCR scale. This includes collaborating on issues relating to housing and planning, but also on transport, infrastructure, skills, and business investment and promotion. As noted in the Draft Local Plan, planning officers in Bassetlaw have worked particularly closely with other districts to develop a Sheffield City Region wide Statement of Common Ground . This has been an extremely valuable exercise and encompasses all the headline matters of agreement on housing, employment, transport and digital connectivity. As such, it is a strong basis for us to continue to work together and should enable us to develop more detailed agreements relating to the matters set out above. As such, I look forward to working together on the Draft Plan and other areas of mutual interest.	The Council will continue to work with relevant partners through DTC moving forward.
1196824	Resident	Other comments	Please think about adding as many wildflower areas as possible, and also keep in mind that drainage will be needed to help alleviate flood water	Noted.
REF256	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Duty to Cooperate	There are concerns around Duty to Cooperate and the absence of a Statement of Common Ground that covers detailed issues relating to the Local Plan. Reliance on the SCR Statement of Common Ground is considered insufficient in respect of the strategic employment policy ST8.	Noted. The Council will continue to work with the Sheffield City Region authorities to ensure that the approach taken to employment land is appropriately justified.
REF256	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Evidence Base	The amount of strategic employment land proposed does not appear to be sufficiently justified by the evidence base. Therefore, we would welcome further information that justifies this need.	Noted. The Council will continue to work with the Sheffield City Region authorities to ensure that the approach taken to employment land is appropriately justified.
REF263	Resident	Other comments	Finally can you tell me how we will know what modifications BDC make to the Local Plan. In other words, what is taken forward to Stage 4 in the consultation process please.	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Other comments	In our experience in preparing the Core Strategy, the Council was required to prepare extensive high-level documents; a Concept Framework with supporting studies to demonstrate the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of the proposed urban extension (Bassingthorpe Farm) was essential to demonstrate to the Inspector that both the Council and the landowners were supportive in bringing forward the site and that it was suitable and deliverable. A similar level of detail is likely to be required to support the identification of these two new settlements within Bassetlaw, as Paragraph 72 of the NPPF refers. There is a format error in the document in the last sentence of para. 6.4.3 (p.60 of the document)	Noted.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Duty to Cooperate	The previous version of the plan (Part 1, 2019) highlighted ongoing dialogue between the two authorities regarding capacity of the A57 and that the next step is to agree a statement of common ground. With regard to paragraph 1.11.3 of the 2020 consultation document, which recognises that further steps will be taken to agree and sign statements of common ground, the Council would welcome the opportunity for further engagement regarding the A57 and also the proposed Strategic Employment sites.	Noted. The Council will continue to work with the Sheffield City Region authorities to ensure that the approach taken to employment land is appropriately justified. The Council intends to progress work on the A57 jointly with neighbouring authorities including Rotherham.
REF270 (LAA)	Barton Willmore	Other comments	On behalf of our client, Howard Retford Ltd, please find attached our representations to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020. Our client has two land interests which are particularly relevant to the draft Local Plan. Those sites are: • Land to the South of Ordsall, Retford; and • Land to the south of Snape Lane, Harworth. Our Client's land to the south of Ordsall has been submitted to the Council via its Call for Sites in 2016 and has been promoted as a sustainable location for an "urban extension" to Retford including residential, employment and community facilities. Our Client's land to the south of Harworth has been promoted for circa 81ha of employment land and has been granted outline planning permission (LPA Reference: 15/00971/OUT) on 14th March 2017. A subsequent S.73 Application (LPA Reference: 19/00886/VOC) was supported at the Council's Planning Committee of 6th November 2019 and is subject to the signing of a S.106. Overall, we are supportive of the draft Local Plan's economic aspirations for Bassetlaw, however, it is our Client's position that the current drafting of the Local Plan does not seek to deliver sufficient housing and we consider its spatial distribution of development is unsound, failing to deliver sufficient growth to the Main Towns, particularly Retford.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
REF270 (LAA)	Barton Willmore	Land to the South of	Our Client's land to the south of Ordsall has been submitted to the Council via its "Call for Sites" process at the beginning of 2016. The Site has been discussed with the Council with a view to promote the land as a sustainable location for an "urban	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
		Ordsall, Retford	<p>extension” to Retford including residential, employment and community facilities. Our Client has produced and submitted to the Council a Development Framework Document that demonstrates how the Site can be delivered as a residential allocation for the plan period; a copy of that Development Framework Document is attached at Appendix 1 of these representations. 3.1 As detailed throughout these representations, we consider that the current drafting of the spatial strategy for Bassetlaw proposes a disproportionate requirement for housing in the least sustainable rural locations. Instead, taking into account the proposed ‘step-change’ for economic growth which shall be supported by housing growth we argue that a larger housing requirement should be proposed boroughwide with a particular increase in the requirement of new homes in Retford. 3.2 Our Client’s Site to the South of Ordsall in Retford constitutes a sustainable “urban extension” to the key centre of Retford. The Local Plan should focus on the delivery of urban extensions such as this as part of its approach to housing delivery in line with its settlement hierarchy which seeks to support development largely in the three Main Towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes. Those urban extensions should be allocated respective to their potential sustainability. 3.3 The sustainability of an urban extension will be dependent on the context in which it is delivered; including, but not limited to, its environmental surroundings and constraints, access to facilities and location on and access to the strategic road network. Therefore, we consider that our Client’s land to the south of Ordsall is a logical and sustainable location for an urban extension which will support the economic development within Retford and the wider borough area and has historically represented a growth area for Retford. 3.4 Retford is identified as playing a key role in maintaining the viability and vitality of the rural centre and east of the District as a service and transport hub. The continued growth of Retford is vital for the health of the surrounding rural areas and is vital for the District in meeting its wider development needs as demonstrated in the AMR data. 3.5 In order to deliver the Council’s aspiration for a step change, we have considered that a significant uplift in the delivery of housing to support economic growth will require the development of areas which are able to sustain higher levels of housing growth. Moreover, it is vital that the Local Plan brings forward development sites that are the most desirable to the housing market in a bid to boost housing supply and demand. 3.6 Our Client’s land to the south of Retford is a sustainable and attractive location for housing development and its continued growth is considered to somewhat underpin the success of the housing market within the District. 3.7 As detailed within the enclosed Development Framework Document for our Client’s Site in Appendix 1, the land to the south of Ordsall extends to 47.6ha and can accommodate approximately 850</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>open market and affordable homes as well as potential employment opportunities and community space. This would contribute a significant proportion of housing to the Council's housing requirement whilst supporting growth of a designated Main Town. 3.8 The Site should be allocated for development within the Local Plan due to its sustainable location on the edge of Retford and benefits a strong retail and employment offer, excellent transport connectivity (including by foot and cycle) and a range of open space and local facilities in Retford. 3.9 The strategic location of the Site benefits from access to the A1 and highways connects to the surrounding settlements without having the need to pass through the centre of Retford. 3.10 As discussed earlier in these representations, Retford benefits from well-connected transport infrastructure, including Retford train Station, highways connectivity to the surrounding settlements and a wide range of bus services. The routes of the no. 42 and no.47 bus services are located to the north of our Client's site providing regular services to Retford, Worksop and other local areas. Crucially, in terms of attracting national and international investment to the area, Retford is located on the main railway network with quick access to London. 3.11 The Site also benefits from existing footpaths to the north along Ollerton Road. There is additional pedestrian access via Brecks Road and a PROW which runs west from the site providing access to open countryside. 3.12 As set out within our accompanying Development Framework Document (Appendix 1) the site is not considered to be of any notable quality or value. The Site is suitable for development as it is largely devoid of any significant landscape features and the land is largely flat. The Council's Draft Landscape Study provides an assessment of potential allocations for the Local Plan. The majority of our Client's Site is assessed under parcel reference 16H (LAA276). The methodology against which the sites within the study have been assessed is not clear, however, some value appears to have been attributed to the Site by virtue of views which are available from the Site out to the open countryside. In the first instance, we consider that similar views could only be attributed a low level of importance and do not interact with any protected landscape and such views would be equally available from a new development edge should our Client's Site be developed. Moreover, no assessment appears to have been undertaken of the Site's landscape and visual quality from outside views. 3.13 It is worthy of note that we were unable to locate a comparative assessment of the landscape value of the proposed Garden Village Site at Babworth. 3.14 Development of the Site will not only provide the opportunity to provide new homes to the area but also provides the opportunity to support and enhance biodiversity. In addition, the Site is entirely within Flood Zone 1, the lowest risk of flooding, which further emphasises its suitability for development as an urban extension to Retford. 3.15 We note that the</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			Local Plan Policies Map proposes to designate the area the south and west of Retford as a Green Gap under emerging Policy ST34 of the Local Plan. This proposed designation is addressed later in these representations.	
REF270 (LAA)	Barton Willmore	Land to the South of Snape Lane, Harworth	Our Client's land to the south of Harworth has been promoted for development for circa 81ha of employment land. Outline planning permission (LPA Reference 15/00971/OUT) for the above development was granted on 14th March 2017. A copy of the planning permission and an indicative development masterplan for that proposal is attached at Appendix 2 and 3 of these representations respectively. Subsequently, a S.73 Planning Application (LPA Reference 19/00886/VOC) to amend the site layout, to aid the delivery of the Site through establishing development platforms to accommodate large buildings was supported at the Council's Planning Committee on 6th November 2019; and is subject to the signing of a S.106. A copy of the revised development parameters plans are attached at Appendix 4 of these representations. With regards to land to the south of Harworth, it is our Client's position that Harworth comprises a sustainable employment provision which is vital for the future economic success of Harworth and Bircotes as well as the position of the District's economy within the wider region and, therefore, supports its allocation (SEM2) within the Local Plan as employment land.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
REF270 (LAA)	Barton Willmore	Soundness of the plan	These representations express our Client's comments on the emerging policy approach and site allocations set out within the 2020 Draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on the delivery of housing and employment land. Our Client seeks to provide a commentary on the "soundness" of the Local Plan's approach in accordance with paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and in a positive manner as required by paragraph 16 of the NPPF. 1.10 We are supportive of the Council's economic aspirations for the district. However, it is our Client's position that the current drafting of the Local Plan does not seek to deliver sufficient housing across the borough to support those ambitions or to meet the needs of its communities. We consider that its approach to the spatial distribution of development is unsound. We consider that the Local Plan fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns, in particular towards Retford and consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas is excessive and not based on sound planning principles; including the proposal for a 'garden village' within the parish of Babworth which we consider to be unsound. 1.11 Where relevant, these representations look at the evidence base that supports the Local Plan. These representations go on to consider that each of our Client's sites, both of which are considered to be strategically significant and vital for the delivery of the District's housing and employment needs. It remains the position of Howard	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			Retford Limited that land to the south of Ordsall is a sustainable and logical location in which to provide housing development to help meet the housing requirements of the District and that the land should be allocated for development within the Local Plan.	
REF270 (LAA)	Barton Willmore on behalf of Howard Retford Ltd	SA	<p>2.82 We note that the Council has published its Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report January 2020 alongside the Draft Local Plan. 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. We do not consider that such an assessment has been adequately undertaken. 2.83 Paragraph 4.41 of the SA notes that the Council has reviewed its housing target options and has taken into account the SMOAN, updated ONS household projections and an updated evidence base, including a draft EDNA. It now considers the following development options: • Option 1: Government's standardised OAN figure – 306 dpa • Option 2: SHMA-based OAN – 374 dpa • Option 3: Overall housing requirement to support economic growth based on the Oxford Economics midpoint scenario (EDNA-based) – 390 dpa • Option 4: EDNA-based higher requirement to support economic growth based on the Experian midpoint scenario – 493 dpa 2.84 Paragraph 4.42 of the SA notes the revised set of four housing target options has now been appraised and the findings are presented in detail in Appendix 4 of the document. We note that the Interim SA report also made commentary in relation to how the options would contribute to HMA-wide OAN and city region employment ambitions. Paragraph 4.42 stresses that these have not been considered in this iteration of the SA for two reasons. Firstly, it was considered that up to date figures for wider needs were not available at the time of assessment. Secondly, 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. 2.85 The above is considered to be an inadequate assessment of alternative options for the Local Plan. 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. It is simply not clear why an increased figure of 636dpa has no longer been considered as a reasonable alternative. 2.86 Moreover, we consider that the assessment of the options above undertaken provides an oversimplified and misleading representation of the development options available. As set out within the SA, the benefits of the various 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</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			assessment of sustainability where planning guidance notes that sustainability of the plan can be enhanced through the provision of additional supply of housing; indeed, the Council has itself sought to boost the supply of housing above the minimum requirements of the SMOAN to increase the sustainability of the Local Plan.	
REF270 (LAA)	Barton Willmore on behalf of Howard Retford Ltd	Transport Accessibility Appraisal for the Potential Garden Village Locations	3.26 This document forms part of the Council's evidence base for the Draft Local Plan and was published in November 2019. It considers transport accessibility for the proposed Garden Village. 3.27 Paragraph 5.4.3 states that consideration should be given to providing a shared pedestrian and cycle route on the A57 and A1 between the site and Worksop. It also states that this route should be lit with a reduced speed limit. Additionally, further consideration is suggested for upgrading the existing footway along the B6420. Three Public Rights of Way (PRoW) are identified within close proximity to the Garden Village site. However, the report states consideration should be given to hard surfacing these routes to make them more suitable to support the development. 3.28 It is our position that the Garden Village will require extensive infrastructure works such as this which is deemed unnecessary considering the sustainable location for development at our Client's Site in Retford. 3.29 In terms of public transport, we emphasise at paragraph 7.3.1 that there are currently no noteworthy bus stops near the proposed new Garden Village. We reiterate again the benefits of the land to the south of Ordsall located near well-established bus routes as well as being in close proximity to local services and facilities.	Noted.
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	Other comments	Whilst we commend the invitation to offer views on the Plan, we would suggest there is further consideration of the overall accessibility to the document to support wider public engagement. The Plan is available in paper copy at council offices (Retford and Worksop) but only if requested and in office hours. Both the Plan and documents related to it are also available on-line but in our experience the site frequently crashed. This may deter some members of the public from engaging in the exercise.	Noted.
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that 'The Health and Social Care Act 2012 has radically changed the way in which health care services are planned and organised. These are primarily provided by the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). The CCG is responsible for planning and buying ('commissioning') local health care services with exception of GP Services, which are commissioned by NHS England. This section does not represent current arrangements; we would therefore suggest this is revised. We would be happy to support with any future amendment. 	Noted. Plan to be amended accordingly
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	Sustainability Appraisal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome the recognition within the sustainability appraisal that there is a need to safeguard existing health care facilities and services and ensure the timely delivery 	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			of new facilities and services to meet needs arising from new development. It is important to note again that increasing/improving access to existing service via appropriate transport is also important to ensuring access to health services and contribution to promoting healthy lifestyles/reducing health inequalities. However 4.11 with regards to health and wellbeing refers to ', because much of the new development is to be focussed at the urban edge or within the larger settlements of the District.... there is potential for these options to limit provision of new services and facilities (including those relating to healthcare) at the smaller, more rural settlements. This is because, while these options distribute development across the District, much of this will still be at the larger settlements and therefore there may not be the critical mass of additional development at smaller settlements to stimulate provision of new services and facilities'.	
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of overall planning and evidence there is multiple assessments, however there does not appear to be a health impact assessment or equality impact assessment which we would consider to be good practice. Health throughout the document is very much from a public health and healthy lifestyle perspective which is very welcome. We would also encourage greater acknowledgement of the wider determinants of health playing such a vital role in supporting people to live well for longer. This includes early starts, employment, adequate housing, transport, air pollution, education and training. As referenced above, without more information on anticipated changes to demographic profiles it is difficult to understand the full impact on NHS services, or to understand the nature and extent of services that will be affected. An increase in population would clearly increase demand it would be useful to model the likely scenarios when further information about the type of developments becomes available. 	Equality Impacts Assessments have been produced to support the Local Plan and the subsequent consultations.
1197023	Resident	Other comments	Why is the council proposing so much housing when evidence shows reduction in EU migrants. Unemployment is low and clearly the 'core' of native residents still unemployed when work is available indicates a wider social problem. Such people will not take up employment regardless of where oris or how much it pays.	Noted.
1197023	Resident	Other comments	I have no confidence at all in Bassetlaw Council elected members.They have presided for far too long over the area, with no vision for change. They are completely out of touch with large sectors of the community and appear to aspire only to low paid employment and second rate services. The amount spent on this consultation simply illustrates the mediocrity and limits of their own thinking and aspirations.Its time for a change and a merger with the County Council would widen the perspectives and aspirations of all.	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF275 (LAA)	Greg Wood on behalf of C. Howcroft and Sons by First Square Ltd.	SHLAA 2010 (site 52) Site South of Ordsall on the east side of Ollerton Road	In the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020, this site along with other areas has now been designated as 'Green Gap', a policy along with others we fundamentally disagree with. Our position is that this is a suitably sustainable, and deliverable location for an urban extension, which should be reflected in the local plan. In summary, it is our position that the current drafting of the Local Plan does not seek to deliver sufficient housing across the borough to support the ambitions of the plan or to meet the specific requirements of each community. We consider that its approach to the spatial distribution of development is unsound and unsubstantiated. The Local Plan fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns, in particular towards Retford, which is also being restricted by the unnecessary Green Gap policy. We consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas is excessive and not based on sound planning principles; this includes the proposal for the Garden Village which we consider to be flawed. Bassetlaw does not suffer from overcrowding and key centres such as Retford are suitable for urban expansion and would benefit from further growth to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability as well as the vitality of surrounding rural settlements. Regardless of whether the infrastructure is feasible, it is our Client's view that existing Main Towns already offer these facilities and services and would be better suited to deliver additional growth. It is the position of Graham Howcroft that land to the south of Ordsall is in a suitable and sustainable position to provide housing development to help meet the housing requirements of Bassetlaw District Council and that the land should be allocated for development in this Local Plan. This site has considerable history and has previously been considered sustainable and deliverable by Bassetlaw District Council and has access provisions already in place for full access, requiring comparatively low infrastructure costs and should be included in the plan and represented in ST14. We trust the above is of interest to you and will be considered when amending this Local Plan.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
REF275 (LAA)	Greg Wood on behalf of C. Howcroft and Sons by First Square Ltd.	Green Gap Study	The Green Gap Study used has been prepared to ensure the area of important landscape in sensitive locations are safeguarded. The study refers to pressure to develop, in some cases, into the countryside and will continue over the next 20 years. In order to achieve Bassetlaw District Council's growing needs, it is not sustainable to prevent development on suitable urban fringes which have no risk of merging with any other settlement.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
REF276	Bassetlaw District Council	Other comments	The Consultation Events I believe have been reasonably well attended and certainly staffed with helpful and knowledgeable officers of the Council. But there have been an insufficient number of events. Those events that have been held were insufficiently advertised, there were some useful and eye catching flyers produced,	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			rendered ineffective through lack of distribution. A leaflet through every door in Bassetlaw ought to have been the prelude to the Consultation. Not everyone relies on Social Media and swathes of our constituents remain unaware that a Consultation has taken place and of the profound changes it might bring to them and wider Bassetlaw.	
