

Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 - 2038

Submission Library

November 2020
Consultation Responses Schedule



Bassetlaw
DISTRICT COUNCIL
— North Nottinghamshire —

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
REF138	Resident	Paragraph 3.11 says that “Figure 5 below provides a summary of the population of the District, Nottinghamshire and England & Wales...”, but unfortunately the table columns are labelled “Bassetlaw, East Midlands and Great Britain”!	Comments noted. Figure 5 will be amended accordingly.
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	Potential threats to our (and other settlements’) Neighbourhood Plan Those of us who worked on our own Parish’s Neighbourhood Plan are concerned with a statement in section 1.12.5.“Following adoption of this plan, as new planning policies are approved at national, local and neighbourhood plan level - the most recent policies always take precedence. If as a consequence of this Plan or new national policy being introduced part of a Neighbourhood Plan becomes out of date, the Council will support Parish Councils to revise their plans accordingly.” This seems to imply that where a new higher tier of government plan is in contradiction to the approved Neighbourhood Plan then the Neighbourhood Plan will always be “trumped” by higher tier plans without recourse to discussion or mediation. What if the higher-level plan, say from the Government, is not evidence based but the Neighbourhood Plan is?	Developing neighbourhood plan policies that are supported by robust evidence is important, but so, too, is the need for such policies to be in general conformity with the strategies that sit above them. Indeed, this is one of the basic conditions that neighbourhood plans are assessed against as part of independent examination. That said, there are, inevitably, times when a degree of ‘catching-up’ is required, owing to the potential variance in when changes to strategies at different levels of the planning policy hierarchy are made. In the same way that neighbourhood plans are produced, the development or review of district and national level planning strategies include opportunities for public consultation before they are adopted. The 2020 consultation on the Planning White Paper is a good example. We actively encourage communities in the District to engage in these opportunities when they arise. In particular, communities that have produced a neighbourhood plan will have a heightened understanding of the implications of higher-order strategies on their own; this is valuable insight, and should be voiced.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Figure 3 Planning Officers should consider the inclusion of West Lindsey District Council and North-East Lincs Council. Although clearly not part of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area, nevertheless Gainsborough (in West Lindsey) is the closest town to many of the villages in north-east Bassetlaw and will see extensive house-building. There is considerable movement for housing, employment, and shopping between north-east Bassetlaw and Gainsborough	The Council engages in Duty to Cooperate with West Lindsey District Council and North-East Lincs Council but neither sit within the Housing Market Area, the D2N2 LEP area or the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority area defined by the map.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	para 3.4/3.5 It is worth noting that while agriculture may still be a significant presence in Bassetlaw, as a source of employment it has seen a decline. Mechanisation and changing patterns of land use mean that far fewer people are working 'on the land'. In Misterton, this, combined with the loss of heavy industry, means that there is very little local employment. With limited public transport, this forces people into their cars to seek employment further afield.	Comments noted.
1658674	D2N2	D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership does not normally comment on specific policies within local plans, but confirm our continued support for the overall strategic aims of the council and its plan. Pleased to have supported important local developments such as the redevelopment of Vesuvius Brickworks and the construction of the Harworth Access Road. Fully support Bassetlaw’s ambition to be a modern and prosperous district. Our recent Economic Recovery and Growth Strategy commits us to securing connectivity-led growth to and for all parts of the D2N2 region, including key sites at High Marnham, Cottam, Apleyhead and the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village. A robust and up-to-date planning framework is essential to making that happen.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
1658674	D2N2	Context para 3.3 The impact of Covid-19 has led us to develop our new strategy to balance the immediate need to sustain and stabilise the region's economy with planning for longer term growth. As a result, our priority sectors for employment support in the short term include retail, hospitality, leisure and catering. There is clear alignment between the Bassetlaw Plan and the D2N2 strategy on longer term growth sectors and roles including low carbon engineering, construction and energy production and a move towards digital adoption in sectors such as logistics and retail.	Support noted and welcome.
1661414	Planning With People	para 5.1.27 refers to the windfall allowance of approx 100 dwellings per year are proposed for ST2 - but I can see no reference to this in ST2 or in ST1 - do you have an windfall allowance in fact?	Based on historical data the windfall allowance has been assessed as 100 dwellings per annum across the District. Windfall sites are expected to be a reliable source of housing supply during the plan period contributing 1200 homes. This is shown in the Trajectory.
1665972	Resident	3.23 Physical infrastructure, social infrastructure and green infrastructure first. not main retail shops really! I've been informed no infrastructure will be applied in a recent Zoom meeting. planning will create the problem then try to fix it. - In reference to Harworth	Planning permissions have secured the infrastructure necessary to mitigate adverse impacts on Harworth. Infrastructure is phased alongside development so not all infrastructure has been provided yet. The national retail chains are already in Harworth town centre.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	4.14 'use of electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles'; there are many articles in the media and Government regarding this and considerable attention obviously needs to be given to it. The policies for the new developments have criteria outlined to address this but thought must be given to the existing localities and how they can resolve the problem they are likely to have in future years when electric vehicles out-number the internal combustion engine. Where communities have sizeable grass verges could these be converted to parking bays with charging points?	The Local Plan supports provision of electric vehicle infrastructure in new development.
REF169	Resident	para 3.19 Gives a more balanced account of the current situation of cycling infrastructure in the District and recognises that expanding the network and improving connectivity continues to be a priority.	Support noted and welcome
REF169	Resident	para 5.3.26 (line 3) Use of the word "bicycle" restricts inclusivity, so change to "cycle".	Change made accordingly
1666746	Resident	3.0 Context. The ambition of the Draft Plan is evident and welcome to an area in need of investment. Applaud the emphasis on creating new but urge BDC to make better use of what has fallen into disrepair or is unused. The description of assets does not detail current housing stock, current housing in build or completed. No mention of council rented dwellings features as context for future housing demand neither does the predicted after shock of Covid on the economy appear given the pandemic is nearing a year of consequences.	This sits outside the planning system and is a matter for housing services.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	Throughout the document, reference is made to 'new housing developments being of high quality, well designed, energy efficient and respectful of the setting' (4.11, ST2, D2). In general this statement is what should be expected of any development but, 'well-designed' and the accompanying 3 criteria can be very subjective. Could there be a situation where modern, energy efficient homes would not be of a similar style to the locality that could then prevent their development? Would like to see significant weighting being applied to the eco-credentials during the planning process. 4.14 'use of electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles'. The policies for new developments have criteria outlined to address this but we would like to see thought given to existing localities and how they can resolve the problem they are likely to have in future years when electric vehicles out-number the internal combustion engine. Where communities have sizeable grass verges could these be converted to parking bays with charging points?	Policy ST50 supports climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in design. Policy ST35 supports use of innovative design subject to the other provisions of the Plan. Each application is judged on its merits and a modern energy efficient home can be designed to complement local context.
REF197	Resident	3.10 p 163 8.8 a. the District has a number of town and rural churches which are listed buildings and of historic interest, some of which relate to the story of the Mayflower Pilgrims and their associated families. b. Retford and Worksop Railway Stations are both listed buildings and have links to the history and heritage of the area. c. The environments in front of the railway stations needs to be considered.	Reference to historic churches has been made to the introduction to the heritage section. The historic value of Worksop Railway station is recognised through the draft Worksop Central DPD, and the importance of Retford Railway

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
			Station acknowledged in the site allocation policy for Station Road.
REF197	Resident	(3.18) The A 631 road which goes through the north of Bassetlaw linking Gainsborough (and beyond the Louth) to Bawtry and the A1 could become a significant arterial road, but this would require planning consideration to resolving potential bottlenecks at Everton and Bawtry. This road could provide a viable road east for distribution companies based at Harworth and/or the A1 junction at Blyth. The plan refers to wanting to discourage people from working outside the District (3.7) – is this a bad thing – with more people working from home etc, does it matter where they earn their money? Is it not more important to encourage people to start up their businesses in Bassetlaw, especially businesses which are able to source local materials and export finished products? Retford has the potential to be an attractive location for people relocating from London, who may initially work from home and occasionally commute – the railway connection for work/social activities is a good one - they may also then start their own enterprises in Bassetlaw. Should Bassetlaw be promoting itself as a business friendly relocation opportunity?	The existing employment sites policy and employment outside designated areas or in rural areas is supportive of local business growth. The town centres policies also promote the growth of local business to enhance the viability of town centres. There are no plans to enhance the A631 at present.
1669799	Resident	(3.14) There is nothing new with this statement. The population has been ageing in increasing numbers for many years but has been completely ignored by actions. In previous plans there have been similar statements regarding providing appropriate housing but the council has done absolutely nothing about it in Harworth & Bircotes. How many bungalows are being built on the sites off Bawtry Road? None. How many bungalows were built on the old pit land near the crossroads? None. How many bungalows have been built or are projected to be built on the pit site itself? None (3.26) Again these are just words. Bassetlaw sold off pensioner flats on Milne Road in Bircotes which were then “revamped” & then turned into general rental accommodation. Yes, people may want to downsize as they get older, maintain their independence & free up family housing but what has Bassetlaw done to enable this up to now? Very little.	The Local Plan ensures that all market housing is designed to be accessible and adaptable. This will make a significant contribution to provision for older people. The sites in Harworth & Bircotes are the result of speculative development and have been assessed against the Core Strategy. Strategic site allocations in the Local plan promote bungalows.
1670869	Resident	(3.12 - 3.14) these paras state that the population growth in Bassetlaw is predominantly due to a change in age profile - ie over 50% of the predicted growth will be in the over 65s (retired) cohort. It is not clear that this prediction has fully influenced some of the proposals in respect of type and importantly location of housing growth. this cohort cannot be isolated miles from town. for example - Why is Cottam considered a suitable location to address the housing needs - a new settlement here will not be suitable for this group. green agenda - paras 3.30 and vision para 4.5 Why is High Marnham considered the appropriate site for green energy rather than Cottam? see later comments, see no assessment of comparison between the two sites.	Cottam is identified as a possible area of growth in the future subject to various criteria in the policy being met. Marnham is identified as a green energy hub because of its ability to provide infrastructure to allow the green energy sector to connect to the national grid infrastructure. Green energy would be supported on Cottam subject to the provision so the policy being met.
REF032	Resident	para 3.4/3.5 It is worth noting that while agriculture may still be a significant presence in Bassetlaw, as a source of employment it has seen a decline. Mechanisation and changing patterns of land use mean that far fewer people are working 'on the land'. In the Misterton Ward, this, combined with the loss of heavy industry, means that there is very little local employment. With limited public transport, this forces people into their cars to see employment further afield.	Comments noted.
REF138	Resident	Paragraph 3.11 says that “Figure 5 below provides a summary of the population of the District, Nottinghamshire and England & Wales...”, but unfortunately the table columns are labelled “Bassetlaw, East Midlands and Great Britain”!	Comments noted. Figure 5 will be amended accordingly.
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	Foreword 2.1 Welcome the statements at paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 which set out that Bassetlaw is an “ambitious ” district, seeking to “secure our long-term economic future” and is “planning for growth ”. This is important context for the Local Plan strategy and policies as a whole, which is rightly focused on Bassetlaw being a ‘growth’ location. Support these comments in the Foreword.	Support noted and welcome.
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	Relationship between development plan documents Note at paragraph 1.9 that the Council intends to also produce a “Workshop Central Development Plan Document” to enable the regeneration of the Workshop Central area (Policy ST6 relates). This strategy is generally supported in recognition of the important role of Workshop. Request that the Local Plan provides greater clarity on the relationship between the Local Plan and the Central Workshop Development Plan Document in respect of the strategy for housing delivery and timescales for the Workshop DPD. 2.3 The following comments are made: • The Council’s recently adopted Local Development Scheme suggests that the Workshop Central DPD is at its embryonic stage and will not be adopted until at least March 2023; • Policy ST6 states that Workshop Central will provide for at least 660 dwellings. Policy ST1 states that Workshop Central Area will provide 700 dwellings; and • Figure 7 provides a housing trajectory and suggests that Workshop Town Centre	The Spatial Strategy and Policy ST5 provide evidence of that relationship between the Central Area and the Local Plan. The Local Development Scheme was updated and approved by Cabinet in June 2021. The Local Plan has been amended to provide consistency in the housing figures. Figure 7 has been updated to provide an up to date picture of the housing trajectory for the plan

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
		(presumably the 'Central' area in the Figure 7 key) will deliver a 'Town Centre Windfall' from year 2026 onwards, of around 50 dwellings per annum. Clarity is required as to the urban capacity of Worksop Town Centre for residential development, whether development would be windfall or plan-led and the timings of those sites coming forwards. Concerned that the amount of housing to be delivered within the Central area may be overstated. Structure of the Local Plan: Referencing to Strategic Policies (ST), Policies and Site References is a little confusing. It would perhaps be clearer to have Policies and Sites, given that this is a holistic Local Plan. Welcomes the structure of the Local Plan and commends the Council on its comprehensiveness in approach to development.	period. The draft Worksop Central DPD identified potential site allocation capable of delivering 700 dwellings in the plan period and a programme for delivery. Inevitably as this area includes the town centre there will be windfall sites, as a result of permitted development and changes to the use classes order. Reference to strategic policies is considered to reflect national policy and provides guidance to those preparing neighbourhood plans.
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	Welcomes the inclusion of Section 3 in the Local Plan which helpfully sets out the context. Paragraph 3.1 refers to the functional economic market area. It is not accurate to state that "Bassetlaw does not sit in a functional economic market area". It is not in a single economic market area for planning purposes, but Bassetlaw does relate to and lie within both the Sheffield City Region and D2N2 economic market areas. The district is therefore very well-located to take advantage of those relationships. 3.3 Economy section does not identify the importance of the rural economy in Bassetlaw which is rich in terms of agriculture and food production. The importance of this sector should not be underestimated by the Council. Paragraph 3.25 identifies the affordable housing needs for the District stating that it is "relatively affordable compared to the national picture". Understand the sentiment that this sentence is trying to convey, it is worth noting that the affordability ratio in Bassetlaw is still very high. The Median ratio (used in Standard Method) is 6.35 for Bassetlaw, directly comparable to the East Midlands (6.86) and England 7.83, with the lower quartile (a reasonable first-time buyer benchmark) being 5.74 in Bassetlaw (compared to East Midlands 6.97 and England 7.27). Therefore, there is a massive need for both market and affordable homes to be provided in the District. These affordability ratios could be usefully inserted into the text. Agree with the comments in paragraph 3.26 that due to the aging population, there is a need for specialist housing for the elderly including retirement, extra care and assisted living accommodation to be provided and welcome the acknowledgement that this can be achieved by delivering a range of housing types including bungalows.	A more explicit explanation of the functional economic market area will be incorporated in the Plan. The Plan including the affordable housing policy is clear that there is a need for affordable housing in the District. Support for provision of specialist housing is welcome.
REF225	Sheffield City Council	The references to Sheffield City Region (SCR) and their Strategic Economic Plan should also include references to the SCR Strategic Employment Land Appraisal (SELA), that analysed levels of need and supply of employment land across the city region and by individual authority. It concluded that there was a surplus of employment land in Bassetlaw of 40 hectares, based on a need of 68 hectares and a supply of 108. The level of supply proposed in the current draft Plan is much higher, so this situation of an over-supply is an acknowledged cross-boundary issue and should be referenced in the draft Bassetlaw Plan. 3.0 Context and 4.0 Vision and Objectives These chapters fail to mention the employment land need or supply situation. Given the significance of the approach to provide much more land than has been assessed as needed, request that this is referenced here.	The Vision and Objectives has been amended to reflect the significant employment land supply experienced in the District. It is considered that the employment section appropriately covers all evidence base documents.
1670589	Resident	1.8.1 Given the insight and knowledge which has shaped the plan, it is suggested that council officers and Councillors provide more guidance on how the Levy could and should be invested to make the community improvements it is intended for such as projects to create more sustainable environments, provision of community housing, local free wi fi, etc	The Infrastructure Funding Statement produced annually by the Council identify the projects CIL will be used for. The Council has a protocol for determining how the community portion of CIL will be distributed to reflect local needs.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Figure 3 Planning Officers should consider the inclusion of West Lindsey District Council and North-East Lincs Council. Although clearly not part of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area, nevertheless Gainsborough (in West Lindsey) is the closest town to many of the villages in north-east Bassetlaw and has plans for extensive house-building. There is considerable movement for housing, employment, retail, and leisure between north-east Bassetlaw and Gainsborough	The Council engages in Duty to Cooperate with West Lindsey District Council and North-East Lincs Council but neither sit within the Housing Market Area, the D2N2 LEP area or the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority area defined by the map.
REF184	Doncaster Council	It is recognised and welcomed that Bassetlaw Council is committed to using the Sheffield City Region Statement of Common Ground. However, as with our previous letter dated 26th February 2020, there are concerns around the Duty to Cooperate and the absence of a Statement of Common Ground that covers further strategic issues relating to the Bassetlaw Local Plan and Doncaster Borough. Reliance on the SCR Statement of Common Ground is considered insufficient in respect of Doncaster where there are additional strategic issues such as highway network/capacity. Paragraph 1.13.3 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that signed Statements of Common Ground will be form part of the	Bassetlaw and Doncaster MBC have agreed a draft Statement of Common Ground in relation to matters identified by the Local Plan. Further Doncaster have confirmed that they would be willing to sign the agreement once the Publication

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION			
		evidence base and others will be signed and added on due course. Doncaster Council wishes to be involved in and to see a draft version (which is relevant to Doncaster) as soon as possible which would reflect the discussions, outcomes and agreements set out in the Doncaster Local Plan: Statement of Common Ground (particularly the section on the Local Highway Network page 30). The Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (paragraph 3.2) describes Table 2 – this table highlights the lack of discussion that the Council has had with Doncaster Council over strategic issues and omits to list any discussions held with authorities as part of the SCR SoCG.	Version has been considered. The Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement has been updated to incorporate all discussions had between neighbouring authorities.
REF168	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is noted that following the January 2020 Local Plan consultation no Duty to Cooperate discussions have taken place. In view of the issues raised previously and reiterated in the comments above and in Appendix 1, the Council would welcome the opportunity for engagement at the earliest opportunity.	Bassetlaw and Rotherham MBC have agreed a draft Statement of Common Ground in relation to matters identified by the Local Plan. Further Rotherham have confirmed that they would be willing to sign the agreement once the Publication Version has been considered. The Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement has been updated to incorporate all discussions had between neighbouring authorities including meetings held in the last six months relating to the Plan.
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	The use of the term evidence based. Evidence should be explicit and open to external scrutiny; it may be quantitative and open to further statistical analysis. The term evidence based is often misleading and misunderstood. For instance, the Plan document lists the Council's existing Strategies and current Planning Policy as evidence which, of themselves, they are not. They may or may not be based on a sound evidence base. Equally, they may be based on opinion or ideological or political bias.	The Council consider that the Local plan evidence base is robust and positively prepared.
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	In Section 1.8.2 (page 10) the document states that "Alongside this Local Plan, the Council is reviewing the CIL Charging Schedule". It is not made clear whether this will be the subject of a consultation.	The CIL Charging Schedule is expected to be consulted upon alongside the Publication Version of the Local Plan.
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	The reference to the Minerals and Waste Local Plans as documents that need to be considered is welcomed by the County Council. Please note that until the emerging Minerals Local Plan is adopted, the adopted 2005 Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (Saved Policies) remains a document for consideration. Also, the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan (2002, Saved Policies) also remains a document for consideration until the County Council and Nottingham City Council adopt a new Waste Local Plan.	Comments noted.
REF230	Chesterfield Borough Council	Support the continuing use of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw HMA grouping as an appropriate geography	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 23, para 12 Misterton Parish Council has recently established a 'Green Working Group, which will focus, initially, on measures to encourage recycling and minimise waste. Other parishes could be encouraged to do the same and all adopt a more strategic approach to waste management. This paragraph could make reference to the waste hierarchy.	Nottinghamshire County Council are the waste planning authority for Bassetlaw and produce the Waste Local Plan for the County.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF089	Resident	<p>References from section 4, Vision and Objectives</p> <p>4.1 '..... facilities which promote healthy and active lifestyles'.</p> <p>4.12 'communities will have improved access tomulti functional green and blue infrastructure close to home, active travel through walking and cycling will be commonplace.'</p> <p>4.13 'provision of better connectivity for walking and cyclingreducing reliance on the car'.</p> <p>4.15.8 'to ensure new developmentenables healthy, accessible green active lifestyles'.</p> <p>4.15.9 'to promote healthier active communities.....'.</p> <p>4.15.11 '.....green and blue infrastructure networks to create high quality multifunctional, well connected spaces, sites and landscapes that improve peoples quality of life and biodiversity.....'.</p> <p>4.15.12 '.....low carbon District..... promoting tree and woodland planting.....'.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
REF101 - Referencing January 2020 plan	East Markham Parish Council	<p>4.1.12</p> <p>There is little evidence that BDC has applied this to existing developments within East Markham.</p> <p>4.2.1.6</p> <p>There is little evidence of any attempts at regeneration in East Markham. East Markham Parish Council does believe that BDC can deliver this.</p> <p>4.2.1.8 – Strategic Objective</p> <p>East Markham development is not reflecting the local character of the village. Thanks to the conservation policy, we have seen a flurry of fake threshing barns in recent years. Again, the Neighbourhood Plan has a specific policy relating to this and it included below for reference. East Markham Parish Council draws BDC's attention to the ongoing development on the old Two Sisters Chicken Factory site where there are no pedestrian links to existing houses.</p> <p>POLICY NP1: Development Design Principles</p> <p>1. Proposals should demonstrate a high design quality that will contribute to the character of the historic, rural village. In order to achieve this new development should:</p> <p>a) incorporate green boundary treatment including native trees and hedgerows; and</p> <p>b) use materials that are in keeping with the character of the surrounding area; and</p> <p>c) demonstrate how the buildings, landscaping and planting creates well defined streets and attractive green spaces that respond to the existing built form in terms of enclosure and definition of streets and spaces.</p> <p>2. The conversion of buildings should be done sensitively to reflect the historic character of the building and its surroundings.</p> <p>3. Schemes should demonstrate a layout that maximises opportunities to integrate new development with the existing settlement pattern. This should include a layout that enables new pedestrian connections to be made.</p> <p>4. Where development sites are adjoining, proposals should include pedestrian links to connect both sites where feasible.</p> <p>4.2.13.</p> <p>Little evidence of an alternative to travel by car in the village. The bus service is not comprehensive enough to provide an alternative to the car for work purposes. In addition, there is not enough consideration for other forms of transport within the plan.</p>	Regeneration is taking place across the district, and is being actively promoted by the Council in a number of locations. Following the adoption of the Local plan a design code will be produced for the District which should provide more locally distinctive design. A similar approach can be undertaken through Neighbourhood Plans/review. The Local Plan looks to support infrastructure associated with the new development in the Plan. It cannot address existing issues. There are other measures that can be explored, with partners.
REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	<p>Strategic Objectives</p> <p>MPG generally support the Strategic Objectives that have been identified, specifically objectives 1, 2 and 3 which seek to direct development to sustainable locations and to ensure that sufficient land is made available to meet housing and employment needs over the Plan Period. The only Strategic Objective we have reservations about is the Council's intention to pursue a Garden Village within this Plan Period (Objective 5), a point we will return to below.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF156	Babworth Parish Council	The Parish are supportive of Bassetlaw's economic aspirations for the district. However, it has some 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 it's communities. Chapter 4 of the Local Plan 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. We support those aspirations; however, we stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in it's ability to achieve that vision. In it's current drafting, we have strong concerns over the plan's ability to do so.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF190	Babworth Parish Council	The Parish are supportive of Bassetlaw's economic aspirations for the district. However, it has some 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 it's communities. Chapter 4 of the Local Plan 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. We support those aspirations; however, we stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in it's ability to achieve that vision. In it's current drafting, we have strong concerns over the plan's ability to do so.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	Section 5.4 confirms that the regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of the Local Plan's Vision and Objectives. Strategic Objective 1 confirms that the vision will be achieved through locating new development to make best use of previously developed land to minimise the loss of the District's highest quality agricultural land. This approach should also be reflected within the Vision at paragraphs 4.1 – 4.14.	Thank you for your comment. The desire for new development to be delivered in the most sustainable locations, many of which will be brownfield sites, is referenced in paragraph 4.6.
REF197	Resident	(4.13) This talks about managing water run off but what about ensuring truly permeable surfaces for drives/pavements etc are used, so that the water transfer is reduced.	This is covered by policies in the Plan and legislation.
REF201	Severn Trent	Paragraph 4.13 Severn Trent are supportive of the approach outline within paragraph 4.13 to improve the district's resilience to climate change through the sensible location of new development and delivery of SuDS to manage surface water. We would also highlight that by directing water to sustainable outfalls such as infiltration and watercourses will help limit the impacts of climate change on the sewerage system.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>4.15 This vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives:</p> <p>11. To protect, restore and enhance the quality, diversity, character, distinctiveness, biodiversity and geodiversity of the District's natural environment, by creating links within and to the green/ blue infrastructure network to create a series of high quality, multifunctional, well-connected spaces, sites and landscapes that improve people's quality of life and where biodiversity can thrive, respond and adapt to change.</p> <p>Proposed amendment: Insert the word 'climate' before the word 'change'.</p> <p>5.4.1 States: The regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of this Local Plan's 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</p> <p>We 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."</p> <p>We support for 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. However, we 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.</p> <p>In all likelihood responses the Draft Bassetlaw Local 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 that are cherished by a local community. There is increasing development pressure on brownfield sites and therefore to ensure sustainability every effort should be made to retain and/or recreate this habitat within a site. We 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. However, 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>	Objective 11 has been updated as requested. All new development will be expected to make provision for at least 10% net gain in biodiversity on site, and, where appropriate, follow the mitigation hierarchy set out in Policy ST42.
REF211	National Trust	<p>The Strategic Objectives are generally supported, with particular support for the following objectives:</p> <p>4. Regeneration and brownfield development</p> <p>10. Historic and natural environments</p> <p>11. Natural environment and biodiversity</p> <p>12. planning for a low carbon district</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
1669799	Resident	<p>(4.1 & 4.11) Suitable housing? What is Bassetlaw's view on this? This does not only apply to the ageing population it also applies to people with varying degrees of need through medical or other reasons. Bungalows by definition mean no stairs. This means that anybody with mobility problems will not have to endure the ritual of struggling up & down them. This applies to people of any & every age & could also be for parents with disabled or handicapped children who have no choice but to carry their children up & down stairs because there were no bungalows available for them. I am not referring to rental or council bungalows but to private properties that simply aren't available because successive councils over the years have not ensure their provision. In my opinion any planning applications should only be granted if they include a certain number of bungalows of various sizes. You manage to do something similar for social housing but not for bungalows.</p> <p>(4.15.2) Local housing needs & aspirations? We live in a 4 bedroom detached house & for at least 15 years have been looking for a 3 bedroom bungalow. What few there are, are primarily not suitable for us. We have no choice. Both of us in our 70's we want to down size a little, not to a council size bungalow but a reasonable size 3 bedrooms detached. There simply aren't any. Our age isn't affecting us, yet, but the results of past accidents is & we want to move to a suitable home of our choice whilst remaining in our community with our family around us.</p>	Policy 32 will ensure that all housing sites provide a mix of housing tenures, types, and sizes appropriate to the site and needs of the area. This could include affordable housing and specific house types such as bungalows.
REF214	Historic England	<p>Para 4.15 - Objective 10 - This deals with the historic environment but separates 'heritage' and 'archaeology' which sets the scene for this approach to run throughout the draft Plan. It is rather unclear since archaeology is heritage and can be a heritage asset with setting.</p> <p>It would be clearer to keep cultural heritage under one umbrella to include the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting or a similar alternative and we would urge you to reconsider the current approach. The proposed alternative would also allow for designated and non-designated assets to be considered.</p>	Objective 10 revised to reference historic environment, heritage assets and their settings, with no separate provision for heritage and archaeology.
1670589	Resident	4.11 Mention of Community Housing schemes within developments are not mentioned as part of providing the mix for to enable new generations of home owners to get onto the housing ladder.	Policy 32, Houses Mix, Type and Density, will ensure that all housing sites provide a mix of housing tenures, types, and sizes appropriate to the site and needs of the area. This could include affordable housing and specific types of housing.
REF030	Resident	I feel that the existing Local plan is more interested in satisfying the national housing needs and objectives rather than taking local needs and requirements, developing those and as an aside incorporating the national requirements imposed on it. I believe your aim or focus should be on the local needs first and then the national, centrally imposed requirements. I also get the impression from the local plan that the long-term view is not being taken and the fact that future generations of residents of Bassetlaw are going to have to live with the changes decided now.	The vision and objectives does address local housing needs. The Council is not able to discount national requirements. There is a requirement for the Local Plan to be consistent with national policy.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Page 23, para 12</p> <p>Misterton and West Stockwith Parish Councils have recently established a 'Green Working Group, of which I am a members. It will focus, initially, on measures to encourage recycling and minimise waste. Other parishes could be encouraged to do the same and all adopt a more strategic approach to waste management. This paragraph could make reference to the waste hierarchy.</p>	Nottinghamshire County Council are the waste planning authority for Bassetlaw and produce the Waste Local Plan for the County.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF058	Sport England	Para 4.1 - Sport England supports the vision which has healthy and active lifestyles at its core. Para 4.12 Supported Para 4.15 – Sport England specifically supports Strategic Objective 8 and 9 14	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF110	Resident	Bassetlaw Vision and Objectives 4.7 on page 20 It states: “Retford will have grown in a sensitive and sustainable manner with a wide range of new houses available better suited to meet local residents needs irrespective of time in their life while a new Country Park, community infrastructure and connectivity improvements will enhance the town's character....” If the development at Ordsall South is reduced or removed from the plan will the country park continue to meet the above statement ? In the strategic objectives 4.15 on page 22 there appears to be a lack of desire to minimise the effects of development and the movement of those who live there, wherever it is, to the existing character of the small rural settlements	The delivery of a country park at Ordsall is closely linked to the scale of development proposed at Ordsall South. The country park would not be delivered if the development at Ordsall South was removed or saw a reduction in the scale of development.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	Clearly the strategic objectives are aligned to those of local NHS organisations; and sustainable economic growth and education opportunities should positively impact on recruitment and retention of the NHS workforce.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF188	Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.Pears Property Ltd.	We 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 it’s economic prosperity. As set out throughout these representations the overall positive thrust of the Plan is welcomed and in our view, the Plan is fundamentally sound, positively prepared, effective and consistent with National Policy. Significant consideration has been given to how major previously developed sites can be reused to ensure most effective use of existing infrastructure. The positive and proactive approach to the delivery of our client’s land at the Former High Marnham Power Station within this and the next plan period, is welcomed and it is considered that J G Pears is well placed to support the opportunity to realise the development potential of this major previously developed site; well connected to the strategic highway network adjacent to the village of High Marnham where proportionate development will be supported and offers a significant opportunity for sustainable redevelopment making use of readily available energy from J G Pears nearby CHP plant. The inclusion of this site as an employment allocation provides a significant opportunity for the LPA to meet its low carbon agenda in a sustainable and appropriate manner whilst also delivering on the wider D2N2 aspirations to improve economic prosperity of the region which must be supported. The allocation will support the Council in meeting the aims and objective of the Plan as a whole, including making best use of previously developed land (Strategic Objective SO1); encouraging and supporting economic growth (SO3); promoting rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape (SO6); and, supporting Bassetlaw’s transition to a low carbon District (SO12).	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Strategic Objectives 4.2.1 Gladman are generally supportive of the Council’s vision and objectives which provide a positive and proactive approach to future development in Bassetlaw over the plan period to 2037. Notably, Gladman are supportive of the positive approach to new growth, which sees the Council make provision for new homes above that required by the Standard Method to help achieve the District’s economic objectives. 4.2.2 Strategic Objectives 3 and Strategic Objective 4 set out the intention of the Plan to encourage and support sustainable economic growth and support sensitive regeneration of previously developed, vacant or underused sites and spaces within urban and rural Bassetlaw. Strategic Objective 14 states that new settlements and development contribute to the provision of necessary infrastructure to deliver growth. 4.2.3 The Bevercotes Colliery site has been identified by the Council as having the potential to accommodate a garden village community, together with Gamston Airfield and its potential allocation for this purpose has been tested through the emerging Plan’s Sustainability Appraisal. Notwithstanding this, the site remains an existing employment site with extant planning permission for its redevelopment for B2 and B8 uses (reference: 09/05/00002). The current iteration of the Plan is now silent on Bevercotes Colliery. It is important that the full potential of the site to support economic development and regeneration is recognised through the plan making process and as such, the sites suitability, availability and achievability for a range of employment uses should also be given pro-active consideration. 4.2.4 The strategic objectives of the Plan, principally SO3 and SO4, highlight the need to prioritise development on previously developed land that is capable of sensitively regenerating Bassetlaw and stimulating sustainable economic growth. Gladman are of the view that land at Bevercotes Colliery can help the Council achieve its strategic objectives and the site should, therefore, be identified as an additional Priority Regeneration Area. Land at Bevercotes Colliery can also be bought forward in a manner to meet the intentions of SO14.</p>	<p>Support for vision and objectives noted. Bevercotes has planning permission for employment use; the Council will continue to work with the promoters to see the successful implementation of the permission. The site was discounted as a Garden Village due to environmental constraints which means that allocating the site is contrary to national and environmental legislation and planning policy.</p>
REF117 (Ordsall South rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>4.0 BASSETLAW VISION AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>4.1 Section 4.0 of the Draft Local Plan sets out the Vision and Objectives. This Section is generally supported by our client, however there are a few points to note which do not align with the spatial strategy set out in Section 5.0.</p> <p>4.2 Paragraph 4.2 groups Worksop, Retford and Haworth alongside the Large Rural Settlements. This is not supported nor is it aligned with ST1 which puts the Large Rural Settlements in a lower tier. The Vision should reflect this.</p> <p>4.3 Our client questions the first sentence of paragraph 4.7. It is unclear why reference is made to Retford to grow in a ‘sensitive manner,’ a comment which is not applied to Worksop. Both Worksop and Retford are historic market towns with Worksop actually having a longer history. Whilst development in both settlements should be sustainable and reflective of the individual character of each settlement, the reference to ‘sensitivity’ in the context of Retford alone is misleading.</p> <p>4.4 We oppose the Council’s vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village (paragraph 4.10) and as set out in detail later in these representations, 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 deliverable in the plan period.</p> <p>4.6 We are supportive of Objective 1 which seeks to locate development in sustainable locations whilst supporting a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas. However, we consider the Local Plan does not adequately reflect this objective as the pattern of growth is not “balanced” across urban and rural settlements.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.2 will be revised to align with the spatial strategy. Paragraph 4.3 will be revised to reflect the approach taken to growth in Retford. Objective 1 will be revised to promote a sustainable pattern of growth across the urban and rural settlements. Objective 13 will be revised to clarify its intention</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
		<p>4.7 We support Objective 2 which seeks to provide a choice of land to ensure the District's housing stock better meets local housing needs. As above, we suggest this objective should be supported by policy within the Local Plan to guide more development to suitable locations within the main settlements of Worksop, Retford and to a lesser extent Harworth. We consider that the Local Plan must focus development towards the District's main settlements to support their role and function as key service centres, not only for their own populations but their surrounding rural hinterlands. We consider that it is more appropriate for the Council to seek to deliver sustainable urban extensions which are defined by their sustainability benefits rather than solely through scale. The housing distribution model is still skewed towards the Rural areas.</p> <p>4.8 We disagree with Objective 5 which promotes the delivery of a new Garden Village. Whilst we note the Council's desire to follow the 'garden village movement' we do not consider that there is a driver for doing so in Bassetlaw. The garden village (and indeed the garden city) movement is driven by overcrowding in urban areas and a need to house significant amounts of people in new sustainably designed settlements given constraints elsewhere. Bassetlaw does not suffer from those urban problems and its main settlements are suitable for urban expansion and, as above, would benefit from additional growth to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability. Such additional growth will be vital as the current population of those towns ages and the number of working age people naturally declines; it will be vital to encourage younger people and families to those towns (which will be a key component of meeting the Council's economic aspirations).</p> <p>4.9 Although we agree in principle with Objective 6 in promoting rural Bassetlaw and acknowledge it is vital to maintain the vitality and viability of existing rural settlements, we consider that the rural settlements are not sustainable locations to meet boroughwide growth. The levels of growth required at rural settlements, based on identified needs and service provision, needs to be calculated on a settlement-by-settlement basis. The sustainability of rural boroughs is necessarily driven by the health and accessibility of its main service centres.</p> <p>4.10 We believe more emphasis should be placed upon Objective 7 to support and enhance the vitality of town centres and local centres and promote an appropriate mix and scale of development. We consider that it is important to stress here the opportunities that new development will provide in terms of unlocking existing development opportunities.</p> <p>4.11 Lastly, we are supportive of Objective 13 which seeks to make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure. We suggest the provision of a new Garden Village contradicts this policy as extensive new transport infrastructure must be delivered to cater for the proposed village. In addition, the Local Plan states that the Rural Settlements are less accessible and so it would be more beneficial to guide a higher proportion of development to the main urban areas, particularly Retford and Worksop which benefit from strong transport connections.</p>	
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>3.0 Context and 4.0 Vision and Objectives</p> <p>These chapters fail to mention the employment land need or supply situation. Given the significance of the approach to provide much more land than has been assessed as needed, we request that this is referenced here.</p>	The vision and objectives will be amended to align with the spatial strategy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>5. Draft Local Plan vision and objectives</p> <p>5.1 Caddick supports the overall local plan strategy, vision, and objectives which seek to deliver significant economic growth that can benefit both Bassetlaw and the wider region. As we have identified in Section 2 of this report, Bassetlaw is ideally positioned to deliver on these aspirational objectives.</p> <p>Vision and objectives</p> <p>5.2 In terms of the draft local plan vision, Caddick welcome the aim of strengthening the economy and economic base, and as part of that seek a greater variety of employment, which encourages more people to live and work in the District¹⁶.</p> <p>5.3 The vision goes on to recognise the key growth sectors of inter alia manufacturing and logistics which capitalise on the District's locational advantage, in terms of proximity to the A1, the A57, and Sheffield Doncaster Airport for example.</p> <p>5.4 These vision points are then carried forward to the plan objectives¹⁸ which state that sustainable and stable economic growth will be delivered:</p> <p>'... by providing the right conditions, land and premises to meet District and sub-regional employment needs and those of inward investors, while helping to create more jobs, education and training opportunities that meet local employment needs and aspirations.'</p> <p>5.5 The visions and objectives are welcomed, although Caddick consider the visions and objectives can go further in explicitly stating that significant levels of growth will be sought in order to provide the desired step change in Bassetlaw which is referred to at various points in the plan¹⁹.</p> <p>Delivering more</p> <p>5.6 The availability of generally flat and unconstrained non Green Belt land in the district means it can logically accommodate major growth generating proposals. This also allows the area to respond quickly to live investment and development enquiries. The district has excellent access to the strategic road network (to the A1 and M1, the A57 corridor) and is within striking distance of major centres and areas of population.</p> <p>5.7 The district, and particularly the Apleyhead Junction site, being positioned on the A1/A57 junction, also has excellent access and connectivity to major freight hubs including large UK airports, ports, and multimodal freight interchanges both within and outside the region.</p> <p>5.8 There is also a suitably large and appropriately skilled local labour market which can fulfil the wider range of jobs that can be created through diverse economic growth which the local plan vision seeks to achieve.</p> <p>5.9 Such qualities make the area attractive for major occupiers who can themselves be key economic drivers.</p> <p>5.10 Hence the plan's strategy, vision, and objectives are entirely correct to push for a step change in economic growth in Bassetlaw which can benefit both the district and wider regional areas. That said, given the key characteristics identified above the plan could potentially be more ambitious and would be correct to do so.</p> <p>5.11 Caddick's representations on the draft local plan policies are made with these characteristics and ambitions in mind.</p>	The step change in the economy promoted by the Local Plan will be better reflected in the vision and objectives.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND VISION			
1671323	William Davis	<p>Bassetlaw Vision and Objectives Overall the vision and objectives are supported. The focus for development on sustainable locations and emphasis on regeneration highlights the importance of Worksop as the largest and most sustainable settlement in the District and the benefits that regeneration can bring; this is consistent with national policy (NPPF para 72) as required by the tests of soundness. Part of creating a more prosperous, desirable and equal place for residents includes the provision of high quality homes in attractive locations including on greenfield sites on the edge of settlements; these sites can be well designed to provide a safe and inclusive environment and will complement regeneration in the town by providing a different offer to regeneration areas attracting new residents to the area. This change has been acknowledged in Policy ST1 (Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy) with the inclusion of the Worksop Outer Area as part of the Settlement Hierarchy; however, this has not been reflected in the Vision or Objectives.</p> <p>To ensure the Vision and Objectives reflect the strategy and are consistent with the NPPF (specifically NPPF 59, 67 and 73) it is proposed that the following be added: Paragraph 4.6 "High quality housing has been provided in appropriate edge of settlement locations around Worksop to complement the regeneration and improvements being delivered within the town centre". Objective 2 "this will include a mix of brownfield regeneration sites and appropriate greenfield sites on the edge of settlements."</p>	Changes to the vision and objectives will better reflect the mix of locations available for housing growth

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF019	Resident	<p>Dear sir I see the plan and I would to know why is The housing targeted at the harworth area . 10000 house for the whole of bassetlaw And prob 3000 in harworth area.why isn't it being shared across the area.its talks about jobs as a priority , open space walks ect however no solid evidence on these promises.</p>	<p>The Council commissioned a housing and employment study earlier this year (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020). This assessment has informed the number of houses and amount of employment land proposed in the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan is seeking to deliver new housing and employment across the district, it proposes a hierarchy based on settlement size. Policy ST1 Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy proposes to deliver the following number of homes per sub- area:</p> <p>Settlement/Area Number of dwellings propose up to 2037 Worksop 3104 Retford 1802 Harworth & Bircotes 1702 Large Rural Settlement (5 villages) 1402 Small Rural Settlement (34 villages) 1502 Bassetlaw Garden Village 500.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			<p>This will be updated in the Submission Plan</p> <p>With regard to Harworth and Bircotes, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan does not propose to allocate new land for housing. The 1700 will be delivered on sites with planning consent for housing, for example Former Harworth Colliery.</p> <p>The draft Plan is proposing to allocate land for new employment and there are also sites with planning consent for employment across the district. Approximately 11,000 new jobs are expected to be delivered on these sites.</p> <p>With regard to open space, there are policies in the draft plan that set out what will be required to make a development acceptable. Development proposals will be required to comply with the policies in the adopted Bassetlaw Local Plan. That's why it's really important that the Council has an up to date Local Plan in place, so that we can ensure open space and other infrastructure is delivered to meet the needs of the district. If we don't have an up to date Local Plan in place, development will happen ad hoc and the Council will have to take a reactive approach rather than a proactive approach.</p>
REF019	Resident	thanks for your speedy and detailed reply.just can we clarify this the 1700 houses what is proposed on committed land for harworth does not include the construction that's taken place over the last 4 years. If that's added I'm guessing it's more like 5000 house and growing.Running in line with this there's been no improvement for our infrastructure to cope with the demand.no new jobs now walks ,doctors and schools that can not cope and traffic that's a real joke.	<p>Over the past three years, Harworth & Bircotes has seen significant housing s growth with over 364 home completions.</p> <p>A significant amount of additional land has planning permission for over 1765 dwellings (as at 30/10/2020). On that basis, no further allocations are proposed in this Plan.</p>
1653147	Resident	How will you ensure that new housing and the garden village do not simply become lower cost commuter homes for people from Sheffield and Nottingham?	The site will be designed to offer a mixture of housing types to meet the needs of the different groups within the community.