REF276	Bassetlaw District Council	Community Infrastructure Levy	The changes are not acceptable to some Parish Councils: A reduction in CIL rate £/sqm might safeguard Developers profits but this at the expense of the Parishes and to the detriment of the facilities that the Parish Councils provide. If it is deemed necessary that the rate of CIL payable by a developer is set at £25 per sqm (dropped from the £55 per sqm currently paid to some parishes) to maintain or enhance developer margins or for other reasons, the percentage of CIL monies collected by BDC and subsequently paid to Parishes currently 15% or 25% should be increased to compensate to match existing returns (so in effect those Parishes where a CIL collection rate of £55 per sqm prevails do not lose out and it is BDC that receives proportionately less not those Parishes).	The CIL rate is the maximum that can be achieved with affordable housing and developer contributions as part of viable development. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment evidences the approach.
REF276	Bassetlaw District Council	ADAS New Settlement Study Methodology 2018	The Evidence Base and the Garden Village “the Council has undertaken a significant amount of research to help inform the proposals and policies in this Plan. This is called the Evidence Base, and includes background information, the Council’s existing strategies and current planning policy as well as specially commissioned studies on particular topics where more information was helpful.” It seems that the early report ADAS, “Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology” April 2018 has been ignored/superseded. The report considered the parishes of Beckingham, Carlton in Lindrick, Clarbrough and Welham, Darlton and Gamston and Elkesley as would be locations for the Garden Village. Noticably absent was any consideration of Babworth Parish, clearly no where near the list of contenders in April 2018. The report identifies as the two prime locations the brownfield sites of Gamston Airport and the old colliery site at Bevercotes.	The reason why Babworth was not included within the original study was because the land was not considered available at this time.
REF276	Bassetlaw District Council	WYG Possible Garden Village Sites 2019	In a later report Consultants WYG, “Possible Garden Village Sites”, November 2019 identifies Babworth as the prime contender having considered again the Gamston and Bevercotes sites and dismissed them. The main reason that Babworth, coming from nowhere and trumping the other two seems largely to be based on the fact that there is a potential, however remote, to build a new railway station on the Lincoln to Sheffield line. The latter dismissed by all who have spoken to me as being highly unlikely ever to come to fruition. The would be development of a New Garden Village will displace a farm of 216 hectares grade 3 agricultural land. It makes no sense at all in turning more farmland into land for housing more sense to build on	The site was made available for development and its change in stance was due to Bevercotes and Gamston sites becoming unsuitable for development due to airport constraints and environmental constraints.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			brownfield sites and indeed the proposal breaches one of BDC's key Policy Plan Objectives 5.4.1.	
1197036	Woodland Trust	Other comments	This is a really good plan from the perspective of trees and woods.	Noted.
REF278 (LAA)	Fisher German	Land west of Cocking Lane, Treswell and Land south of Town Street, Treswell	As previously mentioned, we are concerned that there is no evidence to demonstrate that the Neighbourhood Plan for Treswell and Cottam will identify housing allocation sites within the villages. Consequently, the Council could still need to allocate land to ensure that Treswell and Cottam meet their housing need. The land west of Cocking Lane (see Figure 1) is located to the south of the village and extends to approximately 0.58 ha. It lies immediately to the south of existing dwellings on Cocking Lane and is considered to be a logical site for a development of circa 10 dwellings, which would follow the pattern of linear development on Cocking Lane. The Bassetlaw Land Availability Assessment 2017 (LAA) identified the land west of Cocking Lane (Ref: LAA085) as a suitable site for residential development and stated that there were no significant constraints to development. However, the site was assessed as not achievable as a policy change would be required before it could come forward i.e. an allocation in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. The land south of Town Street (see Figure 2), is located to the east of Treswell and extends to approximately 0.35 ha. It lies immediately adjacent to the East End Farm farmstead and to the south of existing dwellings on Town Street. The land south of Town Street was not assessed in the LAA however, it is considered that the site could accommodate circa 5 dwellings arranged in a 'farmyard style' arrangement to complement the character of neighbouring East End Farm.	The Local Plan is not specifically allocating land within the rural area – other than within Tuxford. Policy ST1 and ST2 provide the management tools for new development within the rural area.
REF279	Resident	Other comments	Firstly, I do not believe that Bassetlaw District Council advertised this Draft Local Plan sufficiently or effectively, and in enough time for people to know what far-reaching proposals it contains. A plan, which wants to literally change the landscape of our rural community in such a dramatic and heavy-handed way, should have been better publicised and sooner in the timetable. To hold a consultation in the parish most affected, the night before the deadline to comment is unfair, unreasonable and frankly undemocratic.	Noted.
REF280 (LAA)	Avant Homes and Wyndthorpe Developments.	Land East of Doncaster Road, Carlton in Lindrick	The focus on this representation is regarding the extent of the Green Gap boundary in policy ST34 paragraph C item 3. 'GG2: Oldcotes-Langold-Carlton in Lindrick', questioning the soundness of evidence submitted evidence and the pretence of the boundary being imposed and in response to put forward a more appropriate revised Green Gap, with the view to release the adjusted land for the purposes of an additional housing allocation. Reference is made in support of the removal of Land East of Doncaster Road, Carlton-in-Lindrick from the draft Green Gap allocation and	The Green Gap report has been based on an independent assessment of these areas around the District. The proposed identified designated areas are in response to the recommended boundaries proposed by that report.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			alternatively allocated for housing development. Additional land east of Doncaster Road represents a highly suitable site which would make a sustainable extension to the existing development being carried out by Avant at 'Hawfinch Place'. The north is bound by a brook leading to a large copse. The brook is lined by hedgerows which can be provided with further ecological enhancements and woodland buffer to strengthen and enhance the existing barrier. The design of a future expanse to this scheme could readily accommodate defensible green boundaries which would both constitute as suitable for the purposes of forming a revised Green Gap whilst protecting views toward the Ryton Valley in accordance with the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan. East of the site are continuations of views into Ryton Valley, of which an opportunity is present where through carefully planned development, views can be maintained and the incorporation of formalised public space can be implemented in the eastern edge of the site where the views can be enjoyed by the wider public, this will also double up as a maintained clear defining edge to the urban settlement. South of the site is the existing residential development scheme under development providing sensitive frontages to its northern edge. This can be incorporated into a wider scheme of Green infrastructure and wider views east joining into a potential POS area mirroring the effect given to the existing scheme. To the west is the Doncaster Road and which provides suitable access to the scheme and direct connectivity to Worksop. The incorporation of the above are indicated within Figure 1 within the Appendices. This illustrates that a more appropriate Green Gap can be incorporated which uses more defined boundaries which allow greater benefits to the wider community.	
1197063	Resident	Other comments	This is a large document. It tries to cover all aspects and is a complex document to draw up. Well done for getting this far. I support the development of a Local Plan for the District and the future sustainability of Bassetlaw. But please don't forget the far reaches of the district and don't make it Worksopcentric.	Noted.
REF283	Resident	Community Infrastructure Levy	I have also reviewed your CIL Draft Charging Schedule Jan.2020 and have no comments to make, other than that the principle of funding infrastructure by this means should be extended to cycling and walking infrastructure, not just road improvements, and projects identified in the District's Regulation 123 schedule.	Noted.
REF283	Resident	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Page Paragraph Response 14 3.4.1 The main map, being from 2008, omits NCN 647 between Clumber South Lodge (junction with NCN 6) via Bothamsall and Tuxford to Fledborough. It is evident from this map that cycle links are non-existent between:- (i) Worksop – Retford (ii) Worksop – Harworth (iii) Retford – Harworth (iv) Everton – Bawtry/Misson The Worksop map omits the section of NCN 6 between Priory Road and Sandhills Lake, and the need to link the existing cycle route along Valley Road	Noted. New and enhanced walking and cycling infrastructure will only be identified within the Local Plan if it is required by new development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>(from the Gateford area) to the railway station, the college, the town centre and NCN 6 is apparent. The Retford map shows a leisure cycle route running east from the town centre along the Chesterfield Canal towpath; this is barely satisfactory as far as Alma Road, but beyond is unimproved and potentially dangerous. Beyond Welham Road it is effectively unusable. There are missing links (a) north-south across the town centre (Bridgegate – Chancery Lane); and (b) east-west between West Street and Pelham Road. 15 3.4.3 The forecast increase in sustainable transport modes is derived from “existing modal splits”, so it is unsurprising that the data resulting therefrom is modest. This methodology takes no consideration of the potential to change modal splits by pursuing a deliberate policy of actively making significant walking and cycling infrastructure investment, as has happened in Nottingham, London, etc. Only if a decent network is provided will many more people use it, when they perceive that it can be more convenient for their everyday needs than vehicular travel. 15 3.4.4 I strongly disagree that the area is generally “well catered for in terms of cycling infrastructure” and to state this in an important policy document is misleading. Rather, the area is poorly catered for, with such cycling provision as does exist being patchy, almost entirely the result of historical circumstances, and in no way forming a coherent network. 16 3.4.10 The Goosemoor Lane footbridge was completed some years ago, so should not appear in future funding estimates.</p>	
REF285	Home Builders Federation	Duty to Cooperate	<p>As set out in the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council is under a Duty to Co-operate with other Local Planning Authorities (LPA) and prescribed bodies on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries (para 24). This collaboration should identify the relevant strategic matters to be addressed (para 25). Effective and on-going joint working is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy (para 26). The Council should demonstrate such working by the preparation and maintenance of one or more Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) identifying the cross-boundary matters to be addressed and the progress of co-operation in addressing these matters. A SoCG should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency (para 27). The Bassetlaw Local Plan should be based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred as evidenced by a SoCG (para 35c). To fully meet the legal requirements of the Duty to Co-operate, the Council should engage on a constructive, active and on-going basis with neighbouring 2 authorities to maximise the effectiveness of plan-making. A key element of Local Plan Examination is ensuring that there is certainty through formal agreements that an effective strategy is in place to deal with</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>strategic matters when Local Plans are adopted (ID : 61-010-20190315 & 61-031-20190315). As explained in the latest National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), a SoCG sets out where effective co-operation is and is not happening throughout the plan-making process (ID : 61-010-20190315). The NPPG also sets out that by the time of publication of a Draft Plan, a SoCG should be available on the Council's website. Once published, the Council should ensure that the SoCG continues to reflect the most up-to-date position of joint working (ID : 61-020-20190315). The HBF note that there is no SoCG available in the Council's supporting evidence for this Draft Local Plan consultation. This omission should be rectified by the Council. The Local Plan should be prepared through joint working on cross boundary issues such as where housing needs cannot be wholly met within the administrative areas of individual authorities. As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the Local Plan should be positively prepared and provide a strategy which as a minimum seeks to meet its own local housing needs in full and is informed by agreements with other authorities so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated (para 35a). Bassetlaw District adjoins seven other LPAs, which are Bolsover, Doncaster, Mansfield, Newark & Sherwood, North Lincolnshire, Rotherham, and West Lindsey. It has been determined that Bassetlaw District Council is a part of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area (HMA) together with North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield Councils. There is also an identified overlap between this HMA and the Sheffield City Region HMA (including neighbouring authorities of Doncaster & Rotherham) with recognised functional economic links between the two HMAs. Bassetlaw is a full member of the Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Bassetlaw is also part of the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority but no longer a member of its LEP. It is understood that the Council is proposing to deliver all its development requirements within its own boundaries and no requests to address the development needs of neighbouring local authorities have been received. However it is known that the Inspector's Interim Findings on the North East Derbyshire Local Plan Examination indicated an insufficient land supply in years 6 -10 to meet housing needs with potential implications across the HMA. An agreed position should be set out in a signed SoCG, which should be publicly available. The HBF may submit further representations on the Council's compliance with the Duty to Co-operate and any implications for the soundness of the Local Plan during the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, which is expected to be held in September 2020.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF285	Home Builders Federation	Supplementary Planning Documents	<p>The Regulations make it clear that development management policies, which are intended to guide the determination of applications for planning permission should be set out as Local Plan policy. Consequently, policies in the Local Plan should not devolve fundamental matters to an SPD. Several policies within the Local Plan require compliance with an SPD or other standalone document thereby giving Local Plan status to documents, which are not part of the Local Plan and have not been subject to the same process of preparation, consultation and examination. This is not compliant with the Regulations. The relevant policies are :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy ST5 : Cottam Priority Regeneration Area Bullet Point (d), Policy 15 : HS1 - Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop Bullet Point (b), Policy 16 : Site HS2 - Former Pupil Referral Centre, Worksop, Policy 17 : Site HS3 - Canal Road, Policy 18 : Site HS4 - Former Manton Primary School, Worksop, Policy 19 : Site HS5 - Talbot Road, Worksop, Policy 20 : Site HS6 - Former Knitwear Factory, Retford Road, Worksop, Policy 21, Policy 22 and Policy 25, which state "... in accordance with ... the forthcoming Design Quality SPD" ; • Policy 23 : Site HS9 - Sandhills, Retford Bullet Point (a), which states "... in accordance with the forthcoming Design Quality SPD and Greening Bassetlaw SPD" ; • Policy ST32 : Design Quality Bullet Point (e), which states "... in accordance with the most up-to-date Nottinghamshire parking standards" ; and • Policy ST50 : Promoting Sustainable Transport Bullet Point (7), which states "... in accordance with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards". <p>Where SPDs are prepared, they should be used to provide more detailed advice and guidance on the policies in the Local Plan and not as an opportunity to change or introduce the requirements of a policy. The Regulations indicate that an SPD does not have statutory force and is not the subject of examination. It is defined as something that is not a Local Plan. As defined in 2019 NPPF 16 Glossary, an SPD is capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but is not part of the Local Plan. It is also noted that the reference to SPDs in the afore-mentioned policies is inconsistent with the approach taken in Employment Policies. Policy 9 : Site SEM1 - Apleyhead Junction, Worksop, which states that "... reflects the design principles in ... the Design Quality SPD". Before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation, the afore-mentioned policies should be modified. Conclusions For the Bassetlaw Local Plan to be found sound under the four tests of soundness as defined by the 2019 NPPF (para 35) the Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. It is hoped that the Council will consider the HBF's submitted representations and before the pre-submission Local Plan consultation undertake modifications accordingly.</p>	<p>The Local Plan provides the Policy framework to manage new development across the District. Where an SPD has been identified is for where additional detail on a specific matter/topic is required to help inform development. Where there are inconsistencies, these will be amended.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF286 (LAA)	Pegasus Group on behalf of Dairy Farms Limited	Land North of Gracefield Lane, Normanton on Trent	<p>Pegasus Group acts on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited in relation to their land interests north of Gracefield Lane, Normanton on Trent. The site is located in a sustainable location for small scale development and has the potential to deliver a mix of housing types and sizes, in accordance with Strategic Objective 2; which seeks to deliver a range of market, affordable and specialist housing types, tenues and sizes, in appropriate and sustainable locations, in order to meet the needs of Bassetlaw District. The site is bounded by existing residential dwellings off Eastgate to the west, agricultural buildings to the east and open countryside to the north. To the south of the site lies Eastgate/Gracefield Lane, and the junction with Brotts Lane. The site extends to approximately 0.49ha and can provide some 8 dwellings. The site comprises part of a field parcel of improved grassland that has most recently been used as a paddock. Mature hedgerows are located along the eastern, western and southern boundaries of the site. A Public Right of Way bisects the site from north to south and can be retained and incorporated within the development proposals without the need for diversion. I have enclosed copies of the Site Location Plan and Illustrative Masterplan. A Call for Sites submission was made in relation to this site in February 2019, as part of the previous consultation on the will also be made in relation to this site. An outline planning application (reference number 18/01257/OUT) was submitted to the District Council in October 2018, seeking permission for up to 8 dwellings, with all matters reserved for future approval, except for access into the site from Gracefield Lane. The application was supported by various technical reports including heritage, transport, flood risk and ecology assessments. No physical constraints that would prevent the development of the site for housing have been identified through the technical work undertaken. The application was refused planning permission in November 2018 with one reason for refusal which related to the sustainability of Normanton on Trent. This position was taken by the case officer, who attached no weight to the emerging Local Plan at that time, however this was prior to the publication of both the Draft Local Plan 2019 and this further consultation, which now seeks to allow proportional growth in rural settlements such as Normanton on Trent, and provides a requirement figure of 31 dwellings. The planning application was accompanied by a Consultation Statement which set out how the applicant has engaged with the local community as part of the planning process. A leaflet was designed which set out information about the proposals, invited initial engagement and provided details about the public exhibition event. 176 leaflets were delivered to homes and businesses in Normanton on Trent on 18th September 2017 and an exhibition was held in the Village Hall on 26th September from 3:30pm – 7:30pm. The consultation period ran from 18th</p>	The local Plan is not allocating land within the rural area other than in Tuxford. Policy ST1 and ST2 provided the Policy framework for managing new residential development within the rural area.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>September to 10th October 2017. Approximately 40 people attended the consultation event and 10 comments were received from local residents; 4 comments forms submitted at the exhibition, 3 responses via email and 3 responses were received through the post. A range of comments were raised, in relation to ecology, transport and flood risk. Additionally, a number of comments highlighted the need for lower cost/smaller/starter homes in Normanton on Trent, and there was support for development that would help to maintain local services and facilities. The Draft Local Plan at Policy ST1 includes Normanton on Trent as a Small Rural Settlements, whereby growth of up to 20% over the plan period is supported. Policy ST2 sets out the requirement of 31 new dwellings in Normanton on Trent over the plan period to 2037. Land north of Gracefield Lane provides an opportunity to meet these housing requirements in Normanton on Trent. The scale and density of the site is considered to be appropriate to the character, shape and built form of this part of Normanton on Trent, and as the extends to 0.49ha, also meets the requirement for small sites (under 1ha) within the Small Rural Settlements. To ensure the delivery of these smaller sites, consideration should be given to allocating sites within the Rural Settlements as part of the Local Plan process (as per those larger site allocations included at Policy ST14). The Illustrative Masterplan proposals have been informed by a range of supporting technical studies which confirm that there are no constraints that would prevent development of this site. The Illustrative Masterplan has been designed to ensure that the proposals minimise impacts on the environment; trees and hedgerows are retained, and additional native planting is proposed. The site is accessible for all modes of transport, located within walking distance of the facilities in Normanton on Trent, and served by public transport that provides connections to Sutton on Trent and Newark on Trent. In accordance with the requirements of Policy 8, the site can be developed in a way that is appropriate to the character of the area, and where amenity or highway safety is not adversely affected. The site provides a sustainable opportunity to meet the identified housing requirements for Normanton on Trent.</p>	
REF288 (LAA)	JVH Planning	Land to the west of the Great North Road, Ranskill	<p>Site lies to the west of the Great North Road and would be a small development of up to 15 homes. The area comprises 0.55 hectares. This development would be large enough to deliver some affordable housing if that is required.</p>	Noted.