1653147	Resident	What evidence is there of success in Garden Village development; are there specific examples used to shape the initiative	<p>Garden City or Garden Suburb principles is a long established concept which had a great influence on the design of new settlements and expansion of existing.</p> <p>Localities such as Milton Keynes, Letchworth Garden City, and Welwyn Garden City have been developed directly as Garden Cities or their development has been heavily influenced by the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			Garden City movement. Recent examples include Ebbsfleet Valley, Kent, Bicester eco town expansion to Bicester in Oxfordshire. On 2 January 2017, plans for new garden villages, each with between 1,500 and 10,000 homes, and garden towns each with more than 10,000 houses were announced by the government in different parts of the country.
1653147	Resident	Cycling links; this is welcome but currently the condition of roads is poor and car and truck driver behaviour and HGVs make cycling hazardous, how will you mitigate this.	The aim of transport and movement policies is to segregate cycling and pedestrian movement from vehicular traffic wherever possible.
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p><u>The inclusion of any new builds in response to the increased housing need</u></p> <p>What most reasonable people would agree with is that there is a housing crisis in the UK and that this is mirrored in a housing crisis in Bassetlaw. It is appropriate that the Council should draft a plan to address this crisis in the District as one of its two major priorities. The second major priority is that any solutions should be green ones. Neither priority should subordinate the other.</p> <p>The Plan quite rightly refers to, and approves of, appropriate change of use of vacant commercial properties such as shops to housing. The UK has, somewhat belatedly, moved from ideas of rigid zoning, the separation of housing from commercial or industrial land use to a more flexible approach. Late or not, it is welcome, and one can see good examples of this in nearby cities such as Sheffield where old, redundant Victorian warehouses and factories have been converted into, often quite desirable, apartments. The logic of this is obvious, it requires fewer building materials and is therefore cheaper and does less harm to the environment than building the equivalent number of dwellings from new. Other countries such as the Netherlands have grasped this point. Whether converting existing buildings offer the same profit margins to developers as new builds is a moot point. In short, no authorisation for new build housing should be approved until a full stock take has been made of redundant buildings that are appropriate for conversion though this will present difficulties.</p> <p>Currently, we are in the midst of the Covid 19 pandemic and also, we leave the Brexit transition period at the end of the month. Both of these events have consequences for commercial and industrial buildings. White collar workers have been encouraged to work from home if possible, during the pandemic and minimise trips to the office. There is speculation that for many workers this trend may become a permanent feature of life with a consequence that companies will downsize their requirement for centralised office accommodation which may, in turn, lead to a significant number of redundant office buildings. This is a matter of real concern for commercial landlords but an opportunity to use some of these office buildings to be converted to apartments which would be cheaper and greener than new builds.</p> <p>Brexit will have a similar impact. The Governments own, recently leaked, impact assessment of both a “no deal” Brexit or minimal deal Brexit forecasts a significant downturn in the economy with consequent large number of job losses and business failures. In turn, this will lead to vacant commercial and industrial buildings that can be converted to housing use.</p> <p>In summary, the Council should carry out a stock take of vacant buildings but not just yet. By the end of next year, the pandemic, hopefully, will have abated and we will also be clearer what the real rather than projected cost to the economy has occurred because of Brexit. Then, and only then, will it be possible to know whether we need any new builds at all.</p>	In accordance with the NPPF a key objective of the Local Plan strategy is for the reuse and redevelopment or conversion to residential of previously developed brownfield land. The quantity of available brownfield land is however, insufficient to meet the objectively assessed need for housing in the District. Hence the need to identify greenfield sites in the most suitable and sustainable locations.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF041	Retford Civic Society	<p>The scale of housing growth</p> <p>In its comments on the January 2020 Draft Plan the Society expressed concern about the scale of house building proposed and requested that it be reduced significantly. We note that this change has not been made. The Draft Plan proposes a scale of building almost double 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. Between 2011 and 2018 the District's population increased by 3.4%. In the January 2020 Draft it was projected to increase by 3.8 % by 2037. The annual rate of population growth was expected to fall significantly. Neither of these projections point to housing growth on anything like the scale being proposed. On the contrary, they suggest that there is no justification for exceeding the minimum required under the government's 'standard method'. The scale of housing is justified by expected employment growth. That could explain why the latest Draft Plan projects an increase in population of 17.8% by 2037. It is unclear from the supporting documents why this figure has changed so much since the January 2020 Draft when only 3.8% growth was predicted. It appears that the predicted growth in employment is expected to result in substantially increased inwards migration. We have reservations about the scale of the increase in employment suggested and consider it over-ambitious. The Society considers that the scale of house building proposed in the Draft Plan is excessive and that it should be reduced to around that required by the government's 'standard method' of assessment.</p>	<p>The standard method provides a minimum housing need figure.</p> <p>GL Hearn have undertaken an independent Housing and Economic Development Need Assessment published in November 2020.</p> <p>Findings - in order to meet the economic growth anticipated in the Local Plan more housing is required and it is considered that 591 dwellings per annum is the objectively assessed need.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF047	Resident	<p>Scale of housing growth</p> <p>The Draft Plan proposes a scale of housing growth which is unnecessary and excessive. The ‘standard method’ of assessment within Government guidance indicates a requirement for 228 additional dwelling a year. The Draft Plan makes provision for 586, almost double this figure. Although the guidance is intended to be a starting point and a minimum, there is no need for development on the scale proposed and it would lead to unnecessary and harmful development on greenfield land.</p> <p>Government guidance (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-development-needs-assessments) gives examples of circumstances when it may be appropriate to plan for more houses than required by its ‘standard method’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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); • strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or • an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground. <p>None of these circumstances apply at present to Bassetlaw. Housing is not required to meet the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. There are no strategic infrastructure improvements to be allowed for. The scale of employment growth assumed in the Draft Plan is unrealistic and unlikely to be deliverable. Background papers for the Plan assess the potential of the area for employment growth. Reflecting the uncertainty in such projections, a very wide range of possibilities is indicated. The housing provision in the Draft Plan is based on a scale of employment growth close to the top of this range. This would require a sustained expansion of employment on a scale not previously seen. There has been success recently in attracting some major developments, but this is unlikely to continue on the same scale over the plan period. On the contrary, it is widely expected that recovery from the covid induced recession will take many years and this will inevitably affect all aspects of the economy. In the unlikely event of employment growth happening on the scale assumed in the Draft Plan, it would exceed what is needed for the local population. The background papers indicate that it would require more people to move into, and be accommodated within, the District. The Draft Plan is, in effect, seeking to expand the District’s population by inducing increased immigration. This is unnecessary and harmful. There is no reason to believe that shortage of housing has ever restricted economic development in Bassetlaw or that prosperity requires increased immigration.</p> <p>The scale of house building proposed in the Draft Plan should be reduced to close to that required by the government’s ‘standard method’.</p>	<p>The evidence from Vision 2030: D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan, D2N2 Local Economic Partnership, and the Draft Bassetlaw Local Industrial Strategy, BDC, 2019 demonstrate that pursuing a housing target based purely on the standard method would not provide the sufficient and necessary dwellings to support the economic growth in the District. It would have consequences in terms of affordability for young people who will be unable to stay in the area. This could constrain economic growth because of labour shortages leading to increased levels of in-commuting to support economic growth, which would be unsustainable.</p> <p>The objectively assessed housing need of 591 dwellings per annum has been set at a level to support the full extent of this jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update November, 2020.</p> <p>The Standard Method calculates a minimum housing need for Bassetlaw of 288 dwellings per annum for the period 2020-2037. This is not a housing requirement figure rather it is the minimum starting point.</p> <p>The increase in housing need above the standard method figure is a reflection of changing economic circumstances and growth strategies in the District. It also reflects market signals where over the past few years 64,045sqm floorspace has been completed on the General Employment Sites, 70.9ha has been granted planning permission since April 2018, and 17.7ha is under construction at Symmetry Park and Manton Wood.</p> <p>This higher figure would also help delivering infrastructure and there is support for it from the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF060	Notts County Council	2a) Cottam is remotely located and therefore beyond what could be considered as an acceptable walking or cycling distance from the majority of everyday services and amenities. The nearest town offering key services is Retford, approximately 9 miles to the west by car. Bus services in the area are limited with a single bus service providing a limited daily service on a pre-booked stop basis. It would be unlikely that the scale of the development would be capable of generating sufficient patronage to sustain a reasonable level of service to main destination. The County Council considers that the site is not in a sustainable location as a choice of transport modes is not available.	<p>The Former Cottam Power Station site is redundant brownfield sites. Its remediation, reclamation and redevelopment would regenerate and enhance the quality of the environment for the benefit of the economy and the local community. This is supported by NPPF policies and objectives. Paragraph 117 : “Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land.” Paragraph 137a “LPA should makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land.” The Cottam power Station is a good example of such a site.</p> <p>The site has good accessibility to Gainsborough and Lincoln two major service centres with a wide range of services and facilities.</p> <p>An objective of the masterplan would be to reduce car travel by providing on site services and facilities and employment opportunities. There would also need to be Improvements TO public transport provision to Retford as well as Gainsborough and Lincoln.</p>
1661414	Planning With People	ST1 3b page 33 the 'by up to 5%' reference should be before the first coma otherwise it reads that site allocations in NPs can still only allocate dwellings in accordance with the 5% growth allowance	Noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF087	Highways England	<p>Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Local Plan for Bassetlaw District which covers the period 2018 to 2037. The document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out several key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help support growth across the region.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is the role of Highways England to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Bassetlaw Local Plan, our principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the A1 which bisects the Local Plan area.</p> <p>In February 2020, Highways England provided comments on the draft version of the Local Plan, with a housing target of 9,087 dwellings and a minimum of 108 ha of new employment land and 199.6 ha of strategic employment land.</p> <p>Regarding the current draft version of the Local Plan, the housing target has increased to 10,013 dwellings. This is shared over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3,104 in Worksop (200 completed, 1,320 committed, 1,959 unallocated); • 1,802 in Retford (200 completed, 820 committed, 1,181 unallocated); • 1,702 in Harworth & Bircotes (260 completed, 1,765 committed); • 1,402 in large rural villages and 1,502 in small rural settlements; • 501 in Bassetlaw Garden Village, adjacent to the east of the A57 / A1 / Blyth Road junction (Apleyhead junction) at Upper Morton. <p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village has been proposed to accommodate a total of 4,000 dwellings, however we note that a minimum of 501 have been allocated for this Local Plan period.</p>	<p>No specific objection to the overall strategic distribution proposed providing that the impacts on the SRN are assessed and inform the development of the infrastructure delivery plan.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the acknowledgement by the HA of 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.</p>
REF097	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>The general consensus was that this version of the plan is a clear improvement on the previous document. However, many concerns were raised and are now put to you in order to consider and develop the plan further. The Parish Council acknowledges the need to develop new and appropriate dwellings and services for a growing local and national population for the future. However, they have some considerations which need to be addressed by Bassetlaw Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overarching concern was raised as to the need to build new houses at a rate that is almost double that required using the current Government's recommended method of calculation. • There is further scepticism of the calculations used to forecast the growth in employment and the creation of jobs which is clearly based on pre-COVID expectations and understanding of working environments. <p>Councillors appreciate that some local communities have to suffer in order for major residential developments as suggested in this Draft Plan. However, it was unanimously agreed that it would be more sensible and indeed beneficial to residents for the BDC to increase the number of houses to be built in the Bassetlaw Garden Village from the start thus being able to reduce the number of buildings in inappropriate sites such as the Ordsall South site.</p>	<p>The Garden Village is a long term vision which is being developed because it requires a long lead in time.</p> <p>With the vaccination programme now under way it is considered that Covid-19 is only a temporary setback, and economic growth and house building should not be based on long term Covid-19 assumptions. A quick economic recovery is now forecast.</p>
REF098	Bawtry Town Council	<p>Substantial expansion is planned for Harworth and Bircotes – “effectively doubling its size” according to paragraph 3.2.3 of the Draft Local Plan. The adjacent much smaller town of Bawtry lies just over 2 miles away, with access being the A631. Bawtry Town Council is</p>	<p>Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 61-009-20190315 of PPG advises:</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>concerned that this expansion may place an unsustainable load upon Bawtry’s infrastructure (roads, health and education) if not adequately mitigated.</p> <p>A satisfactory discharge of Bassetlaw’s Duty to Cooperate would have assessed this risk and identified appropriate mitigations. That has not occurred. It is suggested that Bassetlaw’s compliance with that Duty has been perfunctory. DMBC has commented that “Substantial development has already occurred in Harworth and Bircotes without adequate consultation” but it is to be regretted that DMBC has not properly held them to account.</p> <p>Following BTC’s similar comments in an earlier consultation round, Bassetlaw made a commitment “to explore the potential of a Statement of Common Ground with Bawtry Town Council at the relevant time.” Bassetlaw has not honoured that commitment.</p> <p>As far as BTC is aware, there has been no discussion whatsoever about the impact of Harworth and Bircotes expansion upon Bawtry’s health and education facilities. Such discussion should take place as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>As far as roads are concerned, our major concern is the junction between the A631 Tickhill Road and the A638 High Street in Bawtry. The A631 Tickhill Road, which is the primary route from Harworth and Bircotes, terminates on the A638 High Steet in an uncontrolled T junction. It is already very congested at busy times, with long queues building up on Tickhill Road caused by traffic waiting to turn right, and increasing volumes of traffic diverting along the adjacent (and very narrow) Top Steet as a rat run for traffic turning left. Traffic surveys conducted to support new housing planning applications in Harworth and Bircotes have concluded this junction will not be significantly impacted, such that there is no need for any improvement or mitigation of it.</p> <p>BTC has been surprised and disappointed that DMBC accepted this conclusion because we believe those traffic surveys were flawed. They were all conducted on single days only, which we believe to be contrary to best practice, which recommends surveys on between 5 and 10 days. Those single days appear to have been Tuesdays and Thursdays only – never Mondays or Fridays which are busier. We further believe best practice to be an assumption of a 10% variation of traffic flows on a daily basis. The surveys do not appear to have built in such a margin of variation. Further, we believe it is deemed prudent to assume that traffic simulation models inevitably have inbuilt margins of error, such that the threshold of 80% (Ratio of Flow to Capacity of 0.8) is the practical capacity limit below which estimations of queues and delays experienced by those using the junction are likely to be reliable. The surveys presented in these planning applications do not appear to have applied this advice, that figure of 80% sometimes being exceeded.</p> <p>In the most recent housing planning application, for 650 houses, with the apparent agreement of DMBC, Bassetlaw “stacked” eight traffic generation and junction flow assessments on top of each other, each representing Harworth developments that had already been approved. They then calculated the effects of the extra traffic generated by the 650 development. If a single simulation model has margins of error, such that RFC’s over 80% are the practical limit, what margin of error will there be in a stack of nine?</p> <p>It is acknowledged that these objections should have been made by DMBC previously. The Duty to Cooperate, does, however, “require all Local Planning Authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in relation to cross-boundary issues”.</p> <p>We would wish for the following to occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous assessment of the impact of Harworth and Bircotes expansion upon Bawtry’s health facilities, and the provision of appropriate mitigation if necessary • Rigorous assessment of the impact of Harworth and Bircotes expansion upon Bawtry’s education facilities and the provision of 	<p>“Strategic policy-making authorities are required to cooperate with each other, and other bodies, when preparing, or supporting the preparation of policies which address strategic matters. This includes those policies contained in local plans (including minerals and waste plans), spatial development strategies, and marine plans. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that these authorities should produce, maintain, and update one or more statement(s) of common ground, throughout the plan-making process. Local planning authorities are also bound by the statutory duty to cooperate. <u>Neighbourhood Planning bodies</u> are not bound by the duty to cooperate, nor are they required to produce or be involved in a statement of common ground.”</p> <p>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. This will be updated throughout the plan-making process.</p> <p>The Local Plan proposes no allocations in Harworth & Bircotes. The developments referred to have planning permission and transport infrastructure improvements have been agreed through the planning application process for each site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>appropriate mitigation if necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous evaluation of the integrity of the traffic assessments of the impact of Harworth and Bircotes expansion upon roads in Bawtry, including the A631 Tickhill Road/A638 High Street junction and Top Street, and, if they are found to be unreliable, re-assessment. <p>We believe these concerns should be addressed prior to any further expansion of Harworth and Bircotes.</p>	
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>The plan is again driven more by housing development than by economic interest. In the plan the projected population increase will be 20,700 by 2037. Given the present birth rate in the UK to achieve this growth there will be an inward migration of approx. 7,000 people. The plan assumes with no supporting evidence that 11,836 additional jobs can be provided over the period of the plan. This would appear over optimistic. The plan also calls for the building of 10,137 houses this seems to be an oversupply of houses given the probable population increase. East Markham Parish Council is of the opinion the District is being used to provide low cost housing for surrounding councils which are unable to meet their housing needs</p>	<p>The objectively assessed housing need of 591 dwellings per annum has been set at a level to support the full extent of the jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update November, 2020.</p> <p>The Standard Method calculates a minimum housing need for Bassetlaw of 288 dwellings per annum for the period 2020-2037. This is not a housing requirement figure rather it is the minimum starting point.</p> <p>The increase in housing need above the standard method figure is a reflection of changing economic circumstances and growth strategies in the District. It also reflects market signals where over the past few years 64,045sqm floorspace has been completed on the General Employment Sites, 70.9ha has been granted planning permission since April 2018.</p> <p>This higher figure would also help delivering infrastructure and there is support for it from the of D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership</p>
1665982	Resident	<p>(5.1.47 page 31 regarding Harworth) States no further allocation for development will be applied for.... this is false plans are still being submitted and granted</p>	<p>Although there are no proposals to allocate land for residential in the Local Plan this cannot prevent planning applications from being made. All applications are considered on their merit and will be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material consideration indicate otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF120	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owner	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The draft policy identifies that the District will accommodate a minimum of 10,013 dwellings (589 dwellings per annum) for the plan period 2020-2037. This figure is higher than the target in the previous draft Plan Regulation 18, which is welcomed. Whilst we do not oppose the overall housing requirement, we continue to raise issues with the manner in which it is distributed within the District, namely that more growth should be directed to the Large Rural Settlements, particularly Blyth. Policy ST1 states the District's housing need in the Plan period will be delivered via the following spatial strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - About 6,600 dwellings in the 'main towns'; Worksop, Retford, Harworth and Bircotes; - About 1,400 dwellings on allocations in the draft Plan or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans for the Large Rural Settlements (including Blyth); - About 1,500 dwellings on non-allocated or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans for the Small Rural Settlements; - 500 dwellings through a site allocation at the Bassetlaw Garden Village (within the Plan period, toward a total 4,000 dwelling capacity). <p>We set out concerns around the deliverability of the 500 dwellings at the Garden Village in response to Policy ST3. Whilst we support the ambition to deliver beyond the Plan period, we do not consider these 500 dwellings are deliverable and should be removed from the overall supply. We have significant concerns around the approach to Large and Small Rural Settlements detailed below in our response to Policy ST2. In addition to this, 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 public 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.</p> <p>We support the revision to the draft Plan which applies a lapse discount rate to the housing supply.</p> <p>As the LAA states, this should result in a 24% reduction to the to the total supply of outline permissions, minor sites (9 or fewer), and Neighbourhood Plan Allocations. We have identified in our response to Policy ST2 confusion around the precise makeup of the housing supply for rural settlements. There is a need for a table setting this out and the implications of the lapse rate so it can be readily understood whether the housing requirement for rural settlements is appropriate or whether it needs adjustment. 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, particularly in sustainable rural locations to ensure growth is balanced. 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. Unmet need Bassetlaw is within the defined North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area (HMA) alongside North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield Councils. We continue to raise the point that the Council should provide more evidence as to whether or not it can assist with meeting the unmet needs of any neighbouring authorities. The draft Plan needs to consider the linkages with the Sheffield City Region HMA, which includes Doncaster and Rotherham Councils. At page 145 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, now submitted for Examination, 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 housing needs for an authority within a separate housing market area."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. The Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (October 2020) does not appear to address this, as there have been no further meetings with Doncaster Council</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence and comments received. The distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. A large part of the supply comes from existing commitments. Most of the delivery in the Small and Large Rural settlements will from existing commitments on sites with extant planning permissions.</p> <p>The housing trajectory for the Local Plan has also been updated.</p> <p>The Council considers that Strategic Policy ST1 together with the housing elements of Policy ST16 provide a positive strategy for meeting both Bassetlaw's housing needs and contributing to meeting the needs of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Housing Market Area as a whole. The policies provide land for more dwellings than needed to meet the locally derived housing need. This would deal with unexpected issues affecting the delivery of housing land, and could contribute to meeting possible unquantified unmet needs arising from other areas.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>since September 2019. This should be updated to reflect the potential for Bassetlaw to assist. In summary, we therefore continue to object to Policy ST1 as it is inconsistent with the evidence base around relative sustainability of settlements and will fail to deliver the required housing in the right places. This is contrary to the NPPF and the draft Plan's own Vision, specifically:</p> <p>"The District will have a diverse and thriving economy, with Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes, and the Large Rural Settlements acting as employment and service centres for their surrounding rural areas New development will have been delivered in the most sustainable locations. Residential development within the Large Rural Settlements of Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick, Langold, Misterton and Tuxford will have been delivered to meet strategic and local needs. Necessary physical, community, green and digital infrastructure needed to support this growth will have been delivered on time. The Small Rural Settlements will have seen small-scale, sensitively located development to support local community objectives and aspirations, to meet local housing needs and sustain village services"</p> <p>Suggested changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement to demonstrate compliance with the duty in relation to assisting with unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities. 2. The anticipated supply set out in Policy ST1 and the supporting evidence (particularly around viability) should be reviewed in light of the evidence of deliverability for Bassetlaw Garden Village (see our concerns set out in response to Policy ST3). 3. The growth targets for specific settlements should be updated to reflect the lapse rate and 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. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The Council set out its spatial strategy for development in Chapter 5, noting that at the heart of this is the need to use sustainable development as the framework for growth and change in Bassetlaw. MPG do not disagree with intention. The Council go on to state at paragraph 5.1.9 that the spatial strategy promotes a 'step change' in the District's economy and that the Council are seeking to retain employment locally, provide opportunities for better paid, higher skilled jobs and increase productivity. It goes on to state that "The strategy seeks to align economic growth with the housing offer, by providing the right type of new homes in the right places, to ensure that past trends of out-migration are rebalanced. This will ensure the sustainability of our area in the future as a place to both live and work." In doing so, the strategy seeks to align itself with the priorities of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan and emerging Bassetlaw Local Industrial Strategy. MPG are fully supportive of this economic led, jobs growth strategy that is proposed by the Council. Having identified that the Plan's strategy is to be economic led, it goes on to identify that it is seeking the creation of 11,236 jobs over the Plan Period, of which 5,878 are to be within general employment sites and between 3,857 – 5,358 at the strategic employment site proposed at Apleyhead. Due to the Council's significant supply of employment land (circa 287 hectares) it feels well placed to be able to deliver this level of job creation.</p> <p>In seeking to deliver an economic/jobs led strategy, the Council note at paragraph 5.1.10 that this will have a knock-on effect on the supply and delivery of housing, including affordable and specialist housing in the District, along with new infrastructure. However, the Council note that the current standard method for calculating housing need indicates that the minimum housing need for the District is 288 dwellings per annum (dpa). If the Council pursued the standard method housing requirement of 288 dpa against its job creation target of 11,236 jobs, this would lead to an imbalance between the two leading to unplanned housing growth across the District. As such, the Council are proposing a significantly higher housing requirement than the standard method figure of 589 dpa, in order that this can support the full extent of the jobs growth that is sought by the Council. MPG welcome and support the Council's stated objective of securing economic growth and job creation and vis a vis the need to plan for significantly more dwellings than the minimum housing need as identified by the standard method. Clearly more than doubling the housing requirement over and above the minimum housing need is an ambitious strategy, but it is one that does seek to boost the supply of housing and which will also hopefully secure economic growth and inward investment, both of which are key objectives of Government policy as set out in the Framework. In seeking to deliver this level of housing growth, MPG maintain that it is essential that the Council identifies the right sites, in the right location, in order that they can meet this demand in a timely manner.</p> <p>In setting out its spatial strategy, the Council acknowledge at paragraph 5.1.36 that not all new housing can be accommodated on previously developed land and that two Sustainable Urban Extensions are planned at Worksop and Retford. In addition, a large Garden Village is also planned that will ostensibly deliver more growth for the next Plan Period than the current one, albeit that it is envisaged to make a modest contribution to housing supply in the emerging Plan. We return to this point below. In light of comments above, our response to Policy ST1 is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the focus on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerate the District's town centre; - Support the provision of 589 dpa - Support the provision of 1,800 dwellings in Retford - Object to the provision of 500 dwellings at the Retford Garden Village in the current plan period - Support the creation of at least 11,200 jobs 	<p>The determination of the appropriate distribution of housing and employment growth takes account of strategic growth locations, the settlement hierarchy, and the ability to provide essential utilities and infrastructure, whilst safeguarding local heritage and sensitive landscapes.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy identifies the settlements which are most suitable in sustainability terms to meet the development needs of the District to 2037. It provides the framework from which the spatial strategy has evolved and sustainable development can be realized.</p> <p>In proposing the preferred allocations in the first draft Local Plan version the council assessed sites against a detailed set of criteria and were also subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The assessment of potential development areas focused on sites which lie within or close to one of the settlements identified for growth potential. Locations where development would not be permitted by national policy, such as those in high flood risk areas, were discounted.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan does not allocate very small sites of less than 0.25 hectares in size and these have not been considered for allocation.</p> <p>10% of the identified housing supply comes from sites no larger than one hectare in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The site assessment methodology involved a multistep approach. Sites were assessed against a detailed set of criteria and have been subject to a process of Sustainability Appraisal. The site selection methodology is explained in detail in the site selection background paper.</p>
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	<p>Page 32, Para A and A.1 – The use of the words "evidenced" and "re-use of previously developed land" are very welcome but do need to be strictly adhered to / policed they often are over-ridden for some "compelling reason"</p> <p>Page 33, Para B.3. The separation of Rural Bassetlaw to large and small and the consequent reduction to 5% are more than welcome.</p>	Noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>We broadly welcome the Plan, and its aims of making Bassetlaw's diverse villages and towns a good place to live and work in, and a beautiful place to enjoy for leisure activities. In particular, the plans to develop a garden village with road and rail links and quality employment potential is particularly impressive.</p> <p>The Plan will affect residents and visitors alike for the next 40 years. The expensive schemes for the regeneration of Worksop, and the road network improvements around Peaks Hill will make a huge difference to generations of people. Within our town Retford Branch Members are also extremely pleased to see the preservation of Green Space on the Sandhills, retention of allotments, and the burgeoning plans for the Town Centre.</p> <p>However, we do feel that the Plan has some serious failings which need to be addressed, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A disproportionate housing allocation Retford with serious concerns around the impact of housing on transport and traffic. 2. No clear links between these and job creation in the District - either physically or in our transport network. Retford is getting homes but not the jobs. Job creation opportunities such as the High Marnham Energy Hub lack the ambition to create the jobs needed to justify the homes. 3. A lack of environmental vision particularly not using powers to enforce low carbon technology, EV charging, recycling and better walking/cycling. <p>If these are addressed, then we feel that the Plan can be truly future proof and ensure responsible development for our Town and District. Our response reflects the specific concerns of the Retford Branch of the Labour Party. We have also consulted, where needed, specialists in the areas of concern to our members. In developing this response, we hope not just to raise concerns but also provide considered recommendations on how the Plan should be altered within to alleviate our concerns.</p>	<p>The response to the 3 points of concern is as follows:</p> <p>An objective of the Local Plan is to see Retford grow in a sensitive and sustainable manner with the provision of well-located housing to better meet the needs of the different groups in the community. New infrastructure and connectivity improvements will flow from housing development which will enhance the town's character for the benefit of local residents.</p> <p>The aim is for the new housing developments to be high quality, well designed, energy efficient and respectful of their setting.</p> <p>The local plan contains objectives and policies aimed at producing low carbon and energy efficient design techniques, use of green technologies, extensive tree planting, use of electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles will reduce the carbon footprint enabling the transition to a low carbon economy, and mitigating the impact of climate change.</p>
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	<p>5.1.31 states there is no identified need for new retail development to 2035. Does the garden village not fall into this heading as retail is identified within the policy for it?</p> <p>5.1.35 'encourage use of brown field sites and where possible reduce impact on green fields'. Could this dissuade planners from approving developments in localities that don't have brown field sites available or could Neighbourhood Plans that support development in green field sites enable development to happen?</p>	<p>The Garden Village provides a genuinely long-term Sustainable growth plan for Bassetlaw, beyond the lifetime of the Local Plan. On that basis 500 Dwellings will be provided by 2037 providing greater resilience in housing delivery. The scale of development will mean that this provides the basis of a genuinely long-term sustainable growth plan for Bassetlaw, beyond the lifetime of the Local Plan. A commercial hub to include retail provision will be provided but expected after 2037 when the majority of the housing will be built.</p>
REF159	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Page 31 is misleading 5.1.47 states that there has been 260 completions and 1765 in planned form. However the summary sheet sets out that 1702 new houses in plan or completed. Also within the plan there is discussion around there being a doubling in size! This would not be the 2028 stated and i would say that this is an under estimation as there are many more new houses in this area than is quarter.</p>	<p>Figures to be updated.</p> <p>The information on outstanding permissions reflects the position as at 30/11/2020. The 1702 dwellings is the required figure set for Harworth and Bircotes.</p>
1666746	Resident	<p>Page 25, para 5.1.1. Use of words 'sustainable'/'sustainability' is vague. Does it refer to land that will pay its way and continue to produce revenue for the council in terms of rent or council tax? Strait forward statements of intent to acquire, re-use land for building to increase tax revenues would do. Will my council tax bill sky rocket through the 19 years of the plan?</p>	<p>The term sustainable development is defined in the Local Plan Glossary and in the NPPF (Resolution 42/187 of the United Nations General Assembly)</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			<p>See paragraph 8 of NPPF for what sustainable develop met means in social, economic and environmental terms.</p> <p>The purpose of the plan is to provide housing, employment and the necessary infrastructure for the benefit of the community. Much of the infrastructure is funded by developer contribution under planning agreements tied to the granting of planning permission.</p>
1666746	Resident	<p>Page 26/27/30, para 5.1.9/5.1.10/5.1.18/5.1.35. The premise that economic development will attract skilled workers is at best hopeful, given Covid and the legacy that will be with us at national and local level .Use of the Govt Standard Method to calculate housing need needs a rethink in the light of Covid.No stats are included to indicate present housing capacity and recent uptake of rented /private dwellings that would effect the guesstimates of GSM.Current rates of new housing completions in Bassetlaw-this is no where robust enough , based on a two year average; Covid will act as a massive brake on future delivery targets.</p>	<p>The long term impacts of the pandemic are unclear. There could be a sharp economic rebound. The need and demand for affordable housing is unlikely to change.</p>
REF132	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	<p>1 The Plan Period and the Housing Requirement.</p> <p>The Plan period goes from 2020 to 2037 and seeks to make provision for 10,013 new homes. This is derived from the demographic calculation of 288 dwellings per annum, with an economic uplift to 589 dwellings per annum. The Plan does not set out where in the calculation the affordable housing need has been included, as this is a need of 2,814 new homes, which is a significant amount of the proposed total. The Plan should set out the calculation in a simple table which identifies the required elements and how much they have added over the base calculation. At the moment it is not clear how the figures have been arrived at and if they are adequate to meet the need identified. The calculations should be in the plan so that it is clear and not in an accompanying document</p> <p>2 The Spatial Strategy</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlement as set out in the table on page 36, which is completely misleading. It is not clear from the plan if the 1502 dwellings in the small rural settlements are a new requirement or include existing persimmons.</p> <p>Furthermore it makes no sense to be allocating a Garden Village in the rural area to deliver 500 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>An explanation of the calculation and assessment of need is set out in the evidence document the Housing and economic Development need Assessment produced by GL Hearn in November, 2020.</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> <p>The housing need to be provided for does include all outstanding permissions as at November 2020 position. Sixty six percent of the housing requirement has planning permission. This will be updated in the Submission version of the Plan.</p> <p>The allocation of sites in the small rural village needs to be proportionate in order to preserve their character and identity.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>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.</p> <p>Accordingly we 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.</p> <p>We 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.</p> <p>We object to Policy ST2, it is not clear if the figures on page 35 are a new requirement or include existing permissions.</p> <p>Pages 36 and 37 lists the smaller rural settlements which collectively accommodate 1,502 of the housing requirement, again it is not clear if these figures include existing commitments</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF135	Pegasus Group on behalf of land owner	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policy ST1 identifies a minimum housing requirement of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period (2018-2037). This is expressed as an average annual requirement of 589 dwellings per annum (dpa). The expression of the housing requirement as a minimum is supported and is considered consistent with the NPPF. It is acknowledged that Langold is identified as a Large Rural Settlement within the Local Plan Spatial Strategy and that due to the population and services available it is one of the most sustainable rural settlements (paragraph 5.1.49. This is supported.</p> <p>Our client's site, Land at Chestnut Road, is identified as a committed housing site with a housing capacity of 300 dwellings. However, it is noted that the Development Boundary does not include the site within the boundary for Langold.</p> <p>As discussed with Officers, it is our client's intention to develop on the Land at Chestnut Road, as per the approved consent. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be included within the development boundary of Langold. Furthermore, the site is included as an identified development site with assigned design code within recently Examined Hodstock and Langold Neighbourhood Plan. To place the site outside Langold effectively places the site within the wider countryside, undermining policies ST1 and ST2.</p> <p>The exclusion of the committed sites from within the development limits of Langold does not promote sustainable development and is therefore contrary to the requirements of Paragraph 35 of the NPPF.</p>	All committed sites with planning permission to be shown as falling within settlement boundaries.
REF137	Pegasus Group on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	<p>Policy ST1 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policy ST1 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy focuses on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement in order to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerating the District's town centres, and supporting necessary improvements to infrastructure, services and facilities. Policy ST1 A advises that this strategy will be achieved through; 1) promoting the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, unless there are overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters, and minimising the use of the most versatile agricultural land;</p> <p>2) emphasising the need to develop in sustainable locations in close proximity to transport hubs, key transport nodes and encouraging higher density development in those locations; and</p> <p>3) ensuring that sufficient physical, social and green infrastructure is delivered to meet identified needs in a timely manner.</p> <p>Sub clause B of Policy ST1 sets out the housing requirement of a minimum of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period 2020-2037 (589 dwellings per annum), with this requirement to be distributed in accordance with a settlement hierarchy that focuses on the Main Towns (Worksop Outer Area, Worksop Central Area, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes), the Large Rural Settlements, Small Rural Settlements, and the Bassetlaw Garden Village as a New Settlement. Normanton on Trent is included as a Small Rural Settlement. The settlement hierarchy at Policy ST1 B, advises that for eligible Small Rural Settlements growth will be supported for about 1,500 dwellings on appropriate sites within development boundaries or on site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans by up to 5%. This has been amended from the 20% growth previously proposed within the January 2020 Draft Local Plan. Whilst policy commentary at paragraph 5.1.53 states that Policy ST1 proposes 'a minimum of 1,500 dwellings across the eligible Small Rural Settlements', this is not expressed as a minimum in Policy ST1 itself.</p> <p>Policy commentary at paragraph 5.1.52 advises that the sustainable growth of Small Rural Settlements will help to sustain these settlements in the long term, but that it is recognised that their often greater environmental constraints can limit the ability of each settlement to accommodate growth. The NPPF at paragraph 78 confirms 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 should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.' The support for development proposals that would help maintain local services and facilities was highlighted through the public consultation exercise in relation to land at Gracefield Lane, Normanton on Trent, which took place in September/October 2017. 10% growth for Small Rural Settlements is considered appropriate and will help sustain these settlements as sustainable settlements, and</p>	For settlements with, or without development boundaries any proposed new housing allocations in additions to existing commitments will need to be carried through the Development Plan process. All planning applications will be considered in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>contribute to meeting the District's now higher housing requirement. The Spatial Strategy Background Paper (November 2020) confirms that there are 27 settlement that have development boundaries in the Core Strategy, some of which have been subject to review as part of the Local Plan Review. There is no development boundary (existing or proposed) for Normanton on Trent (and for many other Small Rural Settlements), this means that additional growth over the proposed 5% can only be accommodated through Neighbourhood Plans in such settlements. Reference to settlement boundaries should therefore be removed.</p> <p>For Policy ST1, sub clause 3 should be amended to read: 'By supporting the growth of eligible Small Rural Settlements for at least 1,500 dwellings on appropriate sites by up to 10% of 2018 dwelling numbers for each settlement, with any additional provision to be identified on site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans.'</p>	
REF158	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council - in agreement with Rotherham and Doncaster Councils	<p>Whilst the draft plan recognises at paragraph 5.1.17 that the Council will work with neighbouring authorities to undertake additional work to further consider the impacts of the strategic employment site, it is noted that no discussions or Duty to Co-operate engagement has been undertaken on this matter following the concerns expressed in relation to the January 2020 draft.</p>	<p>Statements of Common Ground have been signed between the Council and Doncaster and Rotherham councils which include an ongoing commitment to work together to consider strategic cross-boundary matters including strategic employment sites and traffic impacts. These will be updated throughout the plan-making process.</p>
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	<p>4.15, 5.1.35 'encourage use of brown field sites and where possible reduce impact on green fields'. We would like to see something within the plan that ensures planners are not dissuaded from approving developments in localities that don't have brown field sites available and when those developments are supported by the residents.</p> <p>5.1.31 states there is no identified need for new retail development to 2035. The garden village and the Yew Tree site at Elkesley both have retail development as part of the pre planning application and the draft local plan, will this now be changed or will this retail development be allowed to continue.</p> <p>Having read through the plan we are broadly in support of the direction it is going with planning for development in future years. What we would like to see within the plan is a policy that protects existing settlements from decline due to the promotion of new development. Whilst good quality new development is inevitable that should not be to the detriment of any existing settlement, the existing settlements need to be included and considered when new development is considered.</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy recognises that the Large and Small Rural Settlements should be allowed to grow appropriately in order to maintain rural vitality, but Policy ST2 also ensures that this is sensitive to place.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Retail and Leisure Study, 201716 states there is no identified need for retail development. It does not consider needs on proposed new housing sites such as the Garden Village.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF175	Resident	<p>In principle I do not oppose the revised list of Retford housing 'Allocation Sites'. They are on the periphery of the town with relatively easy access.</p> <p>I accept that the government have put targets for you, BDC, to meet, and that as a town we have to grow but I, like everyone wants a pleasant and safe living environment.</p> <p>Within very recent times housing estates have sprung up all-around Retford – Tiln, Hallcroft, London Road, Ordsall. Over the years the town has lost many big employers with just Rampton Hospital and Ranby Prison being left. We have become a commuter town where people have to travel to work. Most families have two cars. Many families with young people will have three/four cars.</p> <p>My main concerns regarding Policies 23, 25, 26, 27, 29 and the Garden Village are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increased and flow of traffic into and through the town b. junctions c. Estate layout, car parking and safety of pedestrians and cyclists d. Walking and cycling pathways 	<p>The Local Plan vision is for Bassetlaw to provide residents with a high quality of life, increased access to: quality, suitable housing, a wider range of higher skilled, well paid jobs, high quality facilities in a low Carbon environment. The policies of the adopted plan will be implemented with that vision in mind.</p>
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	ST1: We welcome the additional criteria at A. 2. (transport hubs and nodes) and 3. (social and green infrastructure).	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF151	Guy Taylor Associates on behalf of land owners	<p>Overall we are pleased to see Bassetlaw District Council reviewing the requirements for housing within rural locations. As is the case with a number of authorities it is recognised that the sustainability of rural communities has been restricted by previous policies leading to the loss of many community facilities in these locations during the plan period.</p> <p>Policy ST1 - Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>The Spatial Strategy in relation to Small Rural Settlements has seen the most dramatic and impactful policy changes within the Draft submissions of the Part II Plan. The two versions of the strategy published for consultation in 2020 show an increased requirement for the delivery of rural housing from a minimum of 1,090 in January 2020 to a minimum of 1,502 in the November 2020 version, however, this 45% increase in housing requirement across rural settlements, the allocations for individual parishes have significantly reduced from around a 20% uplift to around a 5% uplift with a considerable number receiving no growth allocation. It is therefore difficult on first reading to reconcile the disparity between the increased housing requirement within rural settlements and the net reduction by 75% for each Parish. It is worthy of consideration at this point that whilst the target figures have increased and Bassetlaw have exceeded the housing requirements for the district at the time of publication, it is common knowledge that the New Standard Method for Housing Need was issued on the 16th December 2020 subsequent to the publication of the November draft of the Part II Plan. This will have generated an uplift in the housing requirements for the district and whilst Bassetlaw had exceeded requirements, it is now likely to be very close to the minimum delivery level if not below it. Consequentially this revision to the housing requirements will need to be reviewed within the next draft of the plan and it would be prudent to reconsider the level of growth allocated for the rural settlements in order to deliver the aspirations of the plan in terms of supporting the rural economy. It is expected within the policy that growth within rural communities should be identified by communities through their Neighbourhood Plan and should not exceed the allocation by more than 5% unless identified by the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst this premise is admirable, it is the case that many Neighbourhood Plans are at various stages of their cycle and a number have been caught out by the shifting position of Bassetlaw with specific reference to the allocation tables within the Part II Plan submissions and are unable at present to establish whether they need to allocate sites and the scale of allocation due to this indecision which is likely to change once more once the New Standard Method of Housing Need is applied.</p>	Policy ST2 has been updated to show housing provision for the large and small rural settlements.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	<p>Harworth Group is one of the leading land and property regeneration companies in the UK, owning and managing around 18,000 acres on around 100 sites in the north of England and the Midlands, including residential development land, commercial property, agricultural estates and low carbon energy and environmental schemes. Harworth are highly experienced at redeveloping previously developed land, including former collieries and power stations. Policy ST1 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy focuses on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement to meet evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerating the District's town centres, and supporting necessary improvements to infrastructure, services and facilities. Policy ST1 A advises that this strategy will be achieved through;</p> <p>1) promoting the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, unless there are overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters, and minimising the use of the most versatile agricultural land;</p> <p>2) emphasising the need to develop in sustainable locations in close proximity to transport hubs, key transport nodes and encouraging higher density development in those locations; and</p> <p>3) ensuring that sufficient physical, social and green infrastructure is delivered to meet identified needs in a timely manner.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 encourages the use of previously developed land, and paragraph 117 confirms that strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed land. Paragraph 118 advises that planning policies and decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land for homes and other identified needs, supporting opportunities to remediate land. The emerging Local Plan will play a critical role in bringing forward previously-developed land such as Cottam Power Station. Policy ST1 A is considered to be consistent with Section 11 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Subsection B of Policy ST1 sets out the housing requirement of a minimum of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period 2020-2037, in accordance with a settlement hierarchy, focusing on the Main Towns (Worksop Outer Area, Worksop Central Area, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes), the Large Rural Settlements, Small Settlements, and the Bassetlaw Garden Village as a New Settlement. Paragraph 3.22 within Section 3 Context confirms that within the rural area are two significant redundant brownfield sites; the former High Marnham and former Cottam Power Stations, advising that the extensive remediation, reclamation and redevelopment are priorities to positively regenerate these significant sites to the benefit of the economy, community and the environment. The regeneration of these significant brownfield sites is however not reflected within the settlement hierarchy. Whilst Subsection D of ST2 confirms support for prioritising the use of brownfield sites within the Small Rural Settlements, it is considered that these sites should also be included within the settlement hierarchy at Policy ST1 B under New Settlement.</p> <p>Policy ST1 B. 5. – Suggested Amendment: Category Settlement New Settlement Bassetlaw Garden Village, Former Cottam Power Station</p>	As delivery the Former Cottam Power Station site is unlikely during this plan period it would not be justified to allocate it as a new garden village settlement. Priority Regeneration Area is considered more appropriate.