REF288 (LAA)	JVH Planning	Land to the east of the Great North Road, Ranskill	<p>Adjoining the Southern Boundary of the village and could provide up to 10 homes developed in a linear manner in keeping with the development to the north. The site comprises 0.33 hectares</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF288 (LAA)	JVH Planning	Land to the east of the Great North Road, Torworth	Land to the west of the great North road Torworth comprising 1 hectare to accommodate up to 30 dwellings	Noted.
REF291 -	James Bonner on Behalf of Heyford Developments Ltd	Duty to Cooperate	<p>Bassetlaw is within the defined North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area (HMA) alongside North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield Councils. The North East Derbyshire Local Plan is subject to an ongoing Examination, and Green Belt release is proposed to address housing needs. Within the North East Derbyshire Local Plan: Duty to Cooperate Draft Statement (March 2018) it states at paragraph 42 that: "At the time of writing although no response had been received from Bassetlaw, it is considered that sites within Bassetlaw District would not relate well to the district and meeting the housing needs within North East Derbyshire." It is not clear what evidence is proposed to support this position given the authorities are within the same HMA. Bassetlaw have not published a Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG'), so it is unclear whether the Council has explored the potential to help assist with North East Derbyshire's housing needs. We consider that it should, given the duty to cooperate and paragraph 137 of the NPPF. This would also help to address a potential housing land supply issue in years 5 to 11 of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan, as identified at paragraph 17 of the Inspector's initial findings. Further, the draft Plan needs to consider the linkages with the Sheffield City Region HMA, which includes Doncaster and Rotherham Councils. At page 141 of the Sustainability Appraisal Appendices, it is identified that there is a net outflow of workers, with 2011 census data indicating 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 Bassetlaw District (4,395 people). The Publication version of the draft Doncaster Local Plan identifies an unmet housing need (paragraph 6.5), although it identifies elsewhere that discussions have not identified housing or other needs that would be more appropriately shared with other local authorities (paragraph 1.3). This follows an apparently unsuccessful attempt to get neighbouring authorities such as Bassetlaw to assist. At page 23 of the Doncaster Revised Draft SoCG (August 2019), Bassetlaw are reported to state it is: "Not considered appropriate to make provision for housing needs as Bassetlaw is currently developing the evidence underpinning their Local Plan, such as setting housing growth and economic growth targets and identifying Local Plan site allocations. Therefore it is not in a position to plan for any additional housing needs. It is also not considered appropriate to make provision for</p>	The Council is working closely with partners in the HMA and SoCG are/will be prepared with partners moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			housing needs for an authority within a separate housing market area.” It is accepted that Bassetlaw is within a different HMA. However there are clear functional relationships between the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA and the Sheffield City Region HMA. There are also clear relationships specifically between Bassetlaw and Doncaster and the draft Plan should do more to demonstrate how it could assist neighbouring authorities. Additional growth within Blyth could assist in respect of assisting Doncaster.	
REF292 (LAA)	JVH Planning	Land at Sutton cum Lound	Sutton Cum Lound Part of this allocated site below remains available following the approval of the dwellings on the site frontage and should be allocated to provide further dwellings in this sustainable settlement . Alternatively or in addition land is available to the south as shown on the Plan overleaf.	The local Plan is not allocating land within the rural area other than in Tuxford.
1197091	William Davis	Green Gap Study	Green Gap Report (November 2019): • No reference is made to the land around St Annes Drive or Manor Lodge • Requires boundaries to be clear, long term and defensible but then uses a path in an open field which is not clear, defensible or recognisable other than on a map • The description and assessment at page 26, fails to set out the value of the landscape and simply lists observations and document-based findings and does not analyse, test and score them as required by the GVLIA3 (Box 5.1) • The Notable Views statement does not draw upon nor matches the Landscape Study findings • fails to draw upon all relevant assessments and recommendations especially the 2009 LCA It is also noted that the LCA (2009) for the landscape policy zone within which the site sits (M11) assess the area as being of moderate sensitivity with an action for the built environment to concentrate new development around the existing settlements which is the case for the site in question (LAA206); other landscape actions can be achieved through obligations and conditions. Therefore, it is considered that Policy ST34.C on Green Gaps should be removed from the plan. As an alternative the boundary of area GG4 should be amended to run along the proposed line of built development to the north of site LAA206; the area to the north of this could include landscaping and open space which are understood to be acceptable uses within Green Gaps. This boundary would provide a clear, long term and defensible boundary for the Green Gap and would not lead to the merging of settlements.	The Green Gap Report has been amended where appropriate.
REF295 (LAA)	dmc20eighteen	Landscape Study	It is noted that this document is a landscape study and does not promote itself as a landscape assessment. It is part of the evidence to the draft local plan. At para 8.3.4 of the draft local plan it states that “The National Planning Policy Framework advises that a landscape character assessment should inform policy making and planning decisions”. As the Landscape Study is not a landscape character assessment it does not meet the evidence required by the NPPF. It can be argued that little weight	The Landscape Assessment builds on the 2009 Bassetlaw Landscape Assessment. The 2019 version is to inform potential development sites of their landscape quality/issues. It then will help inform the future

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>should be given to this landscape study as evidence. In looking for a methodology within the landscape study, none is found. Therefore the findings of the study cannot be relied upon and should not be given weight to the decision making process. The document does not identify the author(s) nor their qualifications. It is essential that the public and the Secretary of State and indeed the LPA policy team are aware of the relevant expertise or qualifications of the experts upon which they rely, judge or examine the evidence. Indeed it is incumbent upon the local planning authority (and the Secretary of State) to ensure they have, or have access as necessary to, sufficient expertise in this regard. This review of the landscape study will draw upon the last landscape assessment undertaken by landscape architects in 2009 as the draft local plan at 8.3.6 confirms the principles of the LCA2009 remain sound. Perhaps this para should be rewritten to state the 'findings' of the LCA remain sound. The landscape study has studied the landscape around St Anne's Drive, reference 14H (LAA206), and the findings set out. The author knows this landscape well having undertaken a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the area. The findings of the study are set out in a table with supporting maps and photographs. The table identifies the LCA 2009 findings. The study area 14H falls within the LCA Policy Zone 11. The LCA found the sensitivity of the landscape to be moderate, a key matter which will be discussed in the review of the Green Gaps Report in the next section. This fact is not referenced in the study table. There are a number of weak descriptions and incorrect statements in the findings table; 1. Previous uses, 'presumed agriculture', a simple check of old maps will confirm the land use to have been fields since, at least the late 19C and probably before then. It would also have shown how intensive agriculture has removed old field boundaries showing the extent of change in the landscape. 2. Based on the 14H Designations Map in the study the landscape features statement is incorrect. The area defined by the red line on the map is one large arable field (not three fields) with no features. There is a worn line across the field which defines the line of the east west public right of way. The only features are the hedgerows to Manor Lodge Lane and trees around the lodge. 3. Notable views to and from the Site; the statement 'there are extensive views of the site' is challenged. The findings list four, this is not extensive. The view from the A57 to the north east adjacent Meadow Holme farm is stated as partial and slight. It is actually a fleeting peripheral glimpse west between vegetation from cars travelling at speeds up to 70mph on a dual carriageway. The significance of this view is negligible. The view from the A60 is not of the site. It is predominantly of the fields to the west of Manor Lodge Lane. The hedgerows on the western edge of the site along the track are visible. But again this is from a busy road with vehicles passing the gap in the vegetation at speeds up to 60mph. The significance of this view is</p>	selection of sites within the Local Plan and helps to inform the Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>negligible also. It is accepted that the public rights of way on and adjacent to the site and from the play area have views to the site. 4. The visual connectivity findings are misleading. As has been stated the A57 and A60 views can be discounted. The viewpoints to the north along the river, canal and around the superstore were found to be negligible by a previous LVIA prepared by the author, due to intervening vegetation in the valley. The visual connectivity is only with the settlement edge and from public rights of way to the settlement edge. 5. Habitat connectivity, it is noted that the study recognises that new development could retain and enhance connectivity. It does therefore acknowledge that development can occur in this land parcel. 6. Recreational connectivity, again the study recognises that new development could retain and enhance recreational connectivity within a landscape framework. It does therefore acknowledge that development can occur in this land parcel. 7. The only Development Constraints stated in the table are the; a. Retention and enhancement of public rights of way, this can be accommodated into new development Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan Policy ST34 Landscape Character Review and Comments for William Davis Ltd Don Munro Consultancy dmc20eighteen@icloud.com 5 b. Respecting views in and out of the site, which also can be accommodated in new development (A57 and A60 and superstore views are challenged and should be discounted) c. Relationship with the housing (to the east). Again through good design and setting this can be accommodated. d. It does not find the listed buildings to be a constraint, nor the hedgerows and tree cover, the biodiversity not the recreation. There is therefore inconsistency in its own findings. 8. Conclusions, these do not reflect the findings elsewhere in the table. The landscape constraints are not excessive and their significance are not measured. Have they a high, medium or low significance as set out by the GLVIA3 guidance? The landscape study fails to advise. The table acknowledges that new development can occur and offers opportunities to retain and enhance habitat and recreational connectivity. Given the weakness or failure of the study findings, the conclusion misdirects itself by limiting development. It fails to provide robust evidence to limit development. 9. Finally it states there is no relationship with the Green Gap (GG4). This is incorrect as it adjoins the gap Turning to the photographs, firstly the Views and Landscape Features map for 14H, do not identify the locations of the photographs making it difficult to locate the viewpoints on the ground. We are not told what lens or camera is used so the images do not meet GLVIA3 guidance. The first panorama, top of page 70, is from the bridleway on Lodge Farm Lane looking east. The statement on connectivity is accepted. However it shows a field with no landscape features, the path is a worn line in the crop and is indistinct. Indeed the path could be located anywhere on the field and would still benefit from the same</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>setting. The roofs of houses and the industrial scale buildings in Worksop are visible which influences the character and sensitivity of the landscape. The previous LCA in 2009 found this landscape to have only a moderate sensitivity. Nothing has changed physically in the landscape to warrant revising that assessment. The second photo, bottom left page 70, is from the Lodge Farm Lane looking east toward the existing housing which again influences the sensitivity. A very disingenuous zoom shows, in an inset, a church spire which being over 2km distant and barely visible cannot be considered to be distinct. It should not be considered a significant visual constraint. The third photo, bottom right page 70, is a statement of fact and would not be a constraint to development and is not mentioned in the previous table. On page 71 are two panoramas. The top one is from the housing looking west along the east west footpath. As with the first photo the path has no distinctive features, the view is limited by the rise in ground so no long distant views to the countryside are available. The view to West Wood relies again upon a zoomed in image to define it and is seen in the context of the ribbon development on the A60, Mansfield Road. Urban and settlement influences are a constant in this landscape. The bottom panorama defines the view along the northern edge of the site towards Manor Lodge. Again the image relies on a zoomed-in view of the upper storeys and roofs as seen above a mature wooded curtilage. Whilst a view of a listed building, it is visually of, at best, moderate to low significance due to setting and distance from the viewer. The photographs do not offer sufficient evidence to substantiate the findings in the table and are not even referenced in the table. There are no photographs from the superstore, the A60 or A57 which is telling and the lack of photographic evidence should discount the significance of these distant views. The photographs show this landscape is broadly featureless other than its boundaries of hedgerows along the Manor Lodge Lane and the well treed curtilage of the lodge. The key views are immediate or adjacent the studied area and are influenced by the existing housing on the A60 and St Annes and the distant high ground of Worksop in the east.</p>	
REF295 (LAA)	dmc20eighteen	Green Gap Study	<p>The Bassetlaw Local Plan Green Gaps Report November 2019, which for brevity will be referred to as the Report, correctly draws from the NPPF. Within the quotes from paras 170 and 171 there are only three relevant matters to consider. These are, • protecting and enhancing valued landscapes • recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside • allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value Therefore the report and in turn the Policy ST34 should only be led by these matters. Evidence should be offered that defines valued landscapes (as per GLVIA3 guidance, specifically Box 5.1), the Landscape Study 2019 upon which this</p>	The Green Gap Report has been amended where appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>report and the draft local plan rely, does not deal comprehensively with these matters. Therefore the evidence is not robust. Regarding intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, this is an emotive and subjective matter which can only be judged against the value of the landscape. Again the landscape study fails to meet the full criteria for defining value. Finally the allocation of land of least environmental or amenity value. Again value has not been considered in line with the accepted guidance of GLVIA3. The Report also references Planning Guidance on the Natural Environment stating it supports Green Gaps. The quote provided from the guidance does not at any point mention Green Gaps. The only place where there may be implied support for the Green Gap policy is Plans can also include policies to avoid adverse impacts on landscapes and to set out necessary mitigation measures, such as appropriate design principles and visual screening. Excluding land by the Green Gap map based blanket 'no development' policy does not accord with the subtler requirement of the guidance seeking appropriate design principles and visual screening. In fact mitigation is practically addressed in full by Policy ST34.B allowing the use of clauses 1 – 6 when assessing and informing/guiding all new developments. The Green Gap element of the policy is flawed and not supported by national policy. The report references the 2009 LCA for Bassetlaw and its Policy Zones. Therefore the LCA is a supporting assessment which can be relied upon in full where not revised by the Landscape Study which it does not. At section 5 the report accepts that scale of development required and the need for sustainable access to facilities mean that some greenfield sites around existing town and villages will need to be developed over the next 20 years. It later at 5.3 recognises that settlements extending into the countryside with the potential for them to merge in the future. It then references Worksop (W) around Shireoaks and Rhodesia. It does not include the land to the east around St Annes Drive or Manor Lodge. Yet this land, especially that to the south of Manor Lodge, is included in GG4 even though it does not constitute a merging of the settlements of Shireoaks and Rhodesia. It later states in 5.7 that the gaps may fulfil the purposes of a green belt, one of which that it states is not applicable is to check the sprawl of large built up areas. But it does seek the gaps to prevent neighbouring towns from merging. Again the merging of Shireoaks and Rhodesia is pertinent but not St Anne's and Rhodesia as they cannot merge due to the presence of Flood Zones 2 and 3 along the River Ryton. Where it cites safeguarding the countryside from encroachment it must revert to the NPPF requirements and address the question of the value of the landscapes. It is interesting to note that a green gap can include open space, parkland and gardens. Can it be inferred then that new development adjacent to a green gap, (should the policy be found to be sound) can place, without impact on the landscape of the</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>green gap, areas of open space, parkland and gardens given these are an accepted land use in green gaps. At 5.12 the Report describes the boundaries that would define the green gap. They should be clear, long term, defensible and recognisable. The use of footpaths and tracks are listed as features suitable for a boundary. Perhaps where they are alongside a hedgerow with its vertical presence in the landscape. Following a path in an open field offers no visible feature and therefore is not clear or defensible and not recognisable other than on a map. Planning of the landscape is a three dimensional exercise to be checked 'in-the-field' and not one that can be successfully achieved by simply marking up a map at a desk. Turning to Green Gap 4, 4. GG4: Worksop West, Shireoaks and Rhodesia (LHS). The description and assessment at page 26, fails to set out the value of the landscape and simply lists observations and document based findings. These are not analysed, tested or scored to define a value which the NPPF requires to establish whether the landscape should be protected or enhanced. This exercise must be undertaken in accordance with GLVIA3, Box 5.1 and the conclusion set out as supporting evidence. Without which an acceptable and robust policy should not be made. The description mentions the 2009 LCA Policy Zone ML11 but does not state that the landscape is assessed to be of moderate sensitivity. The LCA goes on to state in Landscape Actions, Built Features, that to conserve and reinforce the rural character of the landscape, new development should be concentrated around the existing settlements of Worksop and Shireoaks. Given that the draft local plan finds the 2009 LCA to be sound, the green gap boundary as set out, ignores the findings of the 2009 LCA. As an aside the LCA Policy Zone M11 lists other landscape actions. These actions can all be achieved through obligations and conditions upon new developments. It can be argued that without new development the landscape will not be reinforced and that with good masterplanning and design, features can be adequately conserved. The Notable Views statement does not draw upon nor matches the Landscape Study findings. It is concerned with views east west along the valley and it has been shown that views are negligible of area 14H from the valley. Views west across (to) higher open farmland can be readily achieved from the Lodge Farm Lane with its bridleway to the west. Wide views from the spoil heap are not relevant to 14H. The Green Gap report and its definition of GG4 and the policy that relies upon it is flawed. It does not follow acknowledged guidance on assessing landscapes, fails to draw upon all relevant assessments and recommendations especially the 2009 LCA which is recognised as still relevant, draws upon a flawed study of the landscape and does not fully embed that studies findings within its descriptions and conclusions. In setting out the role of the green gap the report misdirects itself at GG4 and moves away from preventing merging of settlements to</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			restricting appropriate development to the edge of settlements as recommended by the 2009 LCA. It relies on poorly defined boundaries especially to the south drawing on a footpath line across an open field. In particular GG4 is a weak form of mitigating against new development and in particularly around St Anne's Drive neighbourhood where Policy ST34B clauses 1 – 6 are perfectly capable of allowing appropriate new development that will avoid adverse impacts on the local landscape.	
REF299 (LAA) Bevercotes	Gladmans	Duty to Cooperate	<p>3.1.1 The Duty to Cooperate (DTC) is a legal requirement established through Section 33(A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended by Section 110 of the Localism Act. The DTC requires local planning authorities to engage constructively, actively, and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary strategic issues through the process of ongoing engagement and collaboration. 3.1.2 As confirmed in Section 2 of this representation, NPPF 2019 has introduced a number of significant changes on how local planning authorities are expected to cooperate, including a new requirement for the preparation of Statement(s) of Common Ground (SOCG) which demonstrate that a Local Plan has been prepared based on effective cooperation with agreements reached with neighbouring authorities on strategic level cross boundary issues. 3.1.3 As demonstrated by the outcome of the examination of the St Albans Local Plan in 2017, if a Council fails to satisfactorily discharge its statutory duty to engage in the DTC, a Planning Inspector must recommend non-adoption of the Plan. This legal test cannot be retrospectively rectified with modifications to the plan. 3.1.4 Gladman recognise that the DTC is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration. It is clear that the DTC is intended to provide effective policies on cross boundary strategic matters. This much is clear by the recent changes to the tests of soundness for plan making which now sets out the need for "cross boundary strategic matters to be dealt with rather than deferred". The Council will therefore need to ensure that it engages effectively with its neighbours on cross boundary strategic matters to meet the tests of soundness as well as to secure the legality of the Local Plan. 3.1.5 It is important that the Council maintains its commitment to engage with neighbouring authorities and other prescribed bodies throughout the preparation of the Local Plan and over the duration of the plan period. The Council should also ensure it monitors progress made by neighbouring authorities in advances made in their Local Plans to ensure that any cross-boundary strategic matters are addressed effectively. As set out in paragraph 27 of the NPPF and through the PPG8, a SOCG forms part of the evidence required to demonstrate that a local authority has engaged in effective and on-going joint working and complied</p>	The Council is fully engaged with the DTC process and will publish SoCG when appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			with the DTC. A SOCG should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. In this regard, it is important that an up-to-date SOCG is made available as part of the Plan's evidence to provide the latest position on joint working.	