REF164	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policy ST1 sets the housing requirement for Bassetlaw during the period 2020-2037. The Council have followed national policy and guidance utilising the Local Housing Need (LHN) as a starting point for establishing its housing requirement. It is noted that in December 2020 the Government published further changes to the Standard Method for assessing LHN, however, for Bassetlaw this results in no change from the existing method, albeit the LHN significantly increases for Sheffield.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance is unequivocal that "the standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour" [our emphasis]. In this context, it is worth remembering the LHN is predominantly demographic led, and as such 'policy-on' considerations such as delivering infrastructure, increasing the supply of affordable housing or as in this case, ensuring economic growth and prosperity cannot always be achieved using this base figure. In this regard, the Council's approach to increase the Housing Requirement to 589 dwellings per annum is supported and has been effectively justified in the supporting Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (Update 2020). Without suitable increases in housing, the Council's employment and economic goals are likely to be restricted due to lack of available working population, or alternatively will lead to large patterns of unsustainable movements as residents commute out of the District to access jobs.</p> <p>Increasing the Housing Requirement also reflects Government ambitions to boost significantly the supply of housing (NPPF Para 59). The Councils approach to increasing the LHR above the figure derived from the Standard Methodology is considered sound and is supported, Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that the recent changes to the Standard Method significantly increase the housing requirement for Sheffield City. It is therefore considered that additional flexibility should be built into Bassetlaw's emerging Plan so in the event that Sheffield City confirm it is unable to meet its own needs, any share of the unmet need can be accommodated by Bassetlaw</p>	There are currently more than 1500 dwellings committed on sites with extant planning permissions within, or on the edge of the small rural settlements. These are expected to be delivered within 5 years.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>ahead of any review of the Plan.</p> <p>The proposed Spatial Strategy within Policy ST1, which seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs in the District is generally supported.</p> <p>With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 65% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. The approach focuses development in the most sustainable locations, whilst still enabling suitable rural growth which is essential for ensuring rural communities can support essential services and ensures their long-term vitality. Concerns are however raised in respect of the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a contribution of 5% of the total requirement over the Plan period. Whilst the contribution of the Garden Village to the supply of housing over the Plan period has been reduced since the Plan was last consulted on it is still considered that assumed delivery from the site is ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. To ensure a deliverable Plan, it is imperative that the Council's delivery assumptions for the emerging sites are realistic.</p> <p>In addition to the above, circa 15% of the housing requirement is to be delivered by Local Plan allocations, Neighbourhood Plan allocations and windfalls in the Large Rural Settlements.</p> <p>A further 15% of the total housing requirement (approximately 1,500 dwellings) is proposed to be delivered in the Small Rural Settlements (which include Treswell), on sites within settlement boundaries or on sites allocated in Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Regarding the overall number of homes to be allocated to Small Rural Settlements, it is noted that this has increased by 3% from the previous Draft Plan. The increased quantum of housing to the Small Rural Settlements is generally supported as this will serve to enhance and maintain the vitality of these rural communities.</p> <p>Concern is however raised in respect of the proposed cap on growth of 'up to 5%' of the existing settlement size (whereas the previous Draft Plan allowed up to 20% growth). The cap does not seem to be based on any clear evidence and could result in the failure to deliver the 1,500 homes assigned to Small Rural Settlements (as detailed in response to Policy ST2 below).</p>	
REF166	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policy ST1 sets the housing requirement for Bassetlaw during the period 2020-2037. The Council have followed national policy and guidance utilising the Local Housing Need (LHN) as a starting point for establishing its housing requirement. It is noted that in December 2020 the Government published further changes to the Standard Method for assessing LHN, however, for Bassetlaw this results in no change from the existing method, albeit the LHN significantly increases for Sheffield.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance is unequivocal that "the standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour" [our emphasis]. In this context, it is worth remembering the LHN is predominantly demographic led, and as such 'policy-on' considerations such as delivering infrastructure, increasing the supply of affordable housing or as in this case, ensuring economic growth and prosperity cannot always be achieved using this base figure. In this regard, the Council's approach to increase the Housing Requirement to 589 dwellings per annum is supported and has been effectively justified in the supporting Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (Update 2020). Without suitable increases in housing, the Council's employment and economic goals are likely to be restricted due to lack of available working population, or alternatively will lead to large patterns of unsustainable movements as residents commute out of the District to access jobs.</p> <p>Increasing the Housing Requirement also reflects Government ambitions to boost significantly the supply of housing (NPPF Para 59). The Councils approach to increasing the LHR above the figure derived from the Standard Methodology is considered sound and is supported, Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that the recent changes to the Standard Method significantly increase the housing requirement for Sheffield City. It is therefore considered that additional flexibility should be built into Bassetlaw's emerging Plan so in the event that Sheffield City confirm it is unable to meet its own needs, any share of the unmet need can be accommodated by Bassetlaw ahead of any review of the Plan. The proposed Spatial Strategy within Policy ST1, which seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs in the District is generally supported.</p> <p>With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 65% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. The approach focuses development in the most sustainable locations, whilst still enabling suitable rural growth which is essential for ensuring rural communities can support essential services and ensures their long-term vitality. Of the three Main Towns, Harworth & Bircotes is proposed to receive the lowest number of proposed dwellings (approx. 1,700 dwellings). Regarding Harworth & Bircotes, the text associated with Policy ST1 (paragraph 5.1.47) states the following: "Over the past two years, Harworth & Bircotes has seen strong growth with just over 260 completions. A significant amount of additional land has planning permission for over 1765</p>	Harworth and Bircotes will receive over 14% of the growth during the plan period. This is considered to be commensurate with its size. It is a smaller town than Worksop in population terms, and has less services and facilities provision.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>dwellings (as at 30/10/2020). On that basis, no further allocations are proposed in this Plan”.</p> <p>The Council’s proposed approach to not direct any further growth at Harworth & Bircotes purely as a result of the existing commitments for the town is not supported.</p> <p>The January 2020 version of the Draft Local Plan advised that the number of homes ‘in the pipeline’ was 1,853 dwellings and Harworth & Bircotes was assigned a housing requirement of 2,000 dwellings. It is not clear why the housing requirement for Harworth has since been reduced to circa 1,700.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that the current housing commitments in the town will provide a much-needed boost to housing supply in the early years of the plan period, it is considered that allocating more homes to Harworth & Bircotes will enable the Plan to encourage further growth, into the later years of the plan period. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF sets out that planning policies should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites for years one to five and “specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan”. Whilst it could be argued that the current commitments may deliver homes for the town for around a 10 year period, we are concerned that not allocating further homes now may stifle development in years 11 – 15 of the plan period.</p> <p>As the Council’s Land Availability Assessment (November 2020) shows, there are a number of available sites at Harworth & Bircotes which could be allocated to future proof the Plan and ensure delivery throughout the whole plan period.</p> <p>Allocating such sites now, or even safeguarding the land to enable them to be brought forward should other sites be delayed in delivery, would be appropriate given Harworth & Bircotes status as a ‘Main Town’ in the emerging Settlement Hierarchy. Moreover, crucially, this will continue to encourage further investment and regeneration in the town, as well as its planned economic growth.</p> <p>Regarding the Main Town tier of the proposed Settlement Hierarchy, it is noted that Worksop is proposed to receive a much higher amount of growth (circa 3,100 dwellings) than what is proposed for Harworth & Bircotes (circa 1,700 dwellings). Due to Harworth & Bircotes being located within the same settlement tier as Worksop we consider that it would be logical for Harworth to receive more housing, commensurate with its tier in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Finally, Harworth & Bircotes is a designated Neighbourhood Plan area and the Neighbourhood Plan was Made in December 2015. It is important that the District Council’s Plan should set out a housing requirement for the Town which will encourage the Neighbourhood Plan to be reviewed in a timely manner to meet the development needs of the period up to 2037.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF167	Marrons Planning on behalf of Vistry Homes Limited.	<p>Plan Period</p> <p>5. It is suggested that the plan period is reviewed. The intended plan period is 2018- 2037 but it is now unlikely that the plan will be adopted until 2023. A plan period of a minimum of 15 years from the point of adoption (NPPF, para. 22) is expected.</p> <p>6. The plan period should run to at least 2038, and arguably to 2039, in order to allow for any unexpected delay in the plan making process. The housing requirement should therefore be increased by circa 1,200 homes over the extended Plan period and the council should identify further housing allocations to meet this requirement.</p> <p>Windfalls</p> <p>7. It appears that the Plan relies upon past trends in part to support a windfall rate of 100 dwellings per annum from Year 6 of the Plan. It is suggested this is unreliable as delivery rates will vary and the Council should review the sources of historic supply; consider whether they will continue at the previous rate, and consider whether there are other sources of supply that may transpire.</p> <p>8. In addition, the Council needs to consider whether any proposed policies will affect the supply of windfalls. Factored into this should be consideration of known sites that may come forward from a comprehensive brownfield land register and housing land availability assessments. Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>9. The Draft Local Plan proposes a five-tier settlement hierarchy comprised of Main Towns, Large Rural Settlements, Small Rural Settlements, a New Settlement (Bassetlaw Garden Village) and then Countryside. Retford is the second largest settlement in the Bassetlaw District and is identified as a 'Main Town' along with Worksop (the largest settlement) and Harworth & Bircotes.</p> <p>10. Retford is a sustainable location for new development and its position as a Main Town is supported. Paragraph 5.1.43 of the draft Local Plan confirms that Retford is a sustainable location for growth due to its ability to maximise opportunities for sustainable and public transport choices.</p> <p>11. The proportion of housing growth that Retford will accommodate has increased from the previous draft version of the plan (January 2020). The increase in the number of dwellings to be provided at Retford is welcome, and better reflects the role of the town in the settlement hierarchy and as a sustainable location for development.</p> <p>12. However, should the Council need to find additional sites to supplement its supply to ensure the Plan is sound when submitted it should first consider sites around Retford owing to its sustainability and ability to accommodate further growth.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken an assessment of historic windfall delivery on small sites. It considers that the evidence justifies the 100 windfall allowance. There will be no windfall allowance for the first 5 years of the plan.</p> <p>Retford will be contributing 17% of the required housing growth during the plan period. The council is not looking to allocate additional sites at present.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owners	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The draft Policies Map show various amendments to the development boundary of Ranskill, in accordance with draft Policy ST1. As part of this, the development boundary to the west of the settlement is shown to be significantly extended, we assume to accommodate a potential housing site that was formerly proposed to be allocated within the emerging Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan (site ref. NP19). This particular amendment to the development boundary is no longer justified on the basis that Policy ST1 now looks to deliver a significantly reduced number of new dwellings in Ranskill. Whilst provisions under draft Policy ST2 allows for an uplifted level of growth to be provided if support is demonstrated via a neighbourhood plan, in this case, the Neighbourhood Plan Group is only just consulting on whether Site NP19 should be included in light of the reduced housing requirement figure (see Appendix 1). For the reasons we set out below, our client has - and will continue to - object to this site being allocated. To include this site within the settlement boundary at this stage, would therefore clearly pre-empt the Neighbourhood Plan process. Accordingly, the proposed amendment to the western development boundary of Ranskill remains unjustified within the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and, thus, unsound in the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF. In any event, in the context that it is deemed appropriate to amend Ranskill's settlement boundaries, we do not consider that Site NP19 represents the most appropriate extension to the settlement on the basis that any such allocation:</p> <p>1 Does not represent a natural extension to the village and, in the absence of any particular natural or physical boundaries, would risk future unconstrained sprawl. Indeed, the layout of the proposed masterplan for Site NP19 – as submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan – makes clear the intent to develop further southwards beyond the proposed revised development boundary.</p> <p>2 Would require residents - including school children - to cross the busy, Great North Road in order to access services such as the school and recreation area. Conversely, an extension to the north of Ranskill would represent a far more logical, 'rounding off' of the existing settlement by extending the area of existing housing off Aundel Drive and infilling land that is bound to the north, west and east by existing roads. Indeed, these would act as physical, defensible boundaries from which the extent of growth can be controlled. A vision document showing the extent of this area is attached and demonstrates how new housing – alongside a village hall / GP surgery, shop and new open space - could be provided in this location and form a natural extension the village . Accordingly, in the event that Ranskill's settlement boundary is to be amended, then this site clearly represents the most appropriate location. We welcome, however, the proposed amendment to south eastern development boundary of Ranskill. This is in accordance with the draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan seeking to allocate site NP25 for employment purposes and follows earlier rounds of public consultation demonstrating clear local support for this. The Neighbourhood Plan Group has also confirmed that this allocation is to be taken forward regardless of the outcome of the additional consultation on Site N19 referenced above. As such, and quite distinct from the wider proposed extensions to the settlement boundary, this particular amendment to the development boundary is effective, justified and sound in the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>There is sufficient provision in the supply including significant buffer to meet the assessed requirement.</p> <p>It will be for the neighbourhood plan process to consider the development boundaries, and whether any new additional allocations should be made in conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan/core strategy.</p>
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owners	<p>In summary, our client considers the draft Local Plan to be unsound in respect of draft Policy ST1 (insofar as it relates to the amended development boundary to the west of Ranskill) and draft Policy ST2. Whilst support is given in principle for draft policies ST11 and ST12, the comments set out in this letter seek to ensure the soundness of these policies in the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF. We trust that the above representation is helpful and will be taken into account in the further preparation of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of all stages of progress, including with regard to submission and opportunity for participation in the Examination in Public.</p>	Support is noted – see above

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF184	Doncaster Council	<p>Development in Harworth/Bircotes and the Bawtry Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Doncaster Council's previous response (February 2020) reiterated our concerns and all those of Bawtry Town Council over the additional impact of the expansion of Harworth/Bircoates on traffic in Doncaster Borough especially Bawtry (as shown in the adopted Bawtry Neighborhood Plan (Section 9: Impacts of the Expansion of Harworth, p25)). 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.</p> <p>The Consultation response summary document (January 2020) for ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy reference 171 states that "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."</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Bassetlaw Local Plan does not include further allocations in Harworth & Bircotes, however, the comment reflects concerns over the impact of development to date on traffic in Bawtry. Doncaster Council wishes for the discussions regarding the duty to cooperate to continue.</p> <p>Also, please ensure that Bawtry Town Council, a neighbouring parish council, are consulted on the Bassetlaw Local Plan at each stage.</p>	<p>All housing growth in Harworth/Bircotes will come from existing commitments with planning permission. The impact of this growth has already been considered including at appeals.</p> <p>All who commented on this version of the plan will be notified of the publication of the proposed submission plan and invited to comment.</p>
REF197	Resident	<p>In terms of geographical and social adjacency, areas to the west and south of Bassetlaw are included but much less emphasis is placed on the areas to the east and north, especially Gainsborough and Doncaster. As Bassetlaw shares a river with West Lindsey, and many in the north east of the District travel to Gainsborough for education, employment and social activities, it would seem worth including.</p>	<p>The policies apply to the whole district. Decisions on site allocations were based upon an assessment of the most sustainable alternative options. The Former Cottam Power Station site is redundant brownfield sites on the eastern edge of the District.</p> <p>Its remediation, reclamation and redevelopment would regenerate and enhance the quality of the environment for the benefit of the economy and the local community</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF211	National Trust	<p>Spatial Strategy supporting text - 5.1.11 – 5.1.17</p> <p>The strategy for employment land is led by ‘land supply’ i.e. land being promoted to the Council by its owner or agent. The fact that a piece of land is being promoted does not necessarily make that land a sustainable development proposition, particularly if it is greenfield land for which there is no demonstrable need. The allocation of a ‘strategic employment site’ on greenfield land at Apleyhead could impact on the viability of other development/regeneration sites both within the district and elsewhere, as well as having impacts on the local environment and strategic road network. We urge the Council to reconsider this strategic approach. In this iteration of the plan, the Council does recognise that boosting the employment land allocation significantly above what is required to support local employment will also have implications for housing requirements, effectively doubling the housing requirement over the plan period.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal report (table 4.6) suggests that an employment target based on large-scale aspirational growth may have a significant negative effect on biodiversity and geodiversity and may also have negative effects on land use and soils, water, flood risk, air quality, resource use and waste, cultural heritage, landscape and townscape. However, the associated Sustainability Appraisal of the Spatial Strategy (table 6.3 and supporting text) fails to properly consider the implications of large-scale greenfield allocations.</p> <p>We note with some concern that according to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment) there may be adverse effects on the integrity of Sherwood Forest ppSPA as a result of air pollution and potentially recreational pressure and cat predation arising from the sizeable increase in employment and housing utilising large greenfield sites close to Clumber Park. The HRA clearly states that further information on traffic and potentially air quality modelling ‘is required before the Local Plan is submitted for Examination’ (para 6.7). The acceptability of major site allocations at Apleyhead and Bassetlaw Garden Village in relation to air quality has therefore not yet been established and cannot be deferred to project level HRAs after the plan has been adopted.</p> <p>ST1 A</p> <p>Part A of Policy ST1 states that the Spatial Strategy will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth ‘to meet the evidenced need for new homes and jobs’. In line with our comments above, we are concerned that the Spatial Strategy approach conflates the concepts of ‘need’ and ‘supply’ and that the resulting strategy may not constitute sustainable development.</p> <p>ST1 A1</p> <p>We support the promotion of ‘the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land’ along with ‘minimising the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3 agricultural land’. However, the proposed allocation of a large amount of greenfield development land for which there is no demonstrable need would appear to contradict this aspect of the strategy.</p> <p>ST1 B</p> <p>The provision of land for a minimum of 10,013 dwellings (589 dpa) – approximately double the assessed need – is tied to the over-allocation of employment land and may not therefore constitute sustainable development.</p> <p>ST1 D</p> <p>The provision of land to create 11,200 jobs is associated with the proposed allocation of greenfield development land significantly over and above an upper end need calculation for employment and may not therefore constitute sustainable development.</p>	<p>The evolution of the preferred Spatial Strategy has followed a methodical and flexible approach. It has followed national planning policy and guidance, and local planning objectives, as well as the sustainability objectives criteria contained within the Sustainability Appraisal. It is based upon the most up to date evidence that was available at each stage in the process.</p> <p>The process has responded to the views expressed by the local community, elected members, parish councils, statutory bodies and developers at the different stages of consultation in the selection of the preferred development Options.</p> <p>The process has also responded to changing circumstances as the evidence was refined relating to the re-distribution of land uses in order to help deliver a significant increase in housing provision balanced with environmental protection, in accordance with government objectives.</p>
1667329	Resident	<p>Disagree with the degree of supply led employment and housing. The government minimum for housing is 288 per annum. the BDC figure of 589 is over a 100% increase.</p> <p>This will be too damaging to the environment, and put too much strain on t existing infrastructure. Too much development of Retford and Worksop will spoil the market towns character.</p> <p>Page 32 5.1.53 I agree with the small rural settlements definition and the percentage being limited to 5% . This should help minimise the use of agricultural land being used to meet unrealistic targets set for small villages</p>	<p>The evolution of the preferred Spatial Strategy has followed a methodical approach. It has followed national planning policy and guidance, and local planning objectives, as well as the sustainability objectives criteria contained within the Sustainability Appraisal. It is based upon the most up to date evidence that was available at each stage in the process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
1668401	Resident	Much of the proposed development is supported. The proposal rightly makes the case for sustainable development and an investment in the future for the young residents. The ability of the the first time buyers to get on the property ladder is extremely difficult. I would ask the following: what will be done to ensure the homes are for the people of Bassetlaw firstly, what limitation on numbers will be in place to reduce foreign buyers from purchasing homes , finally what limitations on private property investors will be in place .	The objective is for affordable housing provision to benefit the local community of Bassetlaw. Support noted.