REF299 (LAA) Bevercotes	Gladmans	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>3.2.1 It is noted that the consultation is accompanied by a Sustainability Report, dated January 2020. In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies that are set out in local plans must be the subject of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan's preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan's proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives. 3.2.2 The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process conducted through the Local Plan making 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. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the Council's decision making, and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent. 3.2.3 The SA must demonstrate that a comprehensive testing of options has been undertaken and that it provides evidence and reasoning as to why any reasonable alternatives identified have not been pursued. A failure to adequately give reasons in the SA could lead to a challenge of the Council's position through the examination process. The SA should inform plan making. Whilst exercising planning judgement on the results of the SA in the Local Plan is expected, the SA should still clearly assess any reasonable alternatives and articulate the results of any such assessment. 3.2.4 Bevercotes Colliery have been subject to SA and the assessment results are presented at Chapter 5 of the Sustainability Appraisal alongside the Garden Village locations proposed following the consultation on the Part 1 Draft Bassetlaw Plan (January 2019). 3.2.5 Chapter 5 of the SA, in addition to Table A6 in the SA Appendices document, clearly outline how the development of land at Bevercotes Colliery has a wide range of potential positive sustainability effects on Housing, Economy, Regeneration, Health and Wellbeing, Transport and Land Use. 3.2.6 The SA score for Biodiversity and Geodiversity, Water, Flood Risk, Cultural Heritage and Landscape and Townscape are all scored negative. Gladman consider that the</p>	The Sustainability Appraisal provides a detailed assessment of all the proposed content of the Local Plan, included the proposed sites for allocation. This assessment has been produced and updated through the process to make sure it considers the latest evidence and amendments to the Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			assessed scores for Bevercotes Colliery in relation to these aspects should be revised.	
REF299 (LAA) Bevercotes	Gladmans	Former Bevercotes Colliery	<p>6.1.1 As the Council is aware, Gladman are promoting the Former Bevercotes Colliery site for mixed use development. The site was previously identified for allocation alongside Gamston Airfield as one of two proposed 'North Nottinghamshire Garden Villages' through the consultation on the Draft Bassetlaw Plan which took place in early 2019. We are therefore greatly disappointed that the site's proposed allocation has been removed in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan 2020. Notwithstanding the Council's current position, we believe that there continues to be a clear rationale for the Former Bevercotes Colliery Site to be allocated within the Local Plan and wish to continue to work with the Council through its plan-making process to ensure that this previously developed site can continue to be considered a priority for regeneration and given every opportunity to be brought back into effective use over the course of the plan period. 6.1.2 Gladman are of the firm view that the site continues to represent a sustainable location as part of the Council's wider strategy and objectives, which seek to secure a diverse and thriving economy; capitalise on the District's locational advantage in terms of proximity to the A1; and, support the sensitive regeneration of previously developed, vacant or underused sites and spaces, within urban and rural Bassetlaw to facilitate their comprehensive redevelopment for housing, employment and leisure, to secure social, environmental and landscape improvements and delivery positive amenity benefits for all. 6.1.3 The site lies alongside the B6387, which provides good access to the A614 to the west and to the A1 in the east, at the Twyford Bridge Junction, enabling good access to the surrounding area. The site has the ability to deliver a standalone mixed-use Garden Village developed around well-connected neighbourhoods. The majority of the site comprises previously developed land, thereby offering the sustainability advantages of bringing previously developed land back into use. The fact that the site has extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for employment development supports the principle of development in this location. Furthermore, the allocation of the site for an appropriate mix of uses would provide a strong strategic fit with the emerging objectives of the Local Plan. 6.1.4 As illustrated on the previously submitted masterplan (see appendix 1), the site could also be extended to accommodate additional housing and employment land to contribute towards meeting Bassetlaw's development needs in full. In summary, the previous master planning work identified that the site has the ability to accommodate the following: - A minimum of 1,500 homes - Primary School Village Centre consisting of Doctor's surgery pharmacy, community building, retail and leisure facilities. - Sports</p>	The Site has been removed as a proposed location for a new Garden Village due to the significant environmental constraints identified on the site. These have been identified and mitigation of these constraints is not possible. Due to this, it is therefore considered that the site is now unsuitable for such development. The Council will continue to talk to Gladmans about the site moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>park - Allotments - Pub/restaurant - Employment space 6.1.5 As set out in our previous communications with the Council, any proposals for the site can be brought forward to adhere to the Garden City principles. Indeed, these principles were one of the main design drivers behind the master planned scheme with the integration of green space within the built environment given paramount importance. This led to the inclusion of tree lined streets and avenues, the creation of recreational, woodland and a sports park, the establishment of leisure walks and the realignment of the bridleway to connect to the Robin Hood Way. 6.1.6 Gladman would welcome the opportunity to continue working with the Council to secure the regeneration of the Bevercotes Colliery site over the plan period. We would therefore greatly appreciate the opportunity to meet with officers to discuss how the site can be integrated into the emerging Local Plan's policies in a way that complements its wider vision, objectives and spatial strategy.</p>	
REF300 -	Natural England	HRA	<p>Natural England has reviewed the Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Bassetlaw Plan. We acknowledge that the report follows accepted guidance and methodology. We also welcome the detailed assessment of the Sherwood possible potential SPA which follows the risk based approach advocated by Natural England. We would however suggest that as the Plan progresses it would be clearer if the HRA presented the assessment on the Sherwood ppSPA separately from that of the European Sites. The ppSPA is not a yet a designation and the assessment of impacts on identified nightjar and woodlark habitat should be termed as a "shadow" HRA or other appropriate term to distinguish it from the HRA for the fully designated sites. We also have concerns noted above that the HRA does not give full consideration to the recreational impact from the increase in population resulting from the proposed Garden Village on the Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC.</p>	The Council will update the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment moving forward.
REF300 -	Natural England	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>Natural England has reviewed the Sustainability Appraisal and considers that it follows accepted methodology and guidance. However we note 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 (please note our comments above).</p>	Noted.
REF301 Peaks Hill Farm (LAA)	Freeths	Land North Worksop, West of Carlton Road	<p>Our clients do however recommend the allocation of additional land to the west of Carlton Road, edged in red below (Figure 2), that would result in the comprehensive redevelopment of the land to the north of Worksop when viewed in relation to the exiting consented development and proposed allocations. It would allow for a new green corridor to the north of Worksop creating a strong defensible urban boundary when viewed with Site HS1. In the Draft Local Plan 2020 this area is currently allocated, predominantly, as a Green Gap (ST34) and we raise significant objections</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>to this allocation. The Draft Local Plan states (para 8.3.8) ‘there are a number of locations throughout the District where important undeveloped areas of land exist between settlements and around settlement fringes’. It would appear from this definition that the purpose of Green Gaps is to prevent coalescence of towns and villages to help give the sense of leaving one place and arriving at another, much like Green Belt policy is designed to (a) to check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; and (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. The allocation of the area to the west of Carlton Road as a ‘Green Gap’ would only serve to sever the comprehensive development of the north of Worksop. The proposed ‘Green Gap’ is between two large areas of proposed development all within Worksop which is highlighted as the most sustainable location for significant growth within the Draft Local Plan. Paragraph 8.3.13 states that ‘Green Gaps do not prevent development taking place’ and also ‘that development needs to have regard to their landscape characteristics to ensure development is designed and situated appropriately to minimise negative impacts on the Green Gap’. Paragraph 8.4.6 of the Draft Local Plan acknowledges that ‘the development of HS1: Peaks Hill Farm will provide for a new green corridor along Worksop’s northern urban fringe’ which would effectively set the urban boundary to the north of this allocation. The allocation of this area as a Green Gap would only prevent the comprehensive development of sites to the north of Worksop allowing for the developments to be designed in an inclusive manner to improve interconnectivity, sustainability and to reinforce the proposed green corridor to the north of Site HS1. A significant number of benefits have been identified in support of this additional allocation. The proposed site lies directly to the north of the settlement boundary of Worksop and to the east of Carlton Road and Site HS1. There is existing and proposed infrastructure allowing access to the Site. The site, in combination with Site HS1 and past approved developments, would form an ideal comprehensive strategic urban extension to the main built-up area providing improved infrastructure, interconnectivity and a significant number of the houses required in the plan period. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 and therefore not at risk from fluvial flooding. The illustrative masterplan (Figure 2 below) demonstrates how the additional site would link with approved development and existing / proposed allocations and would adjoin with the proposed new distributor link road at Site HS1 at the Carlton Road junction as outlined in Policy ST51. The Plan also illustrates how the Locally Important Public Space (ST41) could be incorporated into the design with the exception of the proposed new link road passing through it, similar to the situation along much of Ashes Park Road. Of significant note, and considered relevant to this representation, is the outline planning approval ref: 15/01477/OUT - ‘Outline</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Application with some matters reserved for Mixed Use Development Comprising of up to 182 Dwellings, Clean/Green Tech Business Park, Innovative Data Centre and Ancillary Storage Use, Access and Junction Improvements, Landscaping and Sustainable Urban Drainage’ and the subsequent reserved matters application ref: 18/00862/RES. The outline planning approval establishes further built and economic development to the northeast of Worksop which offers a further opportunity with the additional land to the east and west of Peaks Hill farm to provide comprehensive mixed use development with employment land supported by new housing in a sustainable location on the edge of an established built up area. The proposed housing allocation would be on the edge of Worksop which has been identified as requiring at least 2180 additional homes, to account for lapsed permissions. Based on past trends this figure could increase. Worksop is identified as the key town and employer in the District and economic investment and residential growth in Worksop would also support and benefit the town’s sub-regional links to South Yorkshire which is widely connected through excellent proximity to both the A57, A1 and east-west rail links. For any development proposal to be considered acceptable it must address the transport requirements set out in the NPPF. In this instance, transport modelling work that has been undertaken has established that there could be significant benefits to the wider development to the northeast should our client’s site and additional site be allocated. For any development proposal to be acceptable it must address the transport requirements set out in the NPPF, which states: ‘In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been taken up, given the type of development and its location; b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. Thus from a Highway perspective there are three key topics to address: sustainable transport; off-site traffic impacts; and access. The site is well connected to the existing town centre with relative closeness to all the town’s facilities. Within 2km are the local facilities such as Asda at Gateford, the St John’s Church of England Academy, and Bassetlaw hospital. The A60 Carlton Road is a bus route with stops at the site frontage and the services run between Worksop Bus Station and Doncaster Interchange. The Transport Assessment prepared for the Gateford North development, currently under construction, examined eight junctions in Worksop and the surrounding area to determine how they would cope with the additional development. Potential highway benefits as a result of developing our client’s sites</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>have been identified which could result in improvements to the existing highway network with the creation of a link road through our client's land, the neighbouring land to the east and the additional land to the west of Carlton Road. In terms of landscape and visual impact the site would be located between a proposed allocation and consented development infilling an area to the north of Worksop. The experience of the north edge of Worksop will be that of a growing residential suburban edge around new mixed use and residential allocations. Allocating this additional site has the potential to create a comprehensive new development, improving interconnectivity that in turn would assimilate with the urban expansion of north Worksop creating a more sustainable development. The benefit of this site in landscape and visual terms is that there is a strong sense of enclosure given the location of existing dominant mature green infrastructure and woodlands to the north. This green infrastructure can be enhanced and would form a natural defensible green boundary from the urban area to the open countryside. The vegetation would visually and physically soften the urban boundary. This is in contrast to the current allocation (Locally Important Public Space) which would leave the settlement boundary being defined by the distributor road and roundabout in between two large proposed developments. Figure 2 above illustrates how a potential development would incorporate additional screen planting to reinforce the natural boundary between the urban area and the countryside beyond whilst protecting the locally important public space. Considering the partially enclosed nature of the Site and the abundance of similar proposed land uses in the immediate vicinity the value and susceptibility of the site to change is assessed as limited. The local settlement edge is prominent but not of high visual quality and is therefore assessed as low sensitivity. The allocation of this Site along with the consented development and proposed allocations would create a comprehensive development that would allow for a strong and visually attractive urban boundary to the north. It would also not necessitate the loss of public open space even though this area is well served by the existing spaces and parks along Ashes Park Avenue. The draft local plan currently allocates the land to the north of Ashes Park Avenue roundabout as Locally Important Public Space (ST41). This allocation effectively identifies this area as the settlement boundary along with the allocation at HS1 and the consented development to the east projecting further north. The allocation as open space would inhibit the comprehensive development and restrict the opportunity to extend the distributor road to link up with the existing infrastructure at Ashes Park Avenue. Further significant planning and sustainability benefits have been identified that would also support this allocation. These are summarised below: 1) The proposed additional allocation to the west of</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Carlton Road would support the Strategic Objectives as set out in the Draft Local Plan (Para 4.2) numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 14. 2) Providing a wide range of residential accommodation adjacent to the new employment aspirations of Worksop to the north whilst remaining well connected to the existing settlement of Worksop to the south. 3) Would be on the edge of the existing settlement and would follow the pattern of development and urban expansion considered under Policy 15: HS1: Peaks Hill Farm. 4) Development would be contained between built up development to the north, east and west i.e. the new housing development to the east / west and the new employment development to the north and the proposed Green Technology Park. This development would be infill development due to the built up nature of these proposals and would safeguard the countryside from further encroachment. 5) Peaks Hill makes a natural defensible settlement boundary to the north moving forward in the plan period. The area to the north of the proposals has a network of mature green spaces that would provide a clear and defensible urban boundary. 6) Potential for Green Infrastructure linkages / footpaths / Open space utilising existing features, e.g. Long Plantation and Gateford Hill. This would give access for new residents to high quality public open space within this proposed allocation and the approved residential accommodation to the east. 7) The combination of the link road between Blyth Road, Carlton Road and Ashes Park Avenue would provide increased connectivity to the north of Worksop alleviating traffic congestion from central areas and the main town centre.</p>	
REF304 (LAA)	Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon	Landscape Character Assessment	<p>5.5 This Landscape Character Assessment was identified directly in the text of Policy ST34 as one of the documents which have informed the creation of the policy (albeit the Policy text appears to erroneously refer to this as the 'Landscape Capacity Assessment'). 5.6 The site lies within the Sherwood regional character area and specifically the landscape character parcel of SH57: Gamston Airport Village Farmlands, which is identified as having a 'moderate' landscape condition and 'moderate' landscape sensitivity and equates to the policy of: 'Conserve and Create'. 5.7 To the east, north-west and areas to the west of Retford, the policy zones surrounding the town have been deemed to have either a 'Conserve' or 'Conserve and Reinforce' status, based on their landscape sensitivity and condition. The conclusions of the Landscape Character Assessment therefore appear to be inconsistent with the locations of the Green Gaps as identified within the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, as areas with lower landscape sensitivity and condition are within Green Gaps and those with higher landscape sensitivity and condition are excluded. In particular with regard to our clients site, it is clear that the identified status of the landscape is not one which is commensurate with its identification as</p>	<p>The Landscape Assessment builds on the 2009 Bassetlaw Landscape Assessment. The 2019 version is to inform potential development sites of their landscape quality/issues. It then will help inform the future selection of sites within the Local Plan and helps to inform the Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			one of the areas of Green Gaps and no evidence is provided in the Landscape Character Assessment to suggest that the area to the south of Retford in which it is located should be designated as one of the Green Gaps, in terms of the characteristics of the landscape which the Assessment identifies.	
REF304 (LAA)	Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon	Landscape Study	5.8 This Site Allocations Landscape Study was identified directly in the text of Policy ST34 as one of the documents which have informed the creation of the policy (albeit the Policy text appears to erroneously refer to this as the 'Site Allocations Assessment'). 5.9 Our clients site lies within Site 21H (LAA141), which is one of 27 potential site allocations considered. The aim of the Site Allocations Landscape Study was to undertake the following: 'It explores the existing character and landscape value of each site, and assesses their development potential in terms of landscape considerations, with a view to protecting the district's most valued landscapes and directing development to those least sensitive, most appropriate sites.' 5.10 Apart from the above, the report offered no methodology, rationale or criteria as to how each site was assessed and does not state who undertook the work and their professional credentials as Landscape practitioners. Therefore, it is difficult to understand how each site was tested and scored against key landscape sensitivity criteria and then how each of the sites was compared against one another in a consistent manner. There are no conclusions as to which, out of the 27 sites, are deemed the most appropriate sites for development. 5.11 Most importantly, the document does not provide any guidance in relation to the proposed Green Gaps, it only provides a site-specific high-level overview of each potential development site within the Bassetlaw district. As such, it is clear that there is nothing within the Site Allocations Landscape Study which would provide an evidence base that the area to the south of Retford in which our clients site is located should be designated as one of the Green Gaps.	The Landscape Assessment builds on the 2009 Bassetlaw Landscape Assessment. The 2019 version is to inform potential development sites of their landscape quality/issues. It then will help inform the future selection of sites within the Local Plan and helps to inform the Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.
REF304 (LAA)	Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon	Green Gap Study	5.12 This Green Gaps Report was again identified directly in the text of Policy ST34 as one of the documents which have informed the creation of the policy. 5.13 The report gives limited explanation as to why certain areas within the local authority boundary are considered as green gaps over other areas. The initial sieving exercise as to what the local authority deems important to protect over other areas, is not included. Instead, the report only offers the following explanation of its approach at paragraph 1.2: 'The Council wishes to use the new Local Plan to safeguard the characteristics of areas of "important landscape" around more sensitive locations where there has been high demand for development, including Worksop, Retford, Langold/Carlton and Harworth/Bircotes. Based on small scale indicative maps and locations supplied by Bassetlaw District Council, the purpose of this report is to	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			examine the wider context, establish a methodology and identify physical boundaries for each gap and justify why they are important.' 5.14 There is no rationale behind, why areas surrounding Retford have either been included or excluded as potential areas for Green Gaps anywhere within the report. 5.15 Of most concern however, is that although the plan on page 6 of the report would indicate that the whole of the landscape to the south of Retford, including the area in which our clients site is located, is included within one of the Green Gaps, it is clear that neither Green Gap 7 Retford South/Eaton, nor any of the other seven identified green gap areas which are subsequently discussed in detail in the Report, actually cover this area. This is a major concern with the document, because the Green Gaps as illustrated on the Draft Policies Map, correspond directly to this erroneous summary plan from page 6 of the Green Gaps Report. Therefore, the extent of Green Gaps as they are identified in policy (ST34) within the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020, is contrary to its evidence base as was set out in detail with reference to eight clearly identified areas in the main body of the Report. None of these areas cover the landscape to the south of Retford in which our clients site is located.	