1669799	Resident	<p>(5.1.9) The right types of homes in the right places? What does Bassetlaw consider to be the right type of home? Where do bungalows come into this strategy, if at all? Bassetlaw's past failure in ensuring sufficient bungalows were built to meet the needs of the elderly or infirm has contributed to the "outmigration" of people who needed such housing. I have referred to several reasons why people require bungalows but not yet mentioned their preference. Why does someone have to be elderly or infirm to want to live in a bungalow. They may just simply prefer to live in a bungalow for any number of different reasons but in Bassetlaw their preferences are not even taken into account.</p> <p>(5.1.21) Is this the crux of the problem? Only grant planning permission if the developers cram as many houses onto the site as possible. This suits developers all the way as they obviously cream off far more from houses than bungalows or they would be building bungalows. Or, perhaps the truth of the matter is that Bassetlaw is telling developers not to build bungalows? Quality housing is also mentioned & that is all I am asking for, a nice 3 bedroom quality detached bungalow that we can spend the rest of our years in, with our family close by & at the same time free up a large 4 bedroom detached house to a young family.</p> <p>(5.1.47) I refer back to my earlier comments regarding recent & proposed housing & the number of bungalows included. Out of the 260 recent completions how many were bungalows? The only ones as far as I am aware are on Well Hill Drive but I am open to correction. Out of the more than 1765 to be built how many are bungalows? The information that I have is none but again I am open to correction.</p>	Policies 32 and 33 require development to provide an appropriate mix and type of market and affordable housing, and specialist housing for older people and disabled persons informed by the most up to date Council evidence of housing. This would include the provision of bungalows.
1670549	Resident	The assumptions of growth and housing demand behind this work have been overtaken by the pandemic which will have weakened demand for housing going forward. New jobs are the priority for the area and should be prioritised over housing.	Demand for housing is strong and there has been a recent increase in prices despite the pandemic. According to the Halifax the property market showed a 1.3 % jump in the cost of homes in May 2021 in the UK.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
1670589	Resident	<p>5.1.21 The housing requirement it is asked that numbers in Small Rural Settlements are increased to support and sustain infrastructure in the settlements. The 5% growth in numbers in Sutton-cumlound mitigates against providing starter homes or accommodation for elderly people looking for smaller housing. It will drive up the building of fewer, and to keep within the growth percentage it will mean more large and more expensive houses. It is important that the mix of houses to be developed is given more consideration rather than growth percentage.</p> <p>Retail Needs 5.1.31 Developments and expansion in Small Rural Settlements such as Sutton-cum-lound will help to sustain local retail which is currently not available, and will create employment.</p> <p>5.1.36 To overcome the shortfall of land, small scale sites in village settlements, of land currently unused and unlikely to be used for any other purpose, should be part of local plans. It is asked that a small site near the church in Sutton-cum-lound is given consideration for development, reference number 281. It is currently wasteland, and should be utilised for housing development. This land is part of an old stackyard and provides potential for various developments. At the last planning review this site received a large number of responses supporting its use for housing. The shortage of land is mentioned in the plan, pieces of land currently wasteland and unable to be used for other purposes should be given consideration. The piece of land number 281 has potential for a small development, in keeping with the historical look of the old farm building conversations. Such small pieces of land should be utilised.</p> <p>Small Rural Settlements – 5.1.52 The sustainable growth of Small Rural Settlements does not recognise the significant changes to work patterns which has taken place, working from home and the provision of shared business facilities should be encouraged. The growth limit should not be constrained in Small Rural Settlements and should not have a 5% limit. A higher figure would help create a better mix of residential development and employment uses to sustain other services in those communities. The 5% growth in numbers in Sutton-cumlound will mitigate against providing starter homes or accommodation for elderly people looking for smaller housing, a larger number/percentage growth is needed to provide scope for development of more and small houses. A limit of 5% growth will drive up the building of fewer and implicitly larger houses. To keep within the growth percentage it will mean large and more expensive houses, not necessarily the right mix of housing. It is important that the mix of houses to be developed is given more consideration rather than growth percentage.</p>	<p>The Local Plan supports the use and redevelopment of redundant PDL. Policy ST2 allows for small villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Development of isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided.</p> <p>The 5% growth rate for the small rural villages was arrived at through a process which took into account the views of the local community, elected members, parish councils, statutory bodies and developers at the different stages of consultation in the selection of the preferred development options.</p> <p>Policy 32: Houses Mix, Type and Density requires a mix which is based on the most up to date evidence of need in the 2020 HEDNA.</p>
1670869	Resident	<p>paras 5.1.5. 5.1.53 and 5.1.54 "Each level of the hierarchy reflects the settlement/area's role, the range of services present, their accessibility by public transport, their infrastructure capacity and their ability to expand to accommodate the needs generated by new development" - this does not seem to be the case when considering the Cottam Power Station site. Why is Cottam village not considered a small rural settlement and therefore subject to the 5% housing growth as set out in the policy ST1? It could be considered that by discounting Cottam village as a small rural settlement, this allows for the CPS site to be identified as a site with no or minimal impact - especially ot anyone who does not know the area. Is this disingenuous...?</p>	<p>The categorization of villages is based on a methodical and robust assessment carried out. This is outlined in detail in the Rural Settlements background paper supporting the Plan.</p>
1671143	Resident	I believe that the reduction from a 20% to 5% in the requirement for new build as applied to the Small Rural Settlements is a good move and one that ought to find widespread support across those communities.	Support noted
REF024	Resident	I believe Cottam along with Bole and Sturton are small rural settlements so why are the council proposing over 700 new homes at Cottam and over 400 at West Burton? This surely goes against the Bassetlaw Plan which clearly states 5% of new builds in these areas.	The redevelopment of the Cottam Power Station site is expected to deliver housing.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			Its remediation, reclamation and redevelopment would regenerate and enhance the quality of the environment for the benefit of the economy and the local community
REF109	Resident	<p>5.1.36 The land adjoining Worksop and Retford may be able to sustain the majority of the houses required for the area, but by allocating only two main areas, this will put additional pressure on the local infrastructure as the already busy roads currently struggle to cope during peak times.</p> <p>5.1.38 & 5.1.44 Nearly a quarter of the Retford housing will be located in the Trinity Farm plot after phase 2 is completed, this will have a serious impact on the road infrastructure. The revised plans show each house has been allocated 2 parking places so potentially an additional 880 cars could be using North Road in Retford which could cause major traffic issues on a regular basis.</p> <p>5.1.43 The businesses which have moved into the new employment premises off Randall Way, Retford, have provided little or no additional employment as they have relocated. Public transport is not an option for many people due to the location of where they work to where they live.</p>	The impacts of development would need to be mitigated, and there would be developer contributions to improve capacity and flows.
REF110	Resident	It appears that the “The Draft Plan” proposes house-building at a rate almost double what is required using the current government’s recommended method of calculation. Should they use the current standard method there should be a reduction of at least 600- 800 homes.	<p>The objectively assessed housing need of 591 dwellings per annum has been set at a level to support the full extent of the jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update November, 2020.</p> <p>The Standard Method calculates a minimum housing need for Bassetlaw of 288 dwellings per annum for the period 2020-2037. This is not a housing requirement figure rather it is the minimum starting point.</p> <p>The increase in housing need above the standard method figure is a reflection of changing economic circumstances and growth strategies in the District. It also reflects market signals where over the past few years 64,045sqm floorspace has been completed on the General Employment Sites, 70.9ha has been granted planning permission since April 2018.</p> <p>This higher figure would also help delivering infrastructure and there is support for it from the of D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF134	Resident	<p>I feel I cannot really add to this but would ask that my general development comments be regarded for the specific site and for the general policies of the Plan:</p> <p>e.g. Open countryside should be developed as a last resort, with urban and brown field sites developed first.</p> <p>If developed, landscape corridors should be required and stipulated in planning permissions, together with detailed landscape requirements and open spaces for the site itself. The Local Plan must give specific detailed requirements so a later Planning Permission can include and enforce such requirements.</p> <p>Suitable houses, in keeping with an area, should be allowed for the local district residents, including affordable housing, not just for commuters to outside areas/Cities, like Sheffield.</p> <p>Villages should be allowed to remain and not swamped or taken in by urban expansion.</p> <p>Un occupied houses in the Towns should be brought into use to help housing waiting lists, or their area redeveloped, in preference to more development in the countryside. Section 106 Agreements with Developers should be required in detailed planning policies so Planning Permissions can include and hold Developers to account.</p>	The objective is to locate new development in sustainable locations that respect the environment and support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas, and makes best use of previously developed land and buildings and minimises the loss of countryside.
REF136	Resident	<p>I fully support the plan to build on areas outside Retford.</p> <p>Retford has seen too much development over the last 10 years. We have lost too many of our green spaces to building plots. We have seen that these areas are vital for people to exercise and enjoy open spaces close to the Town. By building further away i.e considering the Cottham Power station site for building is an excellent proposal. Provided the infrastructure is there to support the community this should offer residents the opportunity to thrive outside what is now becoming an increasingly populated area.</p> <p>Retford has now become a dormitory town where people sleep here but work away in Gainsborough, Doncaster etc. At times during the day this extra traffic causes gridlock around the town. Building outside would give easy access to main roads without struggling to get through the town.</p> <p>I strongly support the Councils attempts to free up the town.</p>	Support for the redevelopment of the Cottam Power station site is noted.
REF140	Resident	I approve of the draft local plan and the site allocations for Retford & Ordsall	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF144	Resident	<p>As a resident of Carlton in Lindrick I have followed up the request to comment on these plans but do find it rather difficult to find any particularly constructive statements presented after those issued previously !.</p> <p>I, amongst other residents, did make various contributions (both at the meetings and to the relevant documents, etc.) regarding the future plans for our village but there does not seem to have been any really constructive feedback since then. [We do also have our own residents Internet site but I am not aware of any feedback being presented by yourselves on there]</p> <p>One of the issues raised on the Internet was that of the land available at previous mining site in Costhorpe (which many of us thought should have been part of the original development plan - rather than using the farming land that was eventually utilised !) but since then there has been no constructive statement(s) about any future plans for that site, so I am very surprised that I can still find not reference to that issue in the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>If there is any intention to permit this site to be redeveloped then surely this should be allowed for in your planning as clearly it will have rather a major affect on various aspects of this village, such as transport, schooling, medical facilities, shopping, etc. [but hopefully also ensuring that we remain as a separated village and are not ever incorporated into the residential growth that is currently spreading in our direction !]</p> <p>One aspect about the evolving growth of Worksop and its surrounds is that much of the housing development has been occurring on the North of the town, whereas the major traffic route is the A57 which itself is supporting many of the major employment facilities on the South of the town - resulting in the need for a large number of local residents to travel across town each day ! This is not an easy task as there is no well developed route for that traffic (and even the Ashes Park Road was not constructed as a suitable dual carriageway to help leviatate that growing problem !).</p> <p>The allocation of land on the A57 opposite the Wilko factory for industrial use is surely going to add to that problem but is it not possible to include some residential housing on the triangular plot of land between the B6079 and the railway line (with possibly a railway station and a suitable footpath), thus providing local accommodation for staff working at those factories ?</p>	<p>The Council has assessed all available sites – see Bassetlaw Land Availability Assessment. Most suitable sites including brownfield sites have been taken forward as allocations where they are developable and deliverable.</p> <p>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.</p>
REF150	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	The Harworth & Bircotes Town Council is supportive of the vision statement for Harworth & Bircotes, as shown in the Draft Local Plan. The Town Council values the decision by Bassetlaw to restrict the allocation of new housing development sites up to the year 2037; this allows the Town Council to work with the agreed developments, and accordingly meaningfully review the Neighbourhood Plan and the complete the Town Centre Masterplan.	Support noted
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	It is important to note that the Local Plan is a statutory requirement set by the government, however it has been raised that the Draft Local Plan is twice that recommended by the government to allocate housing need. This is justified by the predicted (and desired) employment growth, however in light of the Covid-19 Pandemic and the subsequent impact, it is likely that growth won't be as what has been ambitiously predicted. With this in mind, are the larger developments required on that scale?	<p>The Covid-19 is considered a short-term set back to growth.</p> <p>According to the Halifax the property market showed a 1.3 % jump in the cost of homes in May 2021 in the UK.</p>
REF183	Resident	While there are fine ambitions there must be doubt cast on the scale of housing proposed which does not seem to follow the method required by government. Population growth figures used now and previously suggest any housing growth will not be near the scale being proposed. There is no justification for exceeding the minimum required under the government's method. You seem to base housing growth on employment growth but show no clear link to job creation. It looks as if Retford gets houses but no jobs.	<p>The objectively assessed housing need of 591 dwellings per annum has been set at a level to support the full extent of the jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update November, 2020.</p> <p>The Standard Method calculates a minimum housing need for Bassetlaw of 288 dwellings per annum for the period 2020-2037. This is not a</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
			<p>housing requirement figure rather it is the minimum starting point.</p> <p>The increase in housing need above the standard method figure is a reflection of changing economic circumstances and growth strategies in the District. It also reflects market signals where over the past few years 64,045sqm floorspace has been completed on the General Employment Sites, 70.9ha has been granted planning permission since April 2018.</p> <p>This higher figure would also help delivering infrastructure and there is support for it from the of D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership</p>
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<p>It is important to understand further when 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, whilst the plan sets out the expected growth, understandable it s not clear when this will be delivered. This is particularly 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. We would 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. For example, the Plan identifies: 'There is a need for around 900 extra care units in the District over the plan period. A starting point will be a new scheme at HS13: Ordsall South' this would clearly directly impact Retford and Villages Primary Care Network, similarly the development at Peaks Hill would impact Newgate PCN and Larwood and Blyth PCN. 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.</p> <p>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. As previously mentioned there is already considerable pressure on this space. We would be keen to ensure any new housing scheme took full consideration of the impact on demand for services and welcome the Council requirement for 'All schemes of 50 or more dwellings will be required to submit a Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix as part of the planning application' which is fantastic, we would welcome any shared input we may have in reviewing the Health Impact Assessment Matrix .</p> <p>Welcome the recognition throughout the plan for the health infrastructure financial contributions and look forward to working with the BDC as plans develop locally.</p> <p>As referenced above, we would welcome more information as each of the development progress locally to further understand the anticipated changes to demographic profiles and assess the full impact on NHS services, to further 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.</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out what additional infrastructure will be needed to deliver the development identified in the Local Plan including for health services. For key infrastructure it sets out cost estimates, timings, funding sources and those responsible for delivery infrastructure financial contributions</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF206	Derbyshire County Council, Economy, Transport, and Environment	<p>As you will be aware, the County Council engages in collaborative and joint working with Bassetlaw District Council on a number of officer working groups, particularly the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Local Plan Liaison Group and Sheffield City Heads of Planning Group, which also involve officers within the three district councils in Derbyshire including Bolsover District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council and North East Derbyshire District Council. In this context, the County Council has been a signatory to a Statement of Common Ground with all the Sheffield City Region Authorities, including Bassetlaw District council, that sets out a range of agreed principles for the preparation of Local Plans in the constituent authorities, particularly regarding housing provision requirements and agreement amongst the constituent authorities that each authority will meet its own housing needs in full without the need to rely on other neighbouring authorities to meet any unmet housing need that might arise in any adjoining authority area.</p> <p>In this context, it is noted and supported that the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan has set out a proposed housing requirement for the District of 10,013 dwellings (589 dwellings per annum) for the period 2020-2037 and identifies sufficient land within the District to meet this need in full without the need for any of this total requirement to be met in neighbouring districts, particularly in Derbyshire. This should ensure that the housing provision level identified should not have any significant adverse impacts on housing delivery in nearby Bolsover, Chesterfield or North East Derbyshire Districts. It is considered that this level of need has been soundly justified and based on the Government's Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need with an additional allowance to be included to support the full extent of planned jobs growth in the District of 11,236 jobs identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update 2020. This is considered to provide for a balanced and sustainable level of housing and employment growth in the District.</p> <p>In terms of distribution, it is noted and considered that the Draft Local Plan seeks to provide for a sustainable pattern of housing growth focussed on the main towns of Worksop and Retford and larger settlements of Harworth and Bircotes. This proposed distribution of housing is considered unlikely to have any significant impacts on housing delivery in Derbyshire or any significant impacts on existing strategic infrastructure in Derbyshire or need for proposed new infrastructure, for which the County council has a statutory responsibility.</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Under a duty to cooperate Bassetlaw Council is collaborating with other prescribed bodies, neighbouring authorities in the housing market area including Derbyshire County Council on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries, which they need to address in their plans</p>
REF227	Resident	<p>Having exhaustively read through and considered the Plan I can only in general terms bemoan and decry the complete lack of any emphasis or direction in relation to the rest of the county of Nottinghamshire and in particular to the areas and districts immediately to the south and east of the district in the approach to Newark, Edwinstowe and Ollerton, for example. A number of the planning, development, housing and most especially transport needs of the district can be much more effectively and appropriately met by a realignment of the district's focus towards and relationships with adjacent districts within Nottinghamshire rather than with the Council's obsession with rendering Bassetlaw a mere siphon and servant of the needs of Sheffield and South Yorkshire to the extent of the Bassetlaw district merely being rendered a subservient satellite of those areas. No wonder there is so much "out-commuting", with more and more of that, very sensibly, going south and east.</p>	<p>Under a duty to cooperate Bassetlaw Council is collaborating with other prescribed bodies, neighbouring authorities in the housing market area including the County Council on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries, which they need to address in their plans.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF181	Rural Solutions on behalf of Foljambe	<p>Draft Policy ST1 (Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy): Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy categorises Sturton-le-Steeple as a 'small rural settlement'. It also aims to support the growth of the eligible Small Rural Settlements by about 1,500 dwellings on appropriate sites within the development boundaries, or on site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans by up to 5%.</p> <p>Policy ST1 as drafted is unjustified and unsound. Development in small rural settlements is capped at 5%, inclusive of sites within development boundaries, or on-site allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We note that the policy wording has changed quite considerably since the January 2020 version of the Local Plan was issued for comment. The January 2020 edition of the Plan specified that up to 20% of the existing number of dwellings in the Parish up to 2037, would be acceptable in rural settlements, including Sturton-le-Steeple. This allows much more flexibility, than the suggested 5%, for the rural settlements to grow, and to ensure that they remain as sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The Council have not provided any clear justification for this revised figure or its cap in the evidence base. The housing requirement in the Small Rural Settlements has not decreased, it has actually increased from 1,090 as stipulated in Draft Policy ST1 (January 2020 version) to 1,500 in the Publication Draft version.</p> <p>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 5% has been reached.</p> <p>Policies ST1 and ST2 are currently unsound with an unjustified cap on sustainable growth in the Rural Settlements. The wording of these policies should be updated to reflect our comments made above on the restrictive percentage but to also allow sustainable development to come forward, regardless of the identified housing requirement. The purpose is to ensure the vitality and viability of all settlements and to provide local communities with a choice of new homes.</p> <p>Policy ST1, Policy ST2To ensure the soundness tests of Policies ST1 and ST2 are met, we respectfully request change the wording to allow for a greater level of housing growth in the Small Rural Settlements. Furthermore, there should be no cap on sustainable development to be in line with national policy. It is important that the smaller rural settlements such as Sturton-le-Steeple are able to make a meaningful contribution to the future housing land supply in the Bassetlaw District and to ensure that they can maintain a healthy population within their local communities.</p>	<p>Considering the large number of settlements in the Small Rural Settlements category it is expected that about 15% (over 1800 dwellings.*) as at 1 April 2021 of the District's housing need will be delivered from this category of the settlement hierarchy. Some settlements have exceeded the 5% growth.</p> <p>Rural settlements should retain their identity and distinctiveness, built form and character in keeping with each settlement's size, scale of services and infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>*This figure also includes areas defined as countryside.</p>
REF195 PHF	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management	<p>Our clients recognise and support the strategic objective of meeting housing needs of the Borough over the plan period and in particular note and support the references in para. 5.1.9 of the Draft Local Plan in relation to facilitating a step change in the District's economy and aligning economic growth with the housing offer in the Borough by providing the right type of new homes, in the right places.</p> <p>Further, our clients also support the statement in para. 5.1.20 of the Draft Local Plan which recognises that pursuing a housing target based purely on Government household projections, would mean the plan would provide an insufficient number of dwellings to support economic growth in the District.</p> <p>We consider that these statements of intent are all the more important given the impact of the Covid 19 pandemic, through which it has become apparent that a permanent change in the way people work, with more home working, is likely in the future. It is even more important therefore to ensure that housing numbers and housing sizes reflect the economic growth target of the District and this likely change in working patterns.</p> <p>Our clients support proposed Policy ST1, in particular ST1B, and the provision of land for a minimum of 10,013 dwellings at an annual delivery of 589 dwellings per annum. They also support ST1B1 in terms of the settlement hierarchy identified. Our clients further support Policy ST1D, in terms of the provision of at least 168 hectares of general employment land in the plan period.</p>	Support - noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF099	Consultant, Trustees of H S Wallis Lanowner	<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. The paragraph draws attention to one of these priorities - the growth zone associate with the A1 strategic corridor - (this approach derives from the 2019 Spatial Strategy Background Paper in which the value of the A1 corridor associated with Harworth is recognised as a "logistics corridor").</p> <p>The following paragraph then summarises the aims of 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 "....sustainale housing growth particularly in rural parts of the District."</p> <p>There are few sites better placed to achieve these objectives than the site the subject of these representations fitting so well as it does into the local landscape and the built forms of "North Blyth", proximity to the A1 and close relationship with substantial areas having permission for employment uses.</p> <p>Subsequent paragraphs set out the process by which the PSatial Strategy has emerged. They refer to the wish to retain the Main Town, Large and Small Rural Settlements hierarchy. However, no where in the document is there any indication that the distinctiveness of "North Blyth" is recognised or where it might fit into this categorisation.</p> <p>Whilst being within the parish of Blyth the area could not be more distinct and separate (not least by the A1) from the core of the more historic core of Blyth.</p> <p>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 Harwoth/Bircotes just to the north.</p> <p>Paras 5.1.24-5.1.26 briefly describe Harwoth/Bircotes in part in the following terms "Harworth & Bircotes is' a strategically advantageous economic location and is expected to deliever significant employment growth (see Policy ST6).... reflecting its easy access to the A1(M)"</p> <p>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 habing 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 facilites and provide a focal point for use by residents of the surrounding small villages and hamlets."</p> <p>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%..."</p> <p>Nothin in the text indicates that this the approach is to be applied to LRS's</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is only in the actual Draft Policy ST1 that the Draft Plan 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.</p> <p>The Draft policy ST1-B2a refers to land allocations and appropriate forms of development within their settlemtn boundaries. However although nominally part of Blyth the area lossely referred to as "North Blyth" does not have any development boundary.</p> <p>Given the very speical and strategic advantages attaching to this part of the District and the planning permissions that have already been granted this is something of an anomaly.</p> <p>In appearing to totally ignore this area the Draft Local Plan appears here to be diverging not only from what is set out above but also from 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..."</p> <p>In Draft Policy ST1-C1 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 followingg through on the importance the Draft Plan is attaching to LRS's</p> <p>However, later in the Draft Plan (Section 7) under the heading "Housing Distribution" at paa. 7.1.6 it states:- "7.16 In the early plan period more development will be delieverd by commitments in Worksop, Retford, and Harworth & Bircotes; in sustainable locationsin accordance with Policy ST1. Similarly housing development will take place in the Large Rural settlements either through Neighbourhood Plann allocations or via commitments...."</p> <p>So now there to be NO Local Plan allocations for the sities in LRS's?</p> <p>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</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
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>entirely to the Neighbourhood Plans' to which a 20% cap will be applied.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 the 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"</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This seems to be a serious error and entirely contrary to the sentiment expressed in the earlier paragraphs 5.1.27-5.1.28 under the heading "Large Rural Settlements".</p> <p>THERE SEEMS TO BE LITTLE POINT IN EXPLAINING AND THEN ADOPTING A SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY HAVING THREE DISTINCT ELEMENTS AND THEN FOR THE Hugely Important Function of Planning for Housing 'LUMPING' TWO OF THEM TOGETHER.</p> <p>In passing it is noted the degree of reliance the Draft Plan is placing 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.</p> <p>There is even a greater argument for it to be seen as an employment site rather than housing.</p>	
REF187	iba Planning on behalf of several clients	<p>The Council has amended the approach to housing growth in the Small Rural Settlements in the latest version of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and we have serious concerns regarding these changes.</p> <p>First, the Council has reduced the permitted growth level for Small Rural Settlements from 20% as in the previous version of the plan to just 5%.</p> <p>The Council's rationale for this is purported to be to achieve a 'more balanced distribution of growth' (paragraphs 5.1.37 and 5.1.38 of the Local Plan); the Council also suggests that many of the Small Rural Settlements would struggle to accommodate 20% growth due to constraints such as flood risk and the availability of suitable land (paragraph 5.2.4 of the Local Plan).</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the previously proposed 20% growth cap for Small Rural Settlements was a maximum housing growth figure not a minimum requirement, and so permitting all Small Rural Settlements to grow by up to 20% would not obligate the Council or local communities to accept housing on unsuitable land such as that at risk of flooding, or in settlements without the capacity to accommodate additional development.</p> <p>This being so, there was no harm in permitting all Small Rural Settlements to grow by up to 20%.</p> <p>By decreasing the cap from 20% to just 5%, the Council appears to be painting all Small Rural Settlements with the same brush by assuming that they are all incapable or unsuitable for accommodating 20% growth due to constraints and land availability, which is surely not the case.</p> <p>Such an approach prevents those settlements without constraint (and with capacity) to grow at a level proportionate to their size.</p> <p>The Council says that it has reduced the cap for Small Rural Settlements to 5% in an attempt to balance the distribution of housing, but it is important to note that retaining a 20% cap for both Large Rural Settlements and Small Rural Settlements would also achieve this. This is because, with a 20% cap applied to all rural settlements, each Small Rural Settlement would inevitably provide a smaller number of houses due to their smaller starting size, ensuring all the rural settlements see a level of housing increase proportionate to their size and status and maintaining a balance in housing provision across the rural area.</p> <p>Whilst both strategies could result in a suitably balanced distribution of housing, the 5% cap restricts growth in many smaller settlements which have both the capacity and desire to grow, stifling their ability to thrive and continue to support a diverse community, and preventing them from making a contribution to the housing growth at a scale proportional to their size, in contrary to the aspirations of paragraph 78 of the NPPF.</p> <p>To address this issue, we submit that the cap for Small Rural Settlements be returned to the 20% previously proposed to ensure a balance distribution of growth and to prevent these important rural communities from stagnating.</p> <p>Our second cause for objection to the latest version of the Local Plan relates to the Council's reduction in the number of Small Rural</p>	<p>Currently more than 15% of the contribution to the housing land supply will come from the Small Rural Villages. These are commitments on sites with planning permission, or allocated in neighbourhood plans. Many of the villages have therefore already met or exceeded their need.</p> <p>Policy ST2 has been amended in terms of its structure to deal with the growth requirement and then to manage any additional residential development in areas. Additional residential development over and above the identified requirement will only be supported where it is planned through a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>A 5% cap for small rural settlements is therefore considered to be justified and would help reduce the potential impact of development on the character and identity of the village and on local infrastructure.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>Settlements.</p> <p>The Council has altered the criteria for defining Small Rural Settlements (increasing both the number of homes and the number of services required in order to qualify) and this has resulted in a decrease in the number of Small Rural Settlements from 42 (as in the previous version of the plan) to 34.</p> <p>There is no explanation as to why the Council has altered the criteria in either the Local Plan or the background documents and it is unclear what the rationale behind this is.</p> <p>As with the Council's reduction in the housing cap from Small Rural Settlements, this amendment is again considered inconsistent with the aspirations of paragraph 78 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study 2020 states that those settlements which do not meet the new criteria "are considered too small ... or are too constrained to receive any planned growth and will be treated as countryside as per Policy ST1". We disagree with this - even very small settlements can contribute to housing supply at a scale proportionate to their size and status whilst benefitting the existing community, a point made in our previous representations.</p> <p>As an example, 4-5 well-designed dwellings located in a suitable location in a settlement with, say, 70 dwellings (which falls just below the revised criteria for being a small rural settlement but previous would have been allowed to grow by up to 20%) would not result in an overburdening of the settlement's infrastructure or any notable change in its size or rural character, but would necessarily help support services and facilities in the settlement and surrounding area.</p> <p>Given the above, there is no sound justification for preventing those settlements identified in the previous version of the Local Plan for up to 20% growth from accommodating a small amount of development proportional to their size.</p> <p>The Council's amended approach appears particularly unfounded given that Bassetlaw is a predominantly rural District.</p> <p>We submit that the previous criteria for defining Small Rural Settlements more accurately identified those settlements suitable for growth and therefore ask the Council to reinstate the previous criteria in light of these comments.</p> <p>In amending the list of Small Rural Settlements, the Council has also omitted Welham, Mattersey Thorpe, Habbleshthorpe and Woodbeck from being considered as Small Rural Settlements alongside a neighbouring settlement.</p> <p>There is no explanation of this within the Local Plan or supporting documentation and this omission makes little logical sense. All these settlements are part of the same parish as a neighbouring settlement still identified as a Small Rural Settlement and are socially and functionally connected to that neighbouring settlement.</p> <p>Moreover, both Welham and Mattersey Thorpe are covered by made Neighbourhood Plans which implicitly link these settlements to their neighbouring settlements²; Woodbeck is also covered by a well-advanced Neighbourhood Plan (simply awaiting referendum) which seeks to plan for this settlement alongside the neighbouring village of Rampton.</p> <p>Similarly, Habbleshthorpe is physically connected to North Leverton and the two settlements have historically been considered as a group and referred to collectively as 'North Leverton with Habbleshthorpe'.</p> <p>As such, it makes little logical sense for part of this settlement to no longer be included within the defined Small Rural Settlement.</p> <p>Excluding Welham, Mattersey Thorpe, Habbleshthorpe and Woodbeck from the defined Small Rural Settlements represents a further way in which the latest version of the Local Plan restricts the growth of small settlements so vital to their long-term survival as affordable, diverse and thriving communities and prevents such settlements from making a contribution to the balanced distribution of growth desired by the Council at a scale proportional to their size, undermining the Council's purported goals for the Local Plan, the vitality of rural Bassetlaw, and the emerging Local Plan's conformity with national planning policy.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF200	Savills on behalf of land owners	<p>Draft Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>We have no issue in principle to the overarching spatial strategy of Bassetlaw given it focuses on delivering sustainable development throughout the district which reflects the NPPF.</p> <p>We also approve of the growth directed to villages given that the NPPF (2019) clearly recognises the importance of rural housing in enhancing and maintaining the vitality of rural communities and requires planning policy to identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive.</p> <p>It is important however that rural settlements such as Elkesley are correctly labelled within the settlement hierarchy to allow manage growth in a positive way through allocating deliverable sites to meet their needs. In allocating the correct level of housing commensurate with their size will help sustain a critical mass and ensure key facilities and services continue to thrive and expand what they can offer as well as ensuring that younger generations are able to afford new homes and remain vibrant, attractive places to live.</p> <p>We therefore have reservations on the mis-categorisation of Elkesley, which is discussed in greater detail as part of our comments on draft Policy ST2, which focuses specifically on rural Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>Elkesley does not meet the criteria, as identified within the Rural Background Paper, to be classified as a Large Rural Settlement. Although the village does have some services and facilities, and is located adjacent to the A1 it is rural in character and has slowly grown over the last 20 years. The settlement's role is generally to provide for its residents and it doesn't provide a role to support other settlements' needs.</p> <p>This approach has been supported through the production of the Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently being reviewed where smaller sites are favoured over larger developments</p>
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd,	<p>With regard to housing, The Standard Method was introduced by the Government to simplify the process of defining housing need, and avoid significant delay and debate experienced in plan preparation and at planning appeals. Revisions to the PPG on the 20th February 2019 confirmed the need for local planning authorities to use the 2014-household projections as the starting point for the assessment of housing need under the standard method2.</p> <p>The most significant of these updates was the confirmation of the need for local planning authorities to use the 2014-household projections as the starting point for the assessment of housing need under the standard method.</p> <p>It is also vital to consider the economic impact of COVID-19 and the long-term role that housing will play in supporting the recovery of the economy, both locally and nationally. In this way, Gladman encourage Bassetlaw to fully consider the merits of planning for a housing figure beyond the minimum requirement of 288 dwellings per annum. For instance, an increased housing figure would enable Bassetlaw to capture a larger proportion of the £7 billion yearly housebuilder contributions4 . With 218,000 homes predicted not to be built due to COVID-19 from now to 2024/255, it is also imperative that Bassetlaw Local Plan identifies sufficient land to support the delivery of homes.</p> <p>In order for the housing needs for the whole plan period to be met, it will also be essential to provide sufficient headroom within the housing supply. In this regard, Gladman supports the Home Builders Federation's recommendation that local plan should seek to identify sufficient deliverable sites to provide a 20% buffer between the housing requirement and supply.</p>	<p>The Council is providing for a requirement of 591 dwellings. As of April 2021 there is an 18 % buffer or contingency in the supply of land for housing, which is considered to be sufficient to protect against non-delivery on some site, and to meet potential unexpected need arising from neighbouring authorities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>4.3.1 Gladman 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.</p> <p>4.3.2 The spatial strategy will be delivered through a range of sites in sustainable locations including a Garden Village and a Priority Regeneration Area. Gladman support the exploration into the delivery of a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas, we are however 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 2020-2037. The inclusion of Bevercotes Colliery, as an additional Priority Regeneration Area for employment 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.</p> <p>4.3.3 Gladman consider that Policy ST1 criterion A1 would also benefit from a modification which makes clear that development, in addition to the areas 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>Housing Requirement</p> <p>4.3.4 As set out in Section 2 above, in accordance with the NPPF and PPG, the starting point for the minimum housing requirement will be determined using the standard method for assessing local housing need unless exceptional circumstances exist to demonstrate that an alternative approach should instead be followed.</p> <p>4.3.5 Applying the NPPF standardised methodology based on the 2014 household projections results in an objectively assessed need of 281 dwellings per annum for the plan period.</p> <p>Gladman welcome the fact that the Council continues to recognise the need to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the district and that the evidence concludes that an uplift against the 2014 household projections is required in order to align with the Council's economic growth ambitions.</p> <p>4.3.6 Policy ST1 seeks to deliver a minimum housing requirement of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period 2020-2037, or 589 dwellings per annum (dpa). The addition of 308dpa exceeds the minimum starting point identified through the standard method and will help to secure the economic objectives and affordability needs of the District. Settlement Hierarchy</p> <p>4.3.7 Criterion B of Policy ST1 sets out the settlement hierarchy for Bassetlaw. Gladman note that the Bassetlaw Garden Village is identified as a 'new settlement within the hierarchy, while Cottam Garden Community, which was listed as a 'large rural settlement' in previous iterations of the Plan has been removed from the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>4.3.8 Gladman propose that Bevercotes Colliery should be identified within Policy ST1, alongside Cottam, as a Priority Regeneration Area. As demonstrated at Section 5, the former Bevercotes Colliery Site represents a suitable site for identification as a Priority Regeneration Area, an approach that would promote the re-use of previously developed land and be in-keeping with the proposed objectives and spatial strategy of the Plan.</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.</p> <p>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
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Both of these sites have been identified as potential allocations in the Draft Local Plan. Our client welcomes this and as the Council is aware, Howard Retford Limited has been in regular discussions with the Council in respect of both of these sites. Our client wishes to highlight that they welcome the opportunity to collaborate with Officers and Members to deliver these two allocations, a summary of which is provided below.</p> <p>1.4 These representations express our client's comments on the emerging policy approach and site allocations set out within the November 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 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and in a positive manner as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>1.5 It is noted that our client is generally 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 deliver the right homes in the right places across the district to support the stated ambitions and objectives set out in the Local Plan, including supporting the rejuvenation of the district's main centres. 1.6 We consider that the Local Plan still 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 to be excessive and not based on sound planning principles. In addition, we consider the proposal for a 'garden village' within the parish of Babworth to be unsound and without an adequate evidence base regarding deliverability, which is overstated.</p>	<p>The Council considers that the Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission Local Plan, based on the sub-area distribution of growth to be justified as being the most appropriate strategy when considered against all the reasonable alternatives. It is also positively prepared in order to deliver the required housing, business, retail and other development based on effective joint working on strategic cross-boundary matters with neighbouring authorities, including within the Housing Market Area.</p> <p>Retford will be taking 17% of the growth with a large number of sites already committed commensurate with its place in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>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.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>HOUSING NEEDS AND REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>5.1 Our client supports the ‘step change’ approach and employment led growth strategy for the District. Paragraphs 5.1.9-5.1.16 set out the employment changes and jobs growth, referencing land that is already consented (our client controls one of those consented sites at Harworth South EM007 and confirms that discussions are well advanced with developers and occupiers).</p> <p>5.2 Our client notes the reference at paragraph 5.1.18 that the Government’s Standard Method calculates a minimum housing requirement of 288 dwellings per annum in the period 2020-2037. Since the production of the Plan, the Government has reconfirmed this figure as accurate in its December 2020 Written Ministerial Statement. As such, the strategy advanced by the Council for housing does not need to be adjusted at this stage.</p> <p>5.3 Accordingly, having regard to the ‘new’ standard methodology and the Council’s position in achieving a step change in employment provision, a process which is already well underway, our client supports the statement at 5.1.21 that the Housing Requirement for Bassetlaw needs to be at least 589 dwellings per annum to support the full extent of jobs led growth. Uplift for affordable housing.</p> <p>5.4 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.</p> <p>5.5 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.</p> <p>The above makes no requirement on the solving of affordable housing shortfalls within Districts. 5.6 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.</p> <p>5.7 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 overall.</p>	<p>The council considers that there is a sufficient uplift over and above the standard 288 calculation to account for affordability as well as affordable housing provision. This is justified in the evidence as contained in the 2020 HEDNA prepared by G L Hearn in accordance with PPG Guidance.</p>