REF304 (LAA)	Pegasus on behalf of Persimmon	Land at Ollerton Road, Retford (LAA141)	6.1 Land at Ollerton Road, Retford (Ref. LAA141) comprises approximately 10.6 hectares of land on the southern extent of Ordsall, Retford. 6.2 Persimmon Homes propose to bring the land into residential use with associated public open space, local area of equipped play and appropriate via Ollerton Road. 6.3 The site is suitable, appropriate and deliverable. The proposed residential use of this site is contiguous with neighbouring residential uses in a sustainable location. The site benefits from no known site constraints. The development of this site would provide biodiversity net gains and offer a strong southern gateway to Retford.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
REF305 -	Department for Education	General comments	4. DfE notes that some growth in housing stock is expected in the borough; the consultation Draft Local Plan anticipates a requirement of 478 dwellings per annum until the end of the plan period in 2037. This will place additional pressure on social infrastructure such as education facilities. The Local Plan will need to be 'positively prepared' to meet the objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements. 5. DfE welcomes reference within the plan to support the development of appropriate social and community infrastructure, as outlined in Policy ST40: Department for Education Sanctuary Buildings Great Smith Street London SW1P 3BT Tel: 0370 000 2288 www.gov.uk/dfe 2 Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities. In addition, we support the emphasis placed within paragraph 9.2.1 on the importance of placing new community facilities (including schools) at the centre of new developments. 6. The National Planning	Noted. The Council will continue to work closely with the local education authority for the provision of education within the District.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that local planning authorities (LPAs) should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of communities and that LPAs should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools to widen choice in education (para 94). 7. DfE supports the principle of Bassetlaw safeguarding land for the provision of new schools to meet government planning policy objectives as set out in paragraph 94 of the NPPF. When new schools are developed, local authorities should also seek to safeguard land for any future expansion of new schools where demand indicates this might be necessary, in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance and DfE guidance on securing developer contributions for education.¹ 8. Bassetlaw should also have regard to the Joint Policy Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Education on Planning for Schools Development² (2011) which sets out the government's commitment to support the development of state-funded schools and their delivery through the planning system. 9. In light of the above and the Duty to Cooperate on strategic priorities such as community infrastructure (NPPF para 24-27)³, DfE encourages close working with local authorities during all stages of planning policy development to help guide the development of new school infrastructure and to meet the predicted demand for primary and secondary school places. Please add DfE to your list of relevant organisations with which you engage in preparation of the plan. 10. Please note that there are two routes available for establishing a new school. Firstly, a local authority may seek proposals from new school proposers (academy trusts) to establish a free school, after which the Regional Schools Commissioner will select the successful trust. Under this 'local authority presumption route' the local authority is responsible for finding the site, providing the capital and managing the build process. Secondly, school proposers can apply directly to DfE during an application round or 'wave' to set up a free school. The local authority is less involved in this route but may support groups in pre-opening and/or provide a site. Either of these routes can be used to deliver schools on land that has been provided as a developer contribution. DfE has published further information on opening free schools and doing this in garden communities.</p>	
REF305 -	Department for Education	Community Infrastructure Levy	<p>18. One of the tests of soundness is that a Local Plan is 'effective', meaning the plan should be deliverable over its period. In this context and with specific regard to planning for schools, there is a need to ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver the additional school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments. 19. The Council should set out</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			education infrastructure requirements for the plan period within an Infrastructure Funding Statement. Where additional need for school places will be generated by housing growth, the statement should identify the anticipated CIL and Section 106 funding towards this infrastructure. The statement should be reviewed annually to report on the amount of funding received via developer contributions and how it has been used, providing transparency to all stakeholders. 20. Local authorities have sometimes experienced challenges in funding schools via Section 106 planning obligations due to limitations on the pooling of developer contributions for the same item or type of infrastructure. However, the revised CIL Regulations remove this constraint, allowing unlimited pooling of developer contributions from planning obligations and the use of both Section 106 funding and CIL for the same item of infrastructure. The advantage of using Section 106 relative to CIL for funding schools is that it is clear and transparent to all stakeholders what value of contribution is being allocated by which development to which schools, thereby increasing certainty that developer contributions will be used to fund the new school places that are needed. DfE supports the use of planning obligations to secure developer contributions for education wherever there is a need to mitigate the direct impacts of development, consistent with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. 21. DfE would be particularly interested in responding to any update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan/Infrastructure Funding Statement, viability assessment or other evidence relevant to education which may be used to inform local planning policies and CIL charging schedules. As such, please add DfE to the database for future consultations on relevant plans and proposals.	
1197189	Resident	Other comments	I think that overall the plan is good. How open ended it is I'm not sure. Is it vulnerable to changes in the economy, climate, Government policy and political make up of the Council?	Noted.
1197234	Resident	Other comments	I support the development of site at Upper Morton, and High Marnham, I do not support the development proposed in Retford, particularly that which affect the Leafields Allotment. I particularly do not support the proposed housing development at the form Cottam Power Station site. I will outline my objection to Cottam site below. Leafields is a widely used valuable community resource, which also bring the community together in an ecologically sound way. It is criminal to consider developing it and shunting allotment out of town to unsuitable land. It will negatively impact on the local community.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
1197237	Resident	Other comments	Yes I do, but surely, the Council is saying one thing and doing another in this Plan. The Leafields site of huge environmental benefit to the people of Retford and Hallcroft in particular, there are also environmental issues with the Plan to build	The Council will consider the information provided and review the plan moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			large scale housing at Cottam. Wild life will be negatively affected, and the site has a colong of Great Crested News, and other animals and a sich variety of avian life, which will all be affected by this. There is also potential environmental harm to people's health. The Cottam site has asbestos, and other chemical pollution. It poses a potential damage to people's heath, both builders and those living there. It will negatively impact on the whole environment, cause light pollution and traffic pollution and make the lives of this tiny hamlet intolerable during building and after.	
1197239	Resident	Other comments	<p>I have made my objections to the Leafields Development clear in sections above.. I object to the proposed development of new housing on the site of the newly decommissioned Cottam Power Station for the following reasons: 1. These houses, in the numbers proposed, are unnecessary as existing site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans and other planning documents (e.g.the new pro development at Upper Morton where a Garden Village is planned) more than meet the required housing development quota needed by Bassetlaw. 2. Even if additional housing were required, new build large scale housing estates are an environmentally disastrous way of meeting this need compared to adapting existing vacant industrial , retail and commercial buildings which require no demolition and fewer building materials. In addition, these structures are likely to be closer to residents' places of work, meaning shorter journeys and even zero polluting commutes. We are used, by now, to seeing Victorian schools and chapels - and increasingly in cities larger warehouses and factories converted to multiple and quite fashionable dwellings - and to this could be added vacant shops and public houses etc. It just takes a bit of imagination. 3. Even if such structures were not sufficiently available, and there was insufficient stock, and new houses had to be built, it is hard to think of a worse site in Bassetlaw than Cottam Power Station. This is for several reasons: the site is deeply contaminated by toxic substances, including asbestos, and it is probably uneconomic to de-contaminate the site thoroughly . A superficial decontamination will make the houses unsaleable if owned privately, as these toxic area will be adjacent to the new houses. If used for social housing, it suggests that the council does not consider the health and well being needs of poorer people who need quality social housing. 4.The road exists and entrances to the site are completely inadequate, and the increasing traffic would provide an intolerable burden to local communities. In addition, the Council gave the go-ahead to development at Sundown Adventure Park which will contribute to increased traffic in this area. Put the two together and it is an intolerable situation and unsafe. 5.The current medical and educational services in the local area could not cope with the influx of such a large number of p[people, and even if a new school was built and a doctors surgery provided,where would the staff</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>come from? Already rural schools and GP Practices cannot recruit sufficient staff in rural areas. 6. Cottam Gas Power Station will continue to operate for some years, in fact probably many years after the demolition of the coal power station. Who would want to live next door to a working gas power station? In addition, there will still be a gas main supply pipeline nearby, and pylons carrying high voltage electricity in close proximity to the housing estate. 7. While there is a shortfall of housing generally in England and Wales, the main problem remains providing the right sort of housing, such as for First time Buyers at affordable prices, and greater provision of Social Housing for those who cannot afford to buy. The last thing Bassetlaw, and the country generally, needs is more "executive housing", in isolated dormer villages/estates involving long commutes to work. No indication has been given on the plan for Social Housing, but if it was put there, it would place perhaps vulnerable people in a socially isolated site. 8. housing is not the only crisis facing the country. With the government's push to replace environmentally damaging electrical power generation with green energy (which I wholeheartedly agree with) we face a challenge providing adequate power to run the country. This is particularly acute with the Government's recent plans to phase out all fossil fuel transport by 2035 (which, again, I agree with). It seems obvious that the best use for the Cottam site in the future would be to replace the existing coal power station with the creation of a green energy site consisting of appropriate low level wind turbines, solar arrays as well as the new battery storage, which will make such an impact on storing green energy in the future. This is what is really needed on this site, and I understand others, both individuals and groups, will be presenting a more detailed proposal about this. In short, this is an opportunity for the Council to be creative and think outside the box. Listen to locals who know the problems associated with the site, but who are open to new ideas for its use.</p>	
1197263	Resident	Other comments	<p>Overall I support the concept of the Plan, but have many reservations. It is good to seek to provide housing and employment, as long as the housing meets the needs of residents (for example an aging population, as in Carlton) otherwise Bassetlaw will become a commuter belt. I feel that worksop is not an attractive place to attract developers and new residents. I am concerned that not enough thought has been given to Healthcare, social care and education. In your policies they appear to be a 'wish list' with no substance as to how you will achieve the provision of them. The more you ask a developer to fund the more expensive properties will become, and perhaps un-affordable to local people. I also feel that the Consultation process has been inadequate, with consultations being during the day when many people are at</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			work, and also not everyone has access to a computer for an online response. This must have cost an awful lot of money to produce!	
1197270	Resident	Other comments	I believe the consultation was rushed as we only had the meeting last week during half term when many people had childcare, may have been away. I was only alerted to this plan very recently. The volume of documentation is huge and must have taken a long time to produce print thus the people of the district should be given more time. Most people I have spoken to did not know about the plan. I am sure all local councillors would wish to liaise and meet with residents throughout the district alongside the planners. This document was difficult to negotiate as it did not follow the plan format. I ran out of time to look at all.	Noted.
REF325 (LAA)	Consultant on behalf of land owner	Land at Markham Moor	The proposals The land edged red on Drawing No. JJ/15/01 should be allocated for employment development with preference to developments which maximise the excellent transport links offered by the location. The site is available and there are no ownership or technical constraints to development. Access is available from the adjacent motorway service area at the points asterisked on Drawing No. JJ/15/01 and could be provided direct from the A57 road. As to the suitability of the location, the Local Planning Authority will be aware of the significant commercial developments which have taken place around the former "Markham Moor roundabout" during the last 30 years or so, precisely as a consequence of its pivotal location adjacent to a key element of the national highway network. Developments have included a busy truck stop and lorry park, the redevelopment of a former petrol filling station, the development of a significant motorway service area, the development of a new employment site on the A638 approach to the interchange and, not least, major highway works to improve capacity and safety on the A1 itself and to improve access to and egress from the A1 for cross-country traffic at what is now a major transport node. Some of these developments were carried out pre-2000 with the major highway works being completed in the mid 2000s. Somewhat less commercial development has taken place since then, as shown on the attached Google images of 2000, 2010 and 2017. The reasons for constraining employment growth at Markham Moor, in contrast with other transport nodes along the A1 where commercial development has been encouraged, are unclear. Whilst the need to pursue sustainable patterns of development is understood, Markham Moor interchange is no – or not significantly – further from centres of population than other greenfield sites which have been developed in the interim or which are proposed for development in the emerging Local Plan. The proposed employment site is accessible by public transport from Retford and Newark and from intervening settlements including the market town of Tuxford. The bus service is hourly from	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>early morning to early evening at times suitable for journeys to and from work, including Saturdays. Development as proposed would support the continuation of this service which would provide journey to work times well within normal parameters for rural areas (20-40 minutes from, respectively, Retford and Newark – correspondingly less from intervening villages). The site is not identified in the emerging Local Plan as being subject to any environmental constraints and does not lie within an area at risk from flooding. It is large enough to offer a range of plot sizes to suit developers’ requirements within a pleasant landscaped setting. In this connection, the draft Plan foreshadows the requirements of the imminent Environment Act which require development proposals to provide net gains for biodiversity. It is therefore relevant to note that the owner of the site owns other land in the immediate vicinity of Markham Moor interchange including land defined as a Local Wildlife Site (edged blue on the attached plan). The current ecological value of the Local Wildlife Site is limited to its boundary vegetation although the site itself retains remnants of ridge and furrow. To that extent the reason for its description as a wildlife site is entirely unclear. However, the blue edged area could be made available for any biodiversity offsetting needed to meet the requirements of the Environment Bill – soon to be – Act in connection with the development of the red-edged area, to be managed for 30 years as required by the imminent legislation. Part of the (blue edged) site could be retained at ridge and furrow, boundary vegetation retained, enhanced and managed with the balance laid out and managed to increase/enhance biodiversity. Public access could be provided via a new footpath within the red-edged area to link with the existing public footpath shown running between Points A and B on Drawing No. JJ/15/01 and/or from the motorway service station to the west. I am instructed by my Client to confirm her undertaking to make the blue-edged area available as described above in the event the area edged red is allocated for employment development. It is anticipated this would be secured by a S106 Agreement associated with any application to develop the red-edged land. Other land in the same ownership is also available for any required biodiversity off-setting if for any reason the blue edged area is considered unsuitable for this purpose. The area including and surrounding the proposed employment site is not identified in the draft Plan as an area of particular landscape sensitivity and although parts of the site – particularly the rising land to the east – are visible from the A1, much of the site is already well screened from the A1 and A57 roads by the site’s boundary hedgerows. Considerable additional planting was carried out along the south side of the A57 road in the vicinity of the site and along the northern margin of the A1 east of the interchange as part of the highway improvement works. In a relatively short time, this planting will enclose views of the</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			site from surrounding roads and, with one exception, from all public vantage points. Internal site landscaping and careful siting of buildings can mitigate much of the impact of any employment development from the public footpath (A-B on the plan) to the east. Conclusion Inclusion of the red-edged site as an employment allocation in the Local Plan would support the economic growth aspirations of the Council, would not undermine the overarching spatial strategy, would support local public transport, would provide ecological and public access benefits and accordingly is worthy of support.	
REF327 -	Scrooby Parish	Other comments	1. Housing Site Allocations – What re-assurances can be given that use of the Housing Allocations do not creep over other existing adjacent Parish Boundaries and over-ride their hard fought Neighbourhood Plans. 2. Affordable Housing – 10% on Brownfield sites, 20% on Greenfield, and then 10% must be for affordable home ownership – Please define 10% of what, the 10/20% for Brown/Greenfield (= 1 or 2%), or 10% of the SITE must be Affordable Home Ownership (or 1 home for a site of 10) 3. Planning Application Procedures (From Outline to Full) All too often a development scheme is passed as an “Outline Application with Matters Reserved” for a specific type and quantity of housing (Shape, no of rooms, etc) but then are allowed to change that through the Amended or Final Application processes that are not normally passed back to the local authority (Parish Councils / Made Neighbourhood Plans) and the public for comment and acceptance of the revisions. That scheme is then built with different / more, usually more profitable, and expensive units. Therefore it must be a requirement within this Draft Local Plan that any such changes MUST be put back to those who approved / commented upon the original application for re-approval and agreement. If that does not happen then we all fall foul of what developers want to give us and no amount of Neighbourhood or Local Planning will be worth the paper it is printed upon.	Proposed site allocations have been identified on the Policies Map. There are clear and defined boundaries for each site.
REF331 (LAA)	Helen Rodger on behalf of Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Worksop College land at Ranby	Worksop College is an independent school for ages 13 to 18 located to the south the A57, to the south of Worksop. Ranby House forms the feeder preparatory school for the College, for ages 3 to 11. Ranby House is located approximately 5.5km to the east of Worksop, within the rural settlement of Ranby. The grounds to Worksop College extend from Windmill Lane in the north and east, Netherton Road to the west, and includes the golf course and playing fields to the south of the main college building. The grounds to Ranby House comprise land to the north of Straight Mile. It includes the main campus buildings, along with two parcels of land to the west, abutting the existing settlement of Ranby, as well as areas of land to the north and east of the comprising playing fields. Worksop College have been in discussions with Bassetlaw District Council (“BDC”) regarding the opportunities for the delivery of an	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			athletics track and associated facilities at the main college site, as well as enabling development across their landholdings. BDC support the principle (subject to meeting relevant development management policies) of a new athletics track and facilities, acknowledging the significant benefits this would provide to the local community, as well as Worksop Harriers and the College. The track is provisionally proposed to be located to the east of Netherwood Road and to the north of the access road to Worksop College. In order to fund and deliver the track, 'enabling development' is required to make up a shortfall of funding. The College have therefore been exploring opportunities for redeveloping some of their residual land. This includes land to the west of the existing settlement of Ranby, as well as land to the south of Windmill Lane. Various potential uses could be promoted, but as things stand it is considered that residential development is the only realistic use that could generate sufficient value to underpin delivery of the community benefit.	
REF331 (LAA)	Helen Rodger on behalf of Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Policies Maps	The draft Policies Map includes a new 'Playingfield and Outdoor Sports Facility' designation for the majority of the land at Worksop College. The draft Policies Map appears to have applied a blanket designation to the College which does not correlate to the actual use of the land. The plan submitted with this letter provides a mark-up of areas which should not form part of the 'Playingfield and Outdoor Sports Facility', whilst Table 1 provides further information on the actual use of these areas of land. The draft Policies Map is therefore not justified by any evidence where it relates to the main college site. The changes proposed in the enclosed plan are required in order to make the Policies Map sound by removing the blanket playing field and outdoor sports facility designation where it is not justified. The additional onerous presumption against redevelopment of playing fields/outdoor sports facilities should not apply to these areas.	Policy ST47 responds to National Planning Policy and the advice from Sports England.