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>HOUSING SUPPLY AND TRAJECTORY</p> <p>5.8 Paragraph 5.1.23 onwards address the supply of land for housing and include a Local Plan Trajectory (base date 1st April 2020). As part of this section, reference is made to the Council’s background paper on Land Availability Assessment (LAA - November 2020).</p> <p>5.9 Our client would generally agree with the main finding of the LAA which is that the district has enough land to meet the overall housing requirement. Bassetlaw does not have significant environmental constraints or Green Belt policy that might otherwise prevent delivery of a higher housing requirement. The findings of the LAA (Table 9) are that there is land available for some 6,678 homes to be provided, against a residual housing requirement of 2,848 dwellings.</p> <p>5.10 We welcome the Council’s transparent approach to understanding the existing housing supply. However, we would question whether the residual figure of 2,848 is correct, which appears understated for the following reasons.</p> <p>Developable Area</p> <p>5.11 Firstly, the development area assumptions of achieving 80%, 90% and 100% coverage on a site is unrealistic. Even on the smaller sites, the Council’s own policy requires infrastructure and open spaces to be provided. We would recommend the Council uses 70% (max) site coverage across the board.</p>	<p>The development area assumptions are a general guide and every site is different depending upon the constraints and location.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an assessment of historic windfall delivery on small sites. It considers that the evidence justifies the 100 windfall allowance. There will be no windfall allowance for the first 5 years of the.</p> <p>In relation to Worksop Central Area the Council is currently undertaking consultation on a Regulation 18 DPD, which contains the proposed sites to meet the 700 dwellings. This will contribute to meeting the requirement and forms part of the overall supply.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>Windfal</p> <p>5.12 Secondly, the Council's justification for the windfall rate is unclear. The Council accepts that all development over the last 10 years has been windfall due to the lack of any previously Local Plan allocations. However, many of these sites have been greenfield locations which would not normally have been permitted if a Local Plan with allocations and development boundaries had been established. It is therefore unclear how the suggested windfall of 440 homes has been calculated. It does not appear to be based upon any robust assessment.</p> <p>5.13 Further, the Council is suggesting an additional 'windfall' of 660/700 dwellings to be provided from the Worksop Town Centre regeneration area. This is unjustified (see below).</p> <p>5.14 Therefore, to assume the continuation of windfall under an adopted Local Plan scenario, at a rate of 1,100 dwellings combined seems optimistic. Further, there seems little point relying on windfall when both the new Local Plan and Central Worksop Development Plan Document are both mechanisms to allocate land for homes.</p> <p>Capacity of Worksop Central Area.</p> <p>5.15 Policy ST6 and the LAA state that the Worksop Central Area will deliver at least 660 homes during the plan period (700(?) homes required under Policy ST1). It is unclear how these figures have been derived. The Council is currently consulting upon a "Call for Sites" exercise for Worksop Central Area which closes on the 11th January. As such, that process is ongoing at the time of writing and it is therefore unclear whether there are landowners who are keen to put their land forward.</p> <p>5.16 In addition, the LAA provides the Council's methodology for assessment of available land. Based on 100% coverage and a density of 40 dwellings per hectare, the Council would need around 16.5 hectares of land within the Central Area. This is clearly unachievable.</p> <p>5.17 Further, the Council appears to have exhausted all possibilities already. Cross referring the Central Worksop Area DPD boundary with the LAA, there are only a very small number of sites identified as having any potential at all. We refer to an extract from the LAA below.</p> <p>5.18 Based upon our review of the Council's LAA, only the following sites lie within the Central Worksop Area - LAA422, LAA426, LAA427, LAA465, LAA467.</p> <p>5.19 It is our firm belief that unless there is a wholesale redevelopment of Worksop Town Centre planned, there is no prospect of the Town Centre delivering anything like 660-700 homes within the Central Area DPD boundary. 5.20 For the reasons above, we consider that the Council has underestimated the residual amount of housing to be allocated through the Local Plan by around 1,000 dwellings. This level of growth needs to be provided for in the main towns of Worksop and Retford, which has proportionately less housing growth than other areas.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>6.0 POLICY COMMENTS</p> <p>6.1 The Local Plan includes a housing distribution model at paragraph 5.1.38. This has been derived from the Spatial Strategy background paper contained in the evidence base (as updated in November 2020).</p> <p>6.2 The Housing Distribution model has evolved over the last 3 years and the latest is provided on page 24 of the Background Paper. The slight change in focus towards the urban areas of Worksop and Retford is welcomed by our client. However, the Tables provided on pages 23 and 24 of the Background Paper do not include the respective percentage splits. We have taken the liberty of preparing this accordingly which demonstrates that the housing distribution is still unduly skewed towards the Rural Areas.</p> <p>6.3 As set out above, we 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.</p> <p>6.4 Despite the three Main Towns being placed at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy, we believe the growth required for the District to meet its economic aspirations has been underestimated and the subsequent development requirements have been understated.</p> <p>6.5 Retford has a population of over 22,000 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 a good location for development.</p> <p>6.6 As illustrated above, Retford, as the District's second largest town, has been proportionally allocated the least amount of housing development among the existing settlements despite its position in the settlement hierarchy. This is despite, as set out later in these representations, Retford having suitable sites for development and a proven track record of delivering housing where other settlements within the District have been less successful.</p> <p>6.7 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.</p> <p>6.8 We 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. We 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 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.</p> <p>6.9 In relation to the Garden Village, the strategy is predicated on first delivering infrastructure in the form of a new railway station as well as road improvements and community facilities. As such, there are serious questions as to whether this site can deliver any housing growth in the remaining plan period to 2037. Whilst we respect the long term aims of the Council, we consider that the contribution from the GV is limited at this stage. 6.10 As such, we propose an alternative housing distribution model for Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>This strategy seeks to provide a more balanced distribution of growth by ensuring that the needs of the entire District are met.</p> <p>The Council considers that the Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission Local Plan, based on the sub-area distribution of growth to be justified as being the most appropriate strategy when considered against all the reasonable alternatives</p> <p>The distribution is considered to be justified and takes into account existing commitments some of which were granted following appeals.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>LOCAL PLAN POLICY ST1: BASSETLAW'S SPATIAL STRATEGY</p> <p>6.11 We consider that Policy ST1 of the Local Plan should be re-drafted at part B to reflect our comments above. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased housing growth towards Retford; • Removal of proposals for a new Garden Village; and • Reduction in the development directed towards the Rural Area. <p>6.12 Although we are supportive of Policy ST1 directing development to appropriate locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, we suggest that a greater housing requirement should be proportioned to support growth and development in the Main Towns in line with our alternative housing distribution provided for above.</p> <p>6.13 Criterion B introduces a new, previously unseen strategy in relation to Worksop, splitting the housing requirement to the Worksop 'Outer' and 'Inner' Areas. We are aware that in parallel, the Council is consulting upon a Worksop 'Town Centre' Development Plan Document. It is unclear whether the defined 'Town Centre' areas is the same as the 'Inner' area. We refer to our comments above regarding the availability of land for housing within Worksop Town Centre having regard to the Council's own Land Availability Assessment. There is not enough land in the town centre to meet the stated housing requirement.</p> <p>6.14 Part B of Policy ST1 should therefore be re-written to reflect our amended housing distribution model which more closely align with the stated Strategic Objectives of focusing on the three main urban areas of Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes.</p> <p>6.15 We also suggest that the policy is amended to change the words 'about' to 'at least' in Criterion B. This better fits the Council's statement that the housing requirements are minimums.</p> <p>6.16 We support criteria D and E which relates to the district's economic development strategy and the focus of sustaining and enhancing the existing town centres. The latter will only be achieved if the housing distribution model is amended.</p>	<p>The policy has been re drafted to take into account some of the comments made.</p> <p>In relation to Worksop Central Area the Council is currently undertaking consultation on a Regulation 18 DPD, which contains the proposed site to meet the 700 dwellings. This will contribute to meeting the requirement and forms part of the overall supply.</p> <p>The use of the word about in the Policy is considered to represent a better reflection of the housing supply position.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF177	Axis PED Limited on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>Policy ST1 – Bassetlaw’s Spatial Strategy</p> <p>1.3.1 Policy ST1 sets out that the Council’s spatial strategy will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth, this is supported as it is in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF which seeks to support sustainable development and economic growth.</p> <p>1.3.2 As set out above, FCC’s site lies to the north of Worksop and 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.</p> <p>1.3.3 FCC support paragraph A1 of Policy ST1 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. FCC’s site is previously disturbed land, has historically been subject to quarrying activity and part of the site is previously developed. The proposed employment uses are an efficient use of the currently underutilised site. Therefore, paragraph A1 would provide support for the development of the site, subject to demonstrating that there are no overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters that would preclude the development.</p> <p>1.3.4 Whilst the site is located outside of the settlement boundary, the entire Site is well connected to the existing settlement and the adjacent allocation (HS1 and EM005). Once the allocation is fully developed, there would be continuous development from Worksop to FCC’s site, it is therefore suggested that the settlement boundary should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.9 confirms that the spatial strategy promotes a ‘step change’ in the District’s economy to: retain employment locally; provide better paid, higher skilled jobs; and increase productivity. The Council’s strategy seeks to align economic growth with the housing offer, by providing homes in the right places, this will ensure the sustainability of the area in the future as a place to both live and work. The delivery of employment uses at FCC’s site would therefore align with this strategy as it is sustainably located adjacent to an existing residential allocation.</p> <p>1.3.5 The previous version of this policy within the January 2020 draft Local Plan set out at paragraph B2 that development would be directed to appropriate locations in accordance with the Council’s settlement hierarchy. Given that FCC’s site is located outside of the settlement boundary, the site falls within a ‘countryside’ location. This policy wording has now been revised and stipulates that housing development must come forward in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>1.3.6 Paragraph D confirms the intention to create at least 11,200 jobs through the provision of at least 168ha of general employment land to accommodate future local employment growth and at least 118ha of employment land to accommodate future significant indigenous employment growth.</p> <p>1.3.7 It is considered that additional wording should be provided within Paragraph D to direct economic development to the most sustainable locations. Greater support should be provided within the spatial strategy 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.</p> <p>1.3.8 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.</p> <p>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>
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>Paragraph 5.1.11 recognises the difference between employment land need and the proposed supply in the district that was picked up in the Strategic Employment Land Appraisal (SELA) referred to above. However, the identified disparities are far greater now than at the time of the SELA. The employment need of 68 hectares (translating to 5,550 additional jobs) recorded in the January 2020 draft Plan is compared to a “significant” employment land supply of about 287 hectares. This is an oversupply of 211 hectares rather than the 40 hectares identified as an issue in the SELA. The draft plan recognises that “it is important that this is accurately reflected in this Plan”.</p> <p>As an illustration of the level of over-supply, paragraph 5.1.15 recognises that a proposed Strategic Employment Site, at Apleyhead will, on its own, provide 3,857 - 5,358 jobs, therefore being sufficient to meet most of the identified employment needs of the whole District. Given that other employment sites are more than sufficient to meet local needs, this additional allocation can only serve to provide for additional demand over and above the calculated local needs.</p> <p>The draft Plan attempts to justify this approach by suggesting the site has the potential to also meet “significant indigenous growth and/or national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated strategic needs over the plan period. This site would bring significant economic benefits to the District and region both in terms of jobs, including higher skilled jobs, and gross value added, and is being actively promoted.” This would be a reasonable approach were the site part of the identified supply required to meet the needs of the area, but does not justify its inclusion as an additional element of supply – other sites are more than sufficient to meet that need.</p>	<p>Apleyhead Junction (118.7ha) will be allocated to accommodate sub-regional and/or regional employment growth.</p> <p>An important part of planning for strategic 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, but by the relationships between where people live and work.</p> <p>The site is in line with the growth strategy of the area and will deliver a range of key benefits to Worksop, Bassetlaw District, and the wider Sheffield City Region, and potentially for the residents of the future Garden Village.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>When the Apleyhead site was proposed in the January 2020 draft plan, we did not object to its inclusion, but suggested that it should be promoted solely to meet city region needs over and above the local need and where alternative sites elsewhere in the city region would be unable to meet such a level of inward investment.</p> <p>Whilst the draft plan recognises at paragraph 5.1.17 that the Council will work with neighbouring authorities to undertake additional work to further consider the impacts of the strategic employment site, no discussions as part of Bassetlaw’s statutory Duty to Co-operate engagement has been undertaken on this matter following the concerns expressed in relation to the January 2020 draft. As part of Sheffield’s production of its own Local Plan we intend to produce a Statement of Common Ground with other SY and SCR authorities. A series of meetings is proposed and Bassetlaw will be invited to take part in those.</p> <p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw’s Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>We note that the Local Plan housing requirement of 589 homes per year (Policy ST1 B) is higher than the Local Housing Need Figure produced using the Government’s standard method, in order to reflect the need to support economic growth in the district. This is welcomed in supporting economic growth in SCR and providing flexibility in relation to overall housing delivery across SCR. This flexibility is critical in ensuring that increased housing needs across SCR are able to be met. We note that the document confirms (paragraph 5.1.38) that Bassetlaw will meet all of its housing requirement within the district through a balanced distribution of growth. On this basis we assume that Sheffield is not required to meet any of Bassetlaw’s housing needs, and also acknowledge that Sheffield falls outside Bassetlaw’s Housing Market Area.</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>This policy in ST1 D proposes “Contributing to the creation of the development of at least 11,200 jobs through the provision of at least 168ha of general employment land to accommodate future local employment growth and at least 118ha of employment land to accommodate future significant indigenous employment growth and/or strategic employment needs.” 11,200 jobs is over twice the 5,550 jobs need identified and the proposed land allocation of 287 hectares is four times that needed. The first question here is why is a jobs target of twice that identified in the evidence base is justified and, secondly, why this translates to a further doubling in the amount of employment land needed? This represents a huge over-supply that has the potential to damage the economic aspirations of nearby local authorities by tapping in to and diverting economic demand in those areas.</p> <p>Given this, the policy wording and supporting text should better reflect the needs identified in the borough’s own evidence and the SY authorities continue to have concerns that the amount of strategic employment land proposed does not appear to be sufficiently justified by the evidence base. There are ongoing concerns at the significant difference in the job requirements identified between the demand and supply led approaches.</p> <p>6.0 Delivery Economic Prosperity [sic] - 6.1 Promoting Economic Growth</p> <p>There are references to the D2N2 (Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire) regional approach to economic development but no mention of the Sheffield City Region and the findings of the Strategic Employment Land Appraisal referred to earlier.</p> <p>The justification in paragraph 6.1.20 for the identification of the Strategic Employment Site in policy ST8 is that it is “capable of accommodating significant indigenous growth and/or national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period”. Given that the supply of General Employment Sites on its own represents an oversupply in terms of meeting the borough’s needs, there is no justification for an additional allocation, unless it is solely to meet wider, regional and national investment opportunities. The wording of the policy must, therefore, reflect this. The policy wording itself only refers to “sub-regional and/or regional employment growth”, not national or regional investment, so does not reflect the justification / supporting text for the policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.24 recognises that a Statement of Common Ground has been signed with the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority that acknowledges each Council is responsible for identifying employment needs and land supply to meet their own economic needs. We believe that the allocation of the Strategic Employment site and the policy as drafted fails to adhere to this Statement. We understand that this is also the view of the SCR and the other three South Yorkshire local authorities.</p>	<p>the SCR Combined Authority Joint Sheffield City Region Strategic Employment Land Appraisal. The SELA identified Bassetlaw as a district which could meet these needs, due to the availability of suitable land, access to suitable local employment, and proximity to the strategic road network. And that by providing space for such uses in Bassetlaw, SCR could then protect existing high value manufacturing areas and maximise the use of such land to meet advanced manufacturing ambitions in other districts.</p> <p>The evidence recognises that parts of Bassetlaw are strongly related to the Sheffield City Region.</p> <p>Although not allocated specifically for logistics the approach to Apleyhead Junction is consistent with national planning practice guidance which recognises that the logistics industry has distinct locational requirements that should be considered separately from those relating to general employment land.</p> <p>Discussions with the D2N2 LEP revealed that Bassetlaw has a key role in achieving their strategic objectives. Key sectors in Bassetlaw include the warehousing and logistics sector, along with low-carbon energy through the existing decommissioned power stations within the district. The logistics sector in the future could also be positioned to integrate with other sectors, such as robotics, information technology and analytics.</p> <p>In light of the above it would be unreasonable to restrict the wording in the Policy to Logistics sector only. It is likely to support transport / logistics or possibly manufacturing employment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>The evidence provided in the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) demonstrates that the Apleyhead site will generate a significant level of commuting into the District from neighbouring areas. This likely draw of employment from outside of Bassetlaw to the Apleyhead site supports the previous concerns that this site could have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities, and the stance previously requested by South Yorkshire authorities that the policy ensures that delivery of economic development on employment allocations within other boroughs is taken into account.</p> <p>This potential negative impact on Sheffield and other authorities is compounded by the change in emphasis between the previous and current draft Policy ST8. The previous draft identified Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within key sectors identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). It is unclear from the policy which sectors this includes, however footnote 13 of the LIS identifies priority sectors as creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing.</p> <p>In light of the above the authorities remain concerned that there is insufficient justification to support the significant allocation of a strategic employment site and that outstanding cross boundary and strategic issues have not been appropriately addressed through the Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that previously suggested policy changes were not supported and that in response Bassetlaw had concerns that requiring consideration of other sites within D2N2 or Sheffield City Region prior to development on the strategic allocation would amount to a sequential approach which is not evidence based or justified. However, the South Yorkshire authorities remain of the view that given the significant potential cross boundary impact of the site, and the fact that it is proposed as a strategic site accommodating development which would not normally be accommodated within general employment allocations, then the policy should provide significantly more certainty than in its current format.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.25 of the draft Plan is welcomed, which states that: “The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost at a strategic level to D2N2 or Sheffield City Region, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority.” However, the policies as currently drafted do not provide an appropriate mechanism for the impact on the economic strategies of other authorities to be taken into account.</p>	
REF091	Consultant on behalf of land owner	<p>The Policy proposes delivering sustainable development and growth appropriate to the size of each settlement and this is generally supported.</p> <p>Specifically, the Policy ST1 at Section A1 promotes the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, unless there are overriding amenity, biodiversity or heritage matters that preclude such use.</p> <p>The Policy at Section B3 supports growth of eligible Small Rural Settlements for about 1,500 dwellings on appropriate sites within the development boundaries, or on-site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans by up to 5%.</p> <p>Hayton is defined as a Small Rural Settlement within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The proposal at Church Farm, Main Street, Hayton is for 20 dwellings on previously developed land, it is in a sustainable location within Hayton as it is within walking distance to existing facilities such as a primary school, church, local convenience store, pub, village hall, sports pitch and open space areas. It is also on a regular bus route with connections to Retford.</p>	Although the housing requirement has reduced for Small Rural Settlements, communities can plan for additional growth through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF185	iba Planning on behalf of Carlton Forest Partnership	<p>I refer to the above public consultation and set out below the formal representations on behalf of our client, the Carlton Forest Partnership.</p> <p>Carlton Forest Partnership represents the owners of the Carlton Forest Distribution Centre and surrounding land adjoining the existing Worksop settlement boundary which is identified on the draft Policies Map for Worksop as forming part of a wider housing and employment allocation under Draft Policy ST16, Policy 17:HS1 (Peaks Hill Farm Worksop) and Policy ST8 (EM005) respectively.</p> <p>Our client, as they did with the previous draft, fully supports the inclusion of their land as part of the aforementioned Peaks Hill Farm housing and employment land allocations.</p> <p>More particularly, our client supports the increased annual housing requirement of 589 dwellings to support economic growth in the District and to meet local housing needs – and considers the increased percentage of all new housing to be directed towards Worksop to be sound given its place at the top of the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Whilst necessarily ambitious, our client considers the draft Plan (and the increased annual housing requirement for Worksop) to be realistic – and acknowledges the importance of the Peaks Hill Farm allocation in delivering housing and employment development in such numbers.</p>	Support - noted
REF180 Trinity Farm	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>1.3 Policy ST1 sets the housing requirement for Bassetlaw during the period 2020-2037. The Council have followed national policy and guidance utilising the Local Housing Need (LHN) as a starting point for establishing its housing requirement. It is noted that in December 2020 the Government published further changes to the Standard Method for assessing LHN, however, for Bassetlaw this results in no change from the existing method, albeit the LHN significantly increases for Sheffield.</p> <p>1.4 The Planning Practice Guidance is unequivocal that “the standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour” [our emphasis]. In this context, it is worth remembering the LHN is predominantly demographic led, and as such policy-on considerations such as delivering infrastructure, increasing the supply of affordable housing or as in this case, ensuring economic growth and prosperity cannot always be achieved using this base figure. In this regard, the Council’s approach to increase the Housing Requirement to 589 dwellings per annum is supported and has been effectively justified in the supporting Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (Update 2020). Without suitable increases in housing, the Council’s employment and economic goals are likely to be restricted due to lack of available working population, or alternatively will lead to large patterns of unsustainable movements as residents commute out of the District to access jobs.</p> <p>1.5 Increasing the Housing Requirement also reflects Government ambitions to boost significantly the supply of housing (NPPF Para 59). The Councils approach to increasing the LHR above the figure derived from the Standard Methodology is considered sound and is supported,</p> <p>1.6 Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that the recent changes to the Standard Method significantly increase the housing requirement for Sheffield City. It is therefore considered that additional flexibility should be built into Bassetlaw’s emerging Plan so in the event that Sheffield City confirm it is unable to meet its own needs, any share of the unmet need can be accommodated by Bassetlaw ahead of any review of the Plan.</p> <p>1.7 The proposed Spatial Strategy, which promotes a hybrid approach to meeting the District’s development needs, is broadly supported. The 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 as such it is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth.</p> <p>1.8 With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 65% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. The approach to locate the majority of the District’s growth to the towns is supported as it focuses development in the most sustainable locations, whilst still enabling suitable rural growth which is essential for ensuring rural communities can support essential services and ensures their long-term vitality.</p> <p>1.9 Concerns are however raised in respect of the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a contribution of 5% of the total requirement over the Plan period. Whilst the contribution of the Garden Village to the</p>	<p>The supply provides for a total of 12,201 dwellings during 2020-2037. This is above the requirement of 10013 dwellings or 591 dpa providing an 18% contingency.</p> <p>This allows for future circumstances affecting the land supply, and provides flexibility to account for future unmet housing need which may come from within neighbouring areas in accordance with paragraph 60 of the NPPF.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
		<p>supply of housing over the Plan period has been reduced since the Plan was last consulted on it is still considered that assumed delivery from the site is ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. To ensure a deliverable Plan, it is imperative that the Council's delivery assumptions for the emerging sites are realistic.</p> <p>1.10 In addition to the above, approximately 1,400 dwellings (14% of the housing requirement) are to be delivered by Local Plan allocations, Neighbourhood Plan allocations and windfalls in the Large Rural Settlements.</p> <p>1.11 Policy ST1 seeks to deliver a further 1,500 dwellings (15% of the total requirement for the Plan period) through Neighbourhood Plans and non-allocated sites, across the 34 Small Rural Settlements delivering new homes. There is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements being delivered through as yet unmade and not-guaranteed Neighbourhood Plans. This has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan if Neighbourhood Plans are not made in a timely manner. The quantum of development to be delivered in this tier is an increase of 3% from the previous draft Plan, with 8 fewer settlements in this tier. This increases the notional delivery target for each village, and as such the Council must be satisfied that there is latent capacity to deliver such a requirement, in the absence of guaranteed allocations.</p>	
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>6.1 Caddick continue to support the overall ambitions in ST1, particularly that of enabling the release of suitable employment land. However, this support is predicated on the importance of ensuring this ambition is not frustrated by site specific policies being misaligned with this strategy