REF331 (LAA)	Helen Rodger on behalf of Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Other comments	This letter comprises Worksop College's (C/O Teakwood Partners) representations to the BLP, with regard to their land ownership at Worksop College and Ranby House. In order to be sound, amendments are sought to the draft policies map, which does not correlate to the actual uses of the land within their ownership. As demonstrated within this letter, the provision of additional development at SRS is supported. However, the inclusion of a cap on the number of homes that can be delivered in SRS is not considered sound, particularly where a development can be proven to be otherwise sustainable. Nor should it preclude development coming forward where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated, and this should be accounted for within Part E of Policy ST2. This letter demonstrates clear support for the emphasis in the BLP on healthy lifestyles, new community facilities and promoting sport and physical activity, although a joined-up approach is necessary to	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			secure some of these applications, and most notably those associated with a new athlete's track.	
REF333 -	Resident	Other comments	<p>The above Bassetlaw map is shown at pg28 of the subject consultation document. Only three settlements immediately adjacent to the district boundary are illustrated: Bawtry, Gainsborough and the much smaller, Sutton-on-Trent. The distance between Bawtry (S. Yorks) and Gainsborough (Lincs) is circa 12 miles across the northern segment of Bassetlaw Notts, on the A631. Gainsborough hosts the nearest Grammar School to Bassetlaw District in addition to nationally important visitor economy attraction, Gainsborough Old Hall. It is also the historic Viking Capital of England and the gateway to Lincolnshire/the coast. It also hosts the largest bridge over the River Trent (one of only two in Bassetlaw). Bawtry is shown on the above Local Plan map because it too has important visitor economy attractions (bars, pubs, restaurants, high-end retail, Pilgrim Father connections) in addition to forming the gateway to Doncaster-Sheffield Airport, Doncaster Wildlife Park, Doncaster Racecourse and the national road network to the north. At 3.1, the draft LP refers to the Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment (GL Hearn 2019) stating: "Bassetlaw does not sit within a functional economic area, different parts of the district are distinct in terms of business composition, strong business locations, growth sectors, assets and infrastructure and has ties to different neighbouring authority areas"</p>	Noted.
REF333 -	Resident	Other comments	<p>The above definition at 4.1.9 does not fit Everton. Geographically, this is an "outward-looking" settlement with fast routes to neighbouring counties – NOT linked to N2D2 - and extensive off-road sporting facilities (walking/cycling/riding). An "Equine Pelican Crossing", in the location of the current pedestrian island (as seen elsewhere in the district), would help to link riding routes and form the only "stop" crossing on the A631 for a 12mile distance. Our experience of Neighbourhood Planning has been extremely poor indeed. Everton required its own development policy within the draft LP.</p>	Policy ST2 covers Everton and other Small Rural Settlements.
REF334 -	Sutton Parish Council	Community Infrastructure Levy	<p>The Parish Council wish to object to the proposed changes in the CIL draft charging schedule. At this point in time the present level of £55-00 per square metre is not deterring rural development and will not therefore as suggested in the CIL draft charging schedule prevent delivery of the Local Plan. Developers charge a premium for rural properties so present levels are acceptable and are delivering properties In arriving at the Draft Charging Schedule there is a reference to the Infrastructure Development Plan being arrived at through engagement with key stakeholders. It is disappointing that Parish Councils were not regarded as key stakeholders and that the 53 million identified as the cost of infrastructure to deliver the Plan will no doubt</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>contain little for Parish Council's. The purpose of CIL is being ignored as it isn't a tool to help deliver a local plan. The Community Infrastructure Levy is designed to help communities deliver the infrastructure required to accommodate the increase in properties. The same rate proposal therefore suggests that the infrastructure required to deliver a development in Worksop is the same as to deliver a similar development in a rural community that has very little existing infrastructure or public transport. This change will alter the bottom line for developers and see a lot more pressure from developers to build on land within rural communities and the Parish Council fail to see how this supports the Local Plan's spatial strategy. This proposal will result in a significant loss to Rural Parish Councils with Neighbourhood Plans. This equates to a £1500 loss for every 10m x 10m property. A 10 dwelling development for example will see developers with an extra £60,000 in their pockets hence the change to the bottom line 20% Cap There is a requirement to deliver a minimum of 1090 dwellings within the rural communities over the Plan period. The 20% cap will actually deliver 2124 properties, more or less a 100% increase over what is required. There is no explanation in the Plan how this is justified. The actual percentage figure to deliver the requirement is around 10.5% . The Parish Council appreciate that this is a minimum requirement but won't additional properties arise from those Parishes that are happy to exceed their cap to deliver on infrastructure projects from CIL receipts. Incidentally the table on pages 36 and 37 does not have correct figures for the 20% increase figure for Dunham on Trent and High and Low Marnham Developers will see this figure as a target to build to and not as an absolute maximum with the result that the rural communities will increase by 100% more than intended with the subsequent pressure on infrastructure. The character of these communities will be changed forever.</p>	
REF339 -	Historic England	Soundness	<p>However, I can advise that Historic England has concerns about the Plan in relation to soundness since it does not clearly demonstrate a positive approach to the historic environment required by the NPPF in respect of preferred site allocations set out in the draft Plan. The information set out in the LAA and supporting 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. In the absence of any assessment of the degree of harm which the proposed site allocations might cause to the historic environment or, indeed, what measures the Plan might need to put in place in order to ensure that any harm is minimised, at present, the authority cannot demonstrate that the sites it is putting forward for</p>	<p>The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			possible development is compatible with the draft policies for the protection of the historic environment set out in the draft Plan or the requirements set out in the NPPF. This seems to be a disconnect between the general positive approach to the historic environment set out in the Plan and we would welcome opportunity to meet with you to discuss whether assessment information has been produced but not shown as part of the current evidence base at this time, and to discuss sites which are of particular concern to use at this time without such assessment information. Should the information not yet be available to address this issue of soundness, we would recommend 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. We will be pleased to discuss our response with you in due course and will continue to engage with the Council in respect of the draft Plan including the Garden Village proposal. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss any of the issues raised in the meantime.	
REF339 -	Historic England	Other comments	As a general comment, Historic England welcomes the positive approach to the historic environment within Draft Plan strategic policies such as Policy ST11: Rural economic growth and Policy ST32: Design Quality and development management policies such as Policy 33: Shop fronts, signage and security in addition to Policies ST37 and 38 which refer specifically to the historic environment and heritage assets respectively.	Noted.
REF344 (LAA)	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist	Land located off Fountain Hill, Walkeringham	The site extends to some 0.46ha and is located off Fountain Hill, Walkeringham. This part of Walkeringham is slightly divorced from the main part of the village but is accessed both by a regular bus service, comprising of 4 public bus routes (running every 2 hours Monday to Saturday) and 3 school bus routes with bus stops approximately 100 yards from both the north and south entrances, and by an illuminated public footpath. The owners of the site, which is a paddock at the present, live adjacent to the site in High View. The proposal would see the site developed for predominantly affordable homes. The owners of this parcel of land are very mindful of the acknowledged need to provide affordable homes for both the younger generation and the members of the public at or beyond retirement age. Not everyone wishes to or can afford to buy their own home outright. It is also an aim of the community to reinforce employment in the village, something that appears to be taking place on the old brickyard site which is very close to my client's piece of land. There are many ways to consider the meaning of sustainable development but one of the more common and easily interpreted views is that development should be located where reliance upon the motor vehicle is not	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>excessive. The obvious way to do this then is to locate new dwellings in or around the centre of the village and, secondly, to build better more eco-friendly structures that in themselves do not rely as much on heat production but more on heat retention. We are then close to reducing our reliance upon the use of fossil fuels. There are other ways in which this can be achieved so that we do not just simply fill up all the gaps in the village, after all if that village has minimal services then putting homes in the village will not reduce the reliance upon the motor car unless a much better public transport service is provided. With the advances in technology, the increased persuasion and use of electric vehicles, with the government committed to reduce the number of internal combustion engined vehicles on the roads, no new diesel and petrol cars to be produced after 2035 and the acknowledgement that eco-friendly design can be acceptable and inspiring and not necessarily expensive then it may well be the time to reappraise where we actually put dwellings. This particular site is located on Fountain Hill, an area that does not initially suggest a sustainable location but when further in-depth consideration is given then the proposed begins to make sense. There is a nationwide and also local need for houses for both elderly and youngsters. The latter group really need to be close to work places if possible. Within Walkeringham there are limited opportunities for work. However, there is the possibility that if the redevelopment of the brickyard was encouraged then hopefully workers or occupiers of units could be sourced locally, much in the same way that workers at the brickyard when it was in production lived in cottages along Fountain Hill. We are not reinventing the wheel but taking guidance from history and what has happened locally beforehand. Of the preferred sites within the Neighbourhood Plan there does not appear to be a site that has been closely identified as capable of providing houses for both young and old. However, the Neighbourhood Plan does identify clearly the need for both sectors as young couples hopefully turn into young families and the children go to the school and utilise the village hall playground. Young families are more reliant upon vehicular use to use local services but Misterton is approximately 1.6 miles and Walkeringham Primary School is only 0.9 miles from the site. Senior citizens are less reliant on the motor vehicle than most other groups and are nowadays more likely to utilise delivery services such as pharmaceutical, groceries, libraries etc. It is, however, true to say that they may require the services of a doctor more than some other groups although children also tend to visit the doctor more than most. Misterton has a very good surgery and pharmacy and it is only 2.3 miles away. This facility serves a large area around the villages of Misterton, Walkeringham, Beckingham and West Stockwith and is located centrally and in a sustainable location. Sustainability is not simply about "less use of the motor car" it is one of</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>many considerations. Greater emphasis has to be placed on the dwellings themselves, how they are constructed, the materials they utilise, energy consumption and conservation and of course long-term maintenance costs. Planning proposals currently are required to include requirements for charging points for electric vehicles which shows that steps forward regarding sustainable forms of transport are already part of the planning process. This particular site is south facing and has a topography that lends itself to a development where capture of solar energy would be very easy. Due to the slope on the land the dwellings could be, if required, cut into the ground providing shelter to the north but also providing underground storage of energy and heat. The overall concept will be to form a small energy conscious village for accommodation for both young and old. The structures would be carefully designed to make the most of the sheltered south facing aspect and the current topography. They would also be constructed using sustainable materials with all timbers being sourced from sustainable forests and suppliers, some recycled materials such as reused roofing materials could be incorporated and other new materials would be used that could prove a high content of recycled material in their makeup. There would be a great reduction in autoclaved products such as new bricks, although reclaimed would be acceptable, insitu concrete, concrete blocks and other cement based products. In comparison there would be greater reliance on high levels of insulation utilising materials with impressive eco credentials such as sheep's wool. The south facing aspect would allow for the use of solar panels either in a standalone location or possibly dwelling mounted. Heating could be provided by a commercial/ communal ground source heat pump with the electricity required to run it sourced from the solar panel installations. The owners have already engaged in discussion through their agent with a much respected local firm of energy advisors and consultants who have confirmed that a carbon audit of such a proposal would clearly show that the development in total would produce a zero carbon footprint even when some additional car journeys are factored in. This in itself would clearly show a true form of sustainable development but sustainability also has other factors and none less so than the social objective. The provision here of a small community of both young families and more senior residents would give a mix so often sought after on other housing projects but unfortunately hardly ever delivered. The site is also very close to the Chesterfield Canal and its walkways which as we all know is in itself is a SSSI and provides recreation in the form of walks, fishing and wildlife viewing. Access to the Chesterfield Canal is very close and within easy walking distance from the proposed site whereas other occupants in the village would usually need to utilise the motor vehicle to access this much cherished asset. The three objectives of sustainability</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			are economic, social and environmental. If this proposal were to become a reality all of these 3 objectives would be satisfied making this proposal much more sustainable than the traditionally built sites of three or more units which all tend to be market housing built to current building regulation standards. It is probably time for a flagship form of residential development to be promoted that could give guidance for other rural housing sites. There would need for close liaison with the local community and with the planning authority and hopefully with a developer that has experience in delivering affordable, eco-friendly zero carbon homes	
REF346 -	Doncaster Council	Duty to Cooperate	There are concerns around Duty to Cooperate and the absence of a Statement of Common Ground that covers detailed issues relating to the Local Plan. Reliance on the SCR Statement of Common Ground is considered insufficient in respect of the strategic employment policy ST8.	The Council will continue to work closely with DMBC to resolve any outstanding issues.
REF346 -	Doncaster Council	Other comments	3. Development in Harworth/Bircotes and the Bawtry Neighbourhood Plan Tickhill and Bawtry are both historic market towns containing significant numbers of heritage assets and both are close to the Bassetlaw boundary. The settlement of Harworth identified as a Main Town in the Bassetlaw Local Plan is very close to both (roughly 1 mile from each). Several main routes also converge on Bawtry and there is already concern over traffic congestion in the town. Concern over the additional impact of the expansion of Harworth on traffic in the town is expressed in the adopted Bawtry Neighbourhood Plan (Section 9: Impacts of the Expansion of Harworth, p25) which has been Adopted through a referendum (September 2019). The volume of traffic generated has a number of adverse impacts noted in the Neighbourhood Plan one of which is that it detracts from the historic character of the place by virtue of the congestion, noise and fumes generated. One of the actions in the Neighbourhood Plan (p101 action 8) is that The Town Council will encourage DMBC and Bassetlaw District Council to fulfil their “Duty to Co-Operate” with regard to the expansion of Harworth-Bircotes upon Bawtry and where concerns are identified, including those generated by increased traffic volume, they should be addressed effectively. Although traffic modelling work to assess the impact of the major Harworth/Bircotes housing developments on the Tickhill Road/ High Street junction in particular and Bawtry/Tickhill area in general has been undertaken, it is not obvious from the Local Plan that the results of this have been considered.	The Council will work closely with DMBC to further understand these issues and undertake further collaborative work if required.
REF346 -	Doncaster Council	Evidence base - employment land	4. Evidence base – employment land The amount of strategic employment land proposed does not appear to be sufficiently justified by the evidence base. Therefore, we would welcome further information that justifies this need.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF347 (Appleyhead Junction)	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	Evidence base	<p>3.23 The economic role of Bassetlaw, particularly within the distribution and logistics sector, has long been noted by the Council within their local plan evidence base given the strategic benefits of Bassetlaw in terms of its excellent connectivity and locational benefits to appropriately skilled labour and strategic road networks. This is particularly evident than the cluster of logistics uses which are located along the A57. Historic undersupply</p> <p>3.24 There is a long-standing quantitative deficit in good quality employment space in the local area and wider region. 16</p> <p>3.25 For example, the East Midlands Northern Sub-Regional Employment Land Review ('NSELR') (2008) indicated a significant shortfall in the supply of employment sites at that time. Indeed, the report noted the growth potential of the Worksop A1/A57 corridor due to the restricted future opportunities for land along the M1 yet excellent accessibility of the A1 as an alternative. 3.26 This shortfall is exemplified in Bassetlaw Council's previous Employment Land Capacity Study (2010) ('ELSC') which showed a gross requirement of between 133ha and 142 ha over the 17 year time period between 2009 to 2026. Whilst there has been some delivery against this overall objective there is still significant demand for quality logistics and employment space in Bassetlaw. 3.27 Significant shifts in the logistics market in recent years (with occupiers taking increasingly larger sites) means that land requirements must be responsive to change and be able to absorb almost immediate increases in take-up requirements. This change is accepted in the Draft Local Plan economic evidence.</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
REF347 (Appleyhead Junction)	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	EDNA	<p>3.28 Since these previous studies, growth within the industrial market and distribution sector has continued over the past decade. The Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment ('EDNA') (2019), which informs the local plan, recognises the high market demand for quality industrial floorspace within Worksop. 3.29 Take-up rates within Bassetlaw have historically represented the highest in the East Midlands Northern sub-region, at an annual average of 11.27ha per annum between 1995 and 20088. This trend continues to be reinforced under the EDNA which states: 'Distribution in the study area is above the national average reflecting in the good accessibility levels of the area and the East Midlands as a whole. Overall the distribution employment totals 5,500 jobs representing 11% of the District's employment.'</p> <p>9 3.30 Worksop continues to attract high levels of market demand, and the A1 provides strong connections north and south, emphasising the opportunity in the form of the proposed employment allocation which is strategically placed to maximise geographical advantages and accessibility. 3.31 Indeed, the EDNA identifies how employment in this sector is concentrated to the south of Worksop, principally along the 'A57 and A1 Corridor'. Despite this high</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>demand for employment space, there remains a significant shortfall in supply of employment sites. There is a pressing need to significantly boost the supply of employment land across the district and at Worksop specifically. 3.32 The location of the Apleyhead Junction site and scale of development proposed is therefore suitably placed to maximise economic growth and attract significant investment in this key sector for Worksop and the wider District, something which the previous ELCS (2010) explicitly stated Bassetlaw did 'not appear to be able to rely on'. 3.33 The EDNA references known market interest from national occupiers looking for a regional base within the area. This reinforces the attractiveness of the site location at the junction of A57 and A1, particularly for final mile distributors, and sub-regional, regional and national interest that can be fulfilled under the proposed allocation. 3.34 A site-specific assessment of the proposed allocation is within the EDNA concludes: 'the site provides a commercially attractive location for development for employment uses, particularly for large scale distribution'. 3.35 As evidenced within this section, there is demand for strategic employment sites to come forward in order to meet the clear market demand within the logistics sector across the UK, regionally, sub-regionally and within Bassetlaw. The Apleyhead Junction site is ideally placed to meet this demand. 3.39 Regional and local evidence documents note the importance of the logistics and employment sector in enabling investment and growth in both the region and Bassetlaw specifically. 3.40 There is proven demand for quality market facing employment sites, particularly along the A57 corridor close to Worksop. The Apleyhead Junction site is ideally placed to meet this demand. 3.41 The draft plan takes a positive approach to meeting future employment needs, thus the release of the Apleyhead Junction site to meet logistics needs is both welcome and logical. We go on to demonstrate there are no other locations in Bassetlaw, nor indeed within the sub-region, that can deliver the scale or quality of employment land in such an accessible location. Indeed, sub-regionally, this scale of development could only be achieved with sizeable additional Green Belt releases. 3.42 We welcome that the Local Plan evidence recognises the success of this area of Worksop in particular (along the A57 corridor) in delivering significant employment growth, job opportunities and major investment and noted the potential for a corridor or cluster of similar uses. The cross benefits of such clusters are well established.</p>	
REF349 (LAA)	Harworth Group	Former Welbeck Colliery	<p>We are supportive of the overall strategy for Bassetlaw but feel that an opportunity has been missed in identifying the former Welbeck Colliery site as a mixed-use regeneration opportunity particularly when considering the need for investment and sustainable growth in rural communities. We are supportive of the housing and</p>	<p>The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>employment distribution proposed in Policy ST1, the draft Local Plan's Spatial Strategy and Policy ST2, Growth of Rural Bassetlaw; and the 20% housing increase to large and small rural settlements totalling an increase of 1,764 and 1,090 dwellings respectively. Whilst policy ST2(D) and ST2(E) outline exceptions and additional requirements of development outside of settlement and Neighbourhood Plan areas, a windfall buffer is not accounted for. The provision of a buffer in the planned Housing Land Supply (HLS) will allow the Local Plan to respond to changing circumstances, provide market choice and cater for any under delivery over the plan period. If a wider range of allocated housing sites are included in the Plan, it will ensure the delivery of housing growth across short, medium and long terms.</p> <p>The Site: The former Welbeck Colliery site is vacant brownfield land wholly within the south-west area of the district of Bassetlaw but immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the village of Meden Vale (previously known as Welbeck Colliery Village) located within the boundary of Mansfield District Council. The site lies within the boundary of Cuckney Civil Parish and is included within the adopted Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan area. It is approximately 2 miles north-east of the town of Warsop, 8 miles south of Workshop and 1 mile north-west of the village of Cuckney. The site is located in close proximity to existing residential development along Budby Crescent and Elkesley Road. Meden Vale is a large village, with a population of over 2000 and a wide range of services and facilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An infant school • Primary school • Village Hall • Doctor's surgery • Post office • Public house • Petrol Filling Station • Pharmacy • A church • Parade of shops • Two Convenience stores • Football and Rugby Club • Small scale employment units <p>Additionally, the site and Meden Vale are served by three bus routes that provide accessibility to the wider area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. 11 – services every 15 minutes to Mansfield, Woodhouse and Warsop • No. 12 – services every 15 mins to Mansfield, Warsop, Shirebrook • No. 213 – dedicated Mansfield Schools bus route (can also be used by public) <p>Planning History: In August 2016, outline planning permission was granted (ref: 15/01037/FUL) for Offices (Use Class B1a), Employment Uses (Use Classes B1b/c, B2 and B8), Residential Development (Use Class C3) up to 65 dwellings and Ancillary Retail and Food/Drink Uses (Use Classes A1 and A3) and Associated Works in addition to a full planning permission that was granted for alterations to existing infrastructure and access points. Importantly, the outline permission for residential and employment use establishes the sustainable location of the site.</p> <p>Revised Masterplan: The site is noted in Policy ST6 'Provision of Land for Employment Development' with a potential availability of 29.6 ha and provision of 6 ha of employment land as per the extant permission. It is considered the site is not attractive for employment use of this scale and there is limited</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>prospect of redevelopment for employment use given that it has been extensively marketed by commercial agents including the use of advert hoardings, without a successful enquiry for a period of over three and half years. The attached masterplan illustrates how the site can be developed for a mixed-use incorporating the existing commercial uses on site. It is anticipated that the proposed development could include up to 250 dwellings that provide the type and mix of housing necessary to address local housing needs. Alongside the residential development, 6 hectares of employment land is proposed, in addition to the existing commercial uses that are already on site as well as 8 hectares of public open space and landscaping. The combination of residential use with a smaller scaled down Registered Office: Advantage House, Poplar Way, Catcliffe, Rotherham, S60 5TR www.harworthgroup.com employment offering seeks to appropriately meet the needs of the area whilst being more viable and attractive to prospective businesses looking to locate here. The proposed reduction in B8 'open storage' use on site by 14 ha will not adversely affect economic growth and employment opportunities in the area. Additionally, in line with Policy ST11, consolidation of B1 and B2 use around the existing commercial uses on site has the potential to create a Rural Enterprise Hub with shared resources and services. The incorporation of further housing seeks to complement this hub by meeting the residential need which cannot otherwise be met in the locality to ensure sustainable development is delivered in line with the Bassetlaw growth strategy. Thereby wholly supporting the rural economy with significant improvements to infrastructure, services and the opportunity to privately own a property.</p>	
REF349 (LAA)	Harworth Group	Former Welbeck Colliery	<p>Sustainability: As established by Bassetlaw District Council in the aforementioned planning permission, the site is sustainably located and if situated within Bassetlaw, Meden Vale would be classed as a Large Rural Settlement within the Bassetlaw's draft Spatial Strategy (Policy ST1), capable of accommodating a moderate level of growth in line with the character of the settlement. Although the site is in Bassetlaw, it is notable that the draft Warsop Parish Neighbourhood Plan (Mansfield District Council) supports residential and employment development directly adjacent to the settlement of Meden Vale to keep the Parish a viable and attractive place which meets local needs. Therefore, this site has potential to improve housing choice, job opportunities and services in this area between Bassetlaw and Mansfield whilst redeveloping vacant brownfield land without adversely affecting the landscape. Policy ST2 'Rural Bassetlaw' acknowledges the rural nature of the authority and outlines acceptable levels of growth in larger and smaller rural villages that have been assessed as sustainable. The following neighbouring villages of Cuckney,</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Holbeck, Norton and Nether Langwith have all been considered sustainable and capable of accommodating a level of growth up to 20% in the draft Plan as seen by table 1. Table 1: Proposed housing growth in draft Local Plan The site falls within a different administrative boundary to the settlement it adjoins (Meden Vale) and so whilst it perceived to be rural when solely reviewing the Bassetlaw draft Proposals Map, the site must be viewed with the wider context of Mansfield and the Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck (CNHW) Neighbourhood Plan area. By viewing the site in this manner, and understanding the duty to cooperate between local authorities, the administrative anomaly can be overcome, and the site is considered sustainable. Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan: The Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) was formally 'made' following a Referendum held in March 2017 and now forms part of the existing statutory Local Development Plan for Bassetlaw. Notably, the NDP illustrates that of the 274 dwellings with the Plan boundary: • 228 (83%) are owned and rented by the Welbeck Estate; Neighbouring Rural villages 2018 Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Policy ST2 proposed 20% growth cap Proximity to site Cuckney 162 32 1 mile north Holbeck 100 20 2.7 miles north Norton 49 Joint with Cuckney 1 mile north Nether Langwith 210 42 Registered Office: Advantage House, Poplar Way, Catcliffe, Rotherham, S60 5TR www.harworthgroup.com • 46 are privately owned; • 50% of all the properties in the Plan area were built before 1900's; • Only 2 houses have been built since the 1990's; • 33% of properties are detached compared to 22% in England; • there are no flats; and • 41% are semi-detached (English average is 31%). The Welbeck Estate is a substantial landowner, large-scale diversified business that employs much of the local population and is a key stakeholder in the Bassetlaw/Mansfield Fringe area. However, it is important to recognise that housing choice and mix is significantly constrained in south-west Bassetlaw and residents have very little choice, if any when attempting to privately own a property. The Housing Needs Survey prepared by Midlands Rural Housing in June 2013 as evidence for the NDP summarised the current housing situation in the plan area as: properties rarely come on the open market so opportunities to purchase are restricted and property prices are expensive. Open market rental prices are also high and there is little social housing. In general, prices are unaffordable for people on low incomes. The evidence indicates that: • Young people are moving away from the area and the population is ageing; • Although 59% of properties are family sized homes, only 21% are occupied by families; • The majority of households contain single people or couples who require smaller, more manageable properties; • Almost 60% of respondents were in favour of developing affordable housing in the area • Many local people have lived there all their lives and have strong ties to the area with the intent to remain there</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>and many do not expect to move from their current home. • Of those who do expect to move in the future, there is a fairly even split between the desire for private ownership, private rental and retirement housing. Importantly, the survey indicates that for future planning purposes, consideration should be given to developing a more diverse mix of housing, a more diverse mix of affordable and open market tenures and a better mix of housing types to meet and sustain a wider housing need. The provision of local employment and leisure opportunities and making larger properties available to a wider market should be considered in order to attract families and professionals into the area. Policy 1(2) relates to sustainable development stating: 2. All development should be located and designed so as to minimise any harm to: a) the amenity of nearby residents, b) any heritage assets or their setting or the character of the conservation area in that part of the village in which the development is located, and c) infrastructure associated with leisure, recreational pursuits, public transport and social and community activities within the parishes or the natural assets of the Plan area. As assessed, the colliery site has no immediate neighbours and therefore does not harm the amenity of nearby residents. There are no heritage assets or conservations areas in close proximity and the site is sustainably located adjacent to recreational areas and a soon to be country park that Sustainability: As established by Bassetlaw District Council in the aforementioned planning permission, the site is sustainably located and if situated within Bassetlaw, Meden Vale would be classed as a Large Rural Settlement within the Bassetlaw's draft Spatial Strategy (Policy ST1), capable of accommodating a moderate level of growth in line with the character of the settlement. Although the site is in Bassetlaw, it is notable that the draft Warsop Parish Neighbourhood Plan (Mansfield District Council) supports residential and employment development directly adjacent to the settlement of Meden Vale to keep the Parish a viable and attractive place which meets local needs. Therefore, this site has potential to improve housing choice, job opportunities and services in this area between Bassetlaw and Mansfield whilst redeveloping vacant brownfield land without adversely affecting the landscape. Policy ST2 'Rural Bassetlaw' acknowledges the rural nature of the authority and outlines acceptable levels of growth in larger and smaller rural villages that have been assessed as sustainable. The following neighbouring villages of Cuckney, Holbeck, Norton and Nether Langwith have all been considered sustainable and capable of accommodating a level of growth up to 20% in the draft Plan as seen by table 1. Table 1: Proposed housing growth in draft Local Plan The site falls within a different administrative boundary to the settlement it adjoins (Meden Vale) and so whilst it perceived to be rural when solely reviewing the Bassetlaw draft Proposals Map, the site must be viewed with the wider context</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>of Mansfield and the Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck (CNHW) Neighbourhood Plan area. By viewing the site in this manner, and understanding the duty to cooperate between local authorities, the administrative anomaly can be overcome, and the site is considered sustainable. Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan: The Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) was formally 'made' following a Referendum held in March 2017 and now forms part of the existing statutory Local Development Plan for Bassetlaw. Notably, the NDP illustrates that of the 274 dwellings with the Plan boundary: • 228 (83%) are owned and rented by the Welbeck Estate; Neighbouring Rural villages 2018 Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Policy ST2 proposed 20% growth cap Proximity to site Cuckney 162 32 1 mile north Holbeck 100 20 2.7 miles north Norton 49 Joint with Cuckney 1 mile north Nether Langwith 210 42 3.4 miles west HARWORTH GROUP PLC Registered in England. Company Number 2649340 Registered Office: Advantage House, Poplar Way, Catcliffe, Rotherham, S60 5TR www.harworthgroup.com • 46 are privately owned; • 50% of all the properties in the Plan area were built before 1900's; • Only 2 houses have been built since the 1990's; • 33% of properties are detached compared to 22% in England; • there are no flats; and • 41% are semi-detached (English average is 31%). The Welbeck Estate is a substantial landowner, large-scale diversified business that employs much of the local population and is a key stakeholder in the Bassetlaw/Mansfield Fringe area. However, it is important to recognise that housing choice and mix is significantly constrained in south-west Bassetlaw and residents have very little choice, if any when attempting to privately own a property. The Housing Needs Survey prepared by Midlands Rural Housing in June 2013 as evidence for the NDP summarised the current housing situation in the plan area as: properties rarely come on the open market so opportunities to purchase are restricted and property prices are expensive. Open market rental prices are also high and there is little social housing. In general, prices are unaffordable for people on low incomes. The evidence indicates that: • Young people are moving away from the area and the population is ageing; • Although 59% of properties are family sized homes, only 21% are occupied by families; • The majority of households contain single people or couples who require smaller, more manageable properties; • Almost 60% of respondents were in favour of developing affordable housing in the area • Many local people have lived there all their lives and have strong ties to the area with the intent to remain there and many do not expect to move from their current home. • Of those who do expect to move in the future, there is a fairly even split between the desire for private ownership, private rental and retirement housing. Importantly, the survey indicates that for future planning purposes, consideration should be given to developing a more diverse mix</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>of housing, a more diverse mix of affordable and open market tenures and a better mix of housing types to meet and sustain a wider housing need. The provision of local employment and leisure opportunities and making larger properties available to a wider market should be considered in order to attract families and professionals into the area. Policy 1(2) relates to sustainable development stating: 2. All development should be located and designed so as to minimise any harm to: a) the amenity of nearby residents, b) any heritage assets or their setting or the character of the conservation area in that part of the village in which the development is located, and c) infrastructure associated with leisure, recreational pursuits, public transport and social and community activities within the parishes or the natural assets of the Plan area. As assessed, the colliery site has no immediate neighbours and therefore does not harm the amenity of nearby residents. There are no heritage assets or conservations areas in close proximity and the site is sustainably located adjacent to recreational areas and a soon to be country park that Sustainability: As established by Bassetlaw District Council in the aforementioned planning permission, the site is sustainably located and if situated within Bassetlaw, Meden Vale would be classed as a Large Rural Settlement within the Bassetlaw's draft Spatial Strategy (Policy ST1), capable of accommodating a moderate level of growth in line with the character of the settlement. Although the site is in Bassetlaw, it is notable that the draft Warsop Parish Neighbourhood Plan (Mansfield District Council) supports residential and employment development directly adjacent to the settlement of Meden Vale to keep the Parish a viable and attractive place which meets local needs. Therefore, this site has potential to improve housing choice, job opportunities and services in this area between Bassetlaw and Mansfield whilst redeveloping vacant brownfield land without adversely affecting the landscape. Policy ST2 'Rural Bassetlaw' acknowledges the rural nature of the authority and outlines acceptable levels of growth in larger and smaller rural villages that have been assessed as sustainable. The following neighbouring villages of Cuckney, Holbeck, Norton and Nether Langwith have all been considered sustainable and capable of accommodating a level of growth up to 20% in the draft Plan as seen by table 1. Table 1: Proposed housing growth in draft Local Plan The site falls within a different administrative boundary to the settlement it adjoins (Meden Vale) and so whilst it perceived to be rural when solely reviewing the Bassetlaw draft Proposals Map, the site must be viewed with the wider context of Mansfield and the Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck (CNHW) Neighbourhood Plan area. By viewing the site in this manner, and understanding the duty to cooperate between local authorities, the administrative anomaly can be overcome, and the site is considered sustainable. Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan: The Neighbourhood</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Development Plan (NDP) was formally 'made' following a Referendum held in March 2017 and now forms part of the existing statutory Local Development Plan for Bassetlaw. Notably, the NDP illustrates that of the 274 dwellings with the Plan boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 228 (83%) are owned and rented by the Welbeck Estate; Neighbouring Rural villages 2018 Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Policy ST2 proposed 20% growth cap Proximity to site Cuckney 162 32 1 mile north Holbeck 100 20 2.7 miles north Norton 49 Joint with Cuckney 1 mile north Nether Langwith 210 42 3.4 miles west <p>HARWORTH GROUP PLC Registered in England. Company Number 2649340 Registered Office: Advantage House, Poplar Way, Catcliffe, Rotherham, S60 5TR www.harworthgroup.com</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 46 are privately owned; • 50% of all the properties in the Plan area were built before 1900's; • Only 2 houses have been built since the 1990's; • 33% of properties are detached compared to 22% in England; • there are no flats; and • 41% are semi-detached (English average is 31%). <p>The Welbeck Estate is a substantial landowner, large-scale diversified business that employs much of the local population and is a key stakeholder in the Bassetlaw/Mansfield Fringe area. However, it is important to recognise that housing choice and mix is significantly constrained in south-west Bassetlaw and residents have very little choice, if any when attempting to privately own a property. The Housing Needs Survey prepared by Midlands Rural Housing in June 2013 as evidence for the NDP summarised the current housing situation in the plan area as: properties rarely come on the open market so opportunities to purchase are restricted and property prices are expensive. Open market rental prices are also high and there is little social housing. In general, prices are unaffordable for people on low incomes. The evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people are moving away from the area and the population is ageing; • Although 59% of properties are family sized homes, only 21% are occupied by families; • The majority of households contain single people or couples who require smaller, more manageable properties; • Almost 60% of respondents were in favour of developing affordable housing in the area • Many local people have lived there all their lives and have strong ties to the area with the intent to remain there and many do not expect to move from their current home. • Of those who do expect to move in the future, there is a fairly even split between the desire for private ownership, private rental and retirement housing. <p>Importantly, the survey indicates that for future planning purposes, consideration should be given to developing a more diverse mix of housing, a more diverse mix of affordable and open market tenures and a better mix of housing types to meet and sustain a wider housing need. The provision of local employment and leisure opportunities and making larger properties available to a wider market should be considered in order to attract families and professionals into the area. Policy 1(2) relates to sustainable</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			development stating: 2. All development should be located and designed so as to minimise any harm to: a) the amenity of nearby residents, b) any heritage assets or their setting or the character of the conservation area in that part of the village in which the development is located, and c) infrastructure associated with leisure, recreational pursuits, public transport and social and community activities within the parishes or the natural assets of the Plan area. As assessed, the colliery site has no immediate neighbours and therefore does not harm the amenity of nearby residents. There are no heritage assets or conservations areas in close proximity and the site is sustainably located adjacent to recreational areas and a soon to be country park that	
REF349 (LAA)	Harworth Group	Former Welbeck Colliery	can offer further community activities. Therefore, the masterplan illustrates sustainable development in accordance with Policy 1 of the NDP. The regeneration of the Colliery site is not included in the scope of NDP given the 2016 planning permission for employment use predates the adoption of the Plan. However, it is noted the communities of CNHW support the redevelopment of the former colliery as a critical driver for employment-led development to replace the economic decline driven by a reduction in mining and agricultural activities. None of the employment policies in the NDP are intended to constrain the Welbeck Colliery redevelopment proposals. Policy 19 of the NDP supports development of Use Classes B1 or B2 on the existing concrete pads located in the Hatfield Plantation adjacent to the northern boundary of the colliery, these are included within the approved hybrid planning application. The policy states that development at the Hatfield Plantation is anticipated to complement commercial activities on the former Welbeck Colliery site, creating a 'business hub' in the area, and also that the combination of both sites will provide a significant boost to the local economy. As previously set out, it is evident the general assumption throughout the NDP that the former Welbeck Colliery will be regenerated and redeveloped for large scale employment use will not be realised in its fullest extent due to lack of demand. The revised masterplan demonstrates development of Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 within the colliery site, this adheres to Policy 19 in relation to delivering economic benefits and regenerating brownfield land with potential to expand into the Hatfield Plantation once development is established on the Colliery site. The revised masterplan consolidates 14 ha of B8 use into 6 ha of B1/B2 and B8 use surrounding existing commercial activities to create a business hub in the area. The residential and leisure uses incorporated into the masterplan will provide a significant boost to the local economy whilst complementing and enhancing the economic benefits associated with redevelopment of the former Welbeck Colliery and the Hatfield Plantation.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Brownfield Land: A significant portion of the site (17.3ha) is identified in Part 1 of the Bassetlaw Brownfield Land Register (reference BFR22) Sites included in Part 1 of the Register are considered to be appropriate for residential development having regard to the criteria set out in regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017. The criteria require that: a) land must have an area of at least 0.25 hectares or is capable of supporting at least 5 dwellings; b) the land is suitable for residential development; c) the land is available for residential development; and d) residential development of the land is achievable. Inclusion of 17.3 ha of the site within the Bassetlaw Brownfield Land Register further establishes the sustainability of the site and strengthens the case for the allocation of the site for mixed use regeneration. Visitor Economy and Quality of Life: The site is adjacent to a permitted Country Park that is currently being restored, to be completed by May 2023. Policy ST12 of the draft Local Plan emphasises support for development that promotes Bassetlaw as a 'destination' for visitors. The proposed masterplan incorporates a green corridor that connects the country park to the wider area. This connection also aligns to chapter's 8, 9 & 10 of the draft Plan that highlight connectivity, health & wellbeing and 'greening' Bassetlaw. The addition of a carefully designed mixed-use development on this site has the potential and develop a social nucleus for the country park and enhance its offering as a destination with Bassetlaw whilst repurposing brownfield land. Allocation of this land for mixed-use with high quality design principles conforms to the aspirations of the Council in delivering a sustainable recreational offering, that makes Bassetlaw a desirable place to not only live in but visit. Additionally, Elkesley Hill, identified as a site of importance for nature conservation (SINC) is located towards the south-eastern extreme of the site. The masterplan proposes a substantial green buffer between the SINC and residential development in the north-east of the site using high-quality public open space, this has the added benefit of maintaining the rural 'feel' of the area. Conclusion: Since outline planning permission was obtained in August 2016, the employment land has undergone extensive marketing with no successful enquiries, consequently developing this land solely for employment use is considered an unviable proposition and there is no realistic prospect of the full extent of employment development coming forward in the foreseeable future. The site occupies a sustainable and highly accessible location on the edge of Meden Vale, with the ability to support nearby smaller rural settlements within the CNHW Neighbourhood Plan area as well as connect to the larger settlements of Warsop, Shirebrook, Mansfield and Worksop. It is accessible by foot, cycle and public transport links that serve both Bassetlaw and Mansfield. Allocation of the site for mixed-use will deliver substantial economic benefits, providing inward investment,</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>economic growth and employment opportunities to the rural economy in line with the Council's strategic objectives and as outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan. It should also be noted that by supporting the re-development of this brownfield land, it provides support to neighbouring villages whilst protecting the character, heritage and amenity of those villages. As evidenced by the CNHW NDP, there is significant need to diversify and improve the housing mix and affordability in this area to support a range of residents as well as provide increased opportunities to privately own a property. Not providing these opportunities to the local population may exacerbate the problem of young people and professionals moving away for these villages. Therefore, Welbeck Colliery makes a suitable site to achieve this and make a valuable contribution towards meeting the housing and employment needs of the district without adversely affecting the character and amenity of neighbouring villages. Given the sustainability of the location, the re-use of brownfield land, enrichment of the rural economy and provision of housing to support Bassetlaw and Mansfield, this site conforms to policies within the draft Plan and adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan and should therefore be allocated for mixed-use development.</p>	
REF353 -	Sturton Parish Council	Other comments	<p>2. We regret, however, that such an important document, which will have a profound impact on the rural environment and economy in general and our deliberations during the NP Review should be afforded only 6 weeks for consultation, given that there has been a gap of 3 ½ years since the first draft was published in October 2016. We note that we were given 8 weeks to comment on the first draft published in 2016. 3. We are a small group of volunteers, working hard to review the NP in accordance with the information we have at our disposal. It is difficult in this environment to devote additional time to scrutinise the Draft Local Plan, particularly when it changes from version to version.</p>	Noted.
REF356 -	Grassthorpe Parish Meeting	Other comments	<p>In conclusion the reuse of this site provides Bassetlaw District Council and EON with a rare opportunity not only to repay the local community for 50 years of acceptance of a former necessary national energy provider which had a significant impact on a very quiet rural location, but to lead the way in contributing a sustainable and environmentally friendly use for the site within a national framework. Extending the Fledborough and Harby Disused Railway Line Local Wildlife Site and the Old Trent Wildlife Site would deliver a more sustainable area for biodiversity which could be enjoyed by the wider community and provide educational and recreational opportunities. Bassetlaw District Council has a significant part to play in gaining wider understanding of how the proposals will impact upon the natural environment, the transport network and the local communities. This should be</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>researched independently by the Council and form part of the plan policy's evidence base. The location of the site so close to the district boundary means that wider collaboration is needed with communities, both to the south and beyond the River Trent to the east, because existing developments have been impacting on those communities including our own as set out above. Point 1.1.2 of your plan states; The draft Local Plan provides an important strategy for Bassetlaw District. It will play a significant role in delivering sustainable development in appropriate locations and in helping to protect the countryside, important green spaces and the built and natural environment from inappropriate development, thus enhancing the quality of life for people and communities. Currently the policy ST7 reads as a developers 'wish list' rather than the Council's framework to provide a truly sustainable reuse for the High Marnham Power Station site. The council should be mindful that their proposal plan policies will need to stand up to the same scrutiny as Heathrow.</p>	
REF360	D2N2	Other comments	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on your draft development plan. As you know, as a non-statutory consultee we do not comment on specific sites or policies in local plans, but we are happy to make some more general observations. I'm delighted to see the strength of the economic growth ambitions for Bassetlaw, and that these ambitions align closely to our key ambitions, and may I commend the team at Bassetlaw District Council for the hard work I know has gone into producing this plan. As you know, our Strategic Economic Plan Vision 2030 set out three key themes: • supporting productive and growing businesses, • delivering skills and knowledge for the future, • enhancing the quality of the places where we live and work. Our draft Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) focuses on some key priorities to ensure we deliver on Vision 2030: • Boosting productivity by focusing on stronger alignment between the education and skills systems and the needs of business • Driving a low-carbon revolution in the way we deliver jobs, homes and infrastructure, including through innovation in low-carbon technologies, taking carbon out of our construction supply chain and better use of our existing natural and physical assets. • Making a step change in physical and digital connectivity. Bassetlaw has a key role to play in delivering on these ambitions. The sites at High Marnham and Cottam, the potential Garden Village and Sherwood Forest are all specifically referenced in our draft local industrial strategy as places which could have significant roles to play across all there LIS priorities. We are aware that there are other significant brownfields sites which we would also welcome being brought back into productive use. You also reference the need to increase the numbers of highly skilled jobs and jobs in the construction sector more broadly, and this aligns very closely to the thinking behind our emerging LIS. You mention the need to</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			increase social mobility through provision of additional superfast broadband, which again aligns well with the LIS and we look forward to working with colleagues in Bassetlaw on this important agenda.	
REF363 -	Resident	Other comments	Finally there is scant mention of the former Bevercotes Colliery site. It would appear this has no part in your plan for the district. I appreciate there is a planning permission granted for warehouse development. This permission will soon run out of date. I do not see any evidence of work on this site. May I offer a suggestion? The area should be used for the planting of trees thus extending the pit wood site and turned into a recreation area. This would have the advantage of absorbing the pollutants from the nearby A1.	Noted.
REF364 (LAA)	Consultant on behalf of land owner	land adjacent to Ratcliffe Cottage	Please find attached a rough plan and aerial image of the land adjacent to Ratcliffe Cottage which we would like to submit for inclusion in your local plan review	Noted.
REF366 (LAA)	Broadgrove on behalf of MLN (Land and Properties) Ltd.	Land off Blyth Road, Harworth	1.4. MLN Land and Properties Ltd control approximately 7.4 hectares of land located west of Blyth Road, Harworth. A site location plan depicting the extent of the land controlled by our client is appended to this document. 1.5. Land off Blyth Road was submitted to, and assessed by, the Land Availability Assessment (LAA) published in 2017 under site reference LAA222. The LAA concludes that the appeal site is suitable, achievable and developable for residential development of up to 178 dwellings. The accompanying housing trajectory assumed development starting in 2023. 1.6. As recognised by the LAA, there are no significant constraints to development and the site is sustainably located for access to the day-to-day services and facilities which would be required by future residents. 1.7. An outline planning application for the erection of up to 199 dwellings and associated access was submitted to Bassetlaw Council in July 2018 (ref: 18/00903/OUT). Although the application was refused by Members of Planning Committee in January 2019, the Case Officer's report demonstrates the sites suitability for residential development, with no technical constraints 1.8. This application had no technical objections and satisfied all statutory consultee requirements demonstrating deliverability. This planning application was the subject of an appeal and the Inspectors report also confirmed that there were no technical reasons why the site could not be developed. 1.9. The Council requested a resubmission of the refused scheme, prior to the appeal being heard. The resubmission scheme was for exactly the same development and was submitted in August 2019. This application (Ref 19/01059/OUT) was recommended for approval by officers and the Committee report (6 November 2019) confirmed that there were no technical constraints to development of the site. 1.10. In recognition of the above we trust that the Council	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			accept that there are no technical reasons why the site should not be allocated for development. As such it is requested that the site is allocated for future residential development in the Bassetlaw Local Plan.	
REF366 (LAA)	Broadgrove on behalf of MLN (Land and Properties) Ltd.	Other comments	<p>1.35. The proposed housing requirement of 478 dwellings per annum, an increase from the previous consultation document is welcomed but still does not go far enough to support a positive growth strategy and has the potential to restrict growth of the Bassetlaw economy. 1.36. The proposed housing target of 478 dwellings per annum is significantly short of the requirement of 670 dwellings per annum that was identified in the 2017 SHMA as being the required level to ensure that the full affordable housing needs of the District are met. 1.37. As set out in the earlier table, the level of affordable housing delivery continues to be poor and has never reached beyond 50% of the required 134 annual requirement over the last plan period. 1.38. As well as an overall increase in the number of houses, there should be additional housing growth proposed in Harworth in order to maximise the opportunity to regenerate the town and make a step change in the delivery of housing in the settlement. Given the recent success of attracting a variety of employers in recent years it is essential that a range of sites and opportunities for new housing are provided to ensure that opportunities exist to accommodate large scale economic growth. 1.39. Reliance on the current housing permissions in Harworth will not provide the appropriate levels of infrastructure for the existing and future residents of the town. The latest Annual Monitoring Reports states that there were only the following 56 affordable housing unit completions in Harworth since 2013. 1.40. The strategy of allocating no further sites will increase reliance on the Colliery site, a site which the owners have publicly stated that due to issues of viability they will be unable to comply with policy requirements on affordable housing and other financial contributions to local infrastructure. 1.41. The suggested strategy of a new garden village for significant housing delivery which will detract from the ability to regenerate Harworth and Bircotes. A more appropriate solution would be for a significant increase in growth around Harworth and Bircotes to create another rural hub town of a similar status to Retford in the north of the district, which could also be delivered where there is a significant increase in employment land, such as the additional 81 hectares at Snape Lane. 1.42. As confirmed by the Councils SHLAA and the two recent planning applications on land off Blyth Road, Harworth, this site is developable for housing. There are no technical constraints to development and could make an immediate contribution to the Districts affordable housing shortage and provide much needed infrastructure to meet the aims and aspirations of the growth of Harworth and Bircotes. 1.43. We</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base and local Plan moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			trust that the comments provided above will be reviewed and recorded by the Council and used to inform the Bassetlaw Local Plan.	
REF412	Consultant	Other comments	Neighbourhood Planning is not a legal requirement but a right which communities in England can chose to use. "Localism Act, updated 2019, Ministry of Housing Committee and Local Government (Paragraph 002 Ref: ID 41-002-20190909 revised 09/05/2019) By not consulting fully with residents prior to publication of B.D.C Local Plan, in Retford; that local population have been unable to have the opportunity to contribute in a corporate way (via neighbourhood planning) of genuine worth. Such a contribution (via neighbourhood planning) would have enhanced and improved B.D.C Draft Local Plan. I ask, therefore, that the consultation period be extended to allow the above to take place. Residents of Retford do not get a "Free Press" and the public consultation has been restrictive, and, consequently not as productive as it could have been.	Noted.
REF462 (LAA)	Consultant	Land at South Wheatley	I would like to express my interest by asking that the area of land which presently constitutes my garden be included in the revised Plan for the area on the basis that prior to publication of the Plan I have twice had an application for an additional dwelling on my property declined on the basis this did not agree with the Bassetlaw Local Plan at that point in time.	Noted.
REF478 -	Resident	Other comments	12th February phoned Council bins not emptied. Said traffic problem. Does this not tell you something about your plans? No support for: • Rural policies • Garden Village (Policy ST3) – you are doing away with Sandhills and building one elsewhere. Please wake up. • Employment policies. Employment cannot get out to go to work. What employment have we in Retford. • Regeneration schemes • Amount and location of new homes • Worksop policies • Retford policies. Two school sites empty, not used. Why? • Policies which seek to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment • Policies which seek to protect community facilities • Policies which seek to address climate change • Policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure Support for: • Policies which seek to protect the historic environment.	Noted.
REF484 -	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	Transport Assessment	The draft local plan makes reference to the Bassetlaw Transport Assessment. The data for bus and rail is now well out of date and we would suggest a new Transport Assessment be carried out before the Local Plan is adopted.	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
REF485	Bassetlaw District Council	Other comments	PLEASE REFER TO COMMENTS ON DOCUMENT THAT IS PRINTED OUT as they are all corrections rather than comments	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF487	Bassetlaw Integrated Care Partnership (ICP)	Transport Assessment	<p>Just some thoughts on the transport assessment for the local plan. I've had no further formal feedback from the group but thought I would share my thoughts/questions. • Is this document being formally adopted by the district council as the approach for the 2037 capacity/ demand planning? • Is there a plan to link in with the county council, particularly in relation to the bus strategy, around both the new developments and capacity improvements? • What are the next steps? Will the document be formally costed or will these costings depend upon which elements of the plan are adopted? • The document mentions the Gamston/Bevercotes GV at various points; is this because of when the report was written? My understanding from your presentation to the group on 10th Feb was that Gamston/ Bevercotes had been ruled out? • How would the junctions identified by DMBC be addressed, if the recommendations are adopted? Is it a case of petitioning DMBC to undertake the necessary improvements or vice versa (with DMBC permissions)? Or is this likely to be a 50/50% split between the authorities? The improvements at Harworth and Kilton Hill (near Morrisons) in Worksop seem the most sensible although improvements at Bawtry are long overdue (more a DMBC issue). Although the document seems to rule out immediate plans around A57 corridor improvements from the A1 towards Worksop, it seems inevitable that some form of improvement schedule would be needed given the likely increase of traffic across that junction and onto the A57? Particularly if there is substantial commercial traffic released by the business development? Interestingly, the report (when excluding the commercial development) concludes that the A57 improvements would not be required on the back of the Morton village alone. Is this because it is anticipated that traffic is self- contained? This would also seem to rely on the development of the rail infrastructure at Morton Garden Village, although my understanding from the presentation was that this might post-date the local plan timeline of 2037, due to the necessary negotiations with Network Rail. Links into the county council bus strategy would seem to be useful given the potential for new bus routes from the new developments – will this capacity have been factored in within the report? Hope these comments are of some use; although I may have highlighted some areas which are not at issue at present.</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.
REF488 (includes images of policies)	Bassetlaw District Council	Formatting of the Plan	<p>• P4 - Page nos for Sections 11 and 12 wrong • Notation for references – 10.1.19, 11.1.2, 11.1.8, 11.1.9, 11.1.12, 11.4.13, 11.4.15 • 3.21 – Council has • 3.25 – What is a churn in the housing market? • 5.1.24 pop of 7,94810? • 5.1.44 to a new etc • ST2 page 36 – Cottam –to be delivered • ST8 (6) extra i • 8.3.5 A key to the colours on the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Areas would help • P135 –existing community</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
			facilities duplicated • ST42 A –what is a 3G pitch? • P164 – High Marnham crept into the Garden village • P175 – land and the next	
REF488 (includes images of policies)	Bassetlaw District Council	Glossary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLOSSARY –explanations would help. o Agricultural land grading o Step-change o Use classes o Vacant building credit o Urban grain. 	Noted.
REF490	Department for Transport	Gamston Airport	<p>I am writing to you as the Aviation Minister at Department for Transport to raise awareness of the strategic network of aerodromes within the United Kingdom. Aerodromes play a key role in both business and leisure aviation and are part of the General Aviation (GA) sector which covers all non-scheduled civil aviation operations. The Government's vision is of the UK being the best place in the world for GA as a flourishing, wealth-generating and job producing sector of the economy. As such, the Department is focussed on furthering the benefits that the GA sector brings to local and national economies and ensuring there is appropriate and proportionate protection for aerodromes forming the strategic network across the UK. I am writing to you in reference to Gamston (Retford) aerodrome, which has been identified as a potential site for a garden village development in the Bassetlaw District Council Local Plan. I understand that the next stage of the draft plan is due for consultation in January 2020. Whilst I appreciate that local authorities need to carefully balance land use priorities, housing in particular, I wanted to emphasise the contribution that GA makes to regional economies and the importance of maintaining access to a national network of GA airfields. You may already be aware that Gamston airfield hosts a range of GA activities, including charter services, air ambulance and medical flights, refuelling and private flying. Alongside this, there are pilot training facilities and Nottinghamshire Police use the site to deliver driver training in tactical pursuit. In order to provide greater support for local GA airfields, the Government issued guidance to planning authorities within the National Planning Policy Framework (section 104f). This document specifies the importance of maintaining a national network of GA airfields and asks that their economic value be considered within Local Plans and taken into account in future planning decisions. I hope this information can be included in future considerations of development applications for the area close to the aerodrome, as well as the land on which it operates. I understand, that in the interests of fairness and transparency, you may wish to share this letter with the parties interested in the decision about the airfield site.</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY/PAGE/ PLAN PART	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENTS
REF491 (LAA263)	Stone Planning Services	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>Sustainability Appraisal 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 pages 580-583 of the Sustainability Appraisal. We would be grateful if the Council would consider the following points: 1. SA1 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity The SA notes: "Cliff Gate Grassland LWS is within the site and Beacon Hill Grassland is adjacent the site". 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. 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. 2. SA3 - Economy and Skills. 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 SHELAA's related to: Site A - 15.76ha Site B - 13.61ha Site C - 6.64ha 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. 3. SA8 - Water. 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. 4. SA13 - Cultural Heritage 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. We would be grateful if the Council would 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.</p>	The Council will consider the information provided and review the evidence base moving forward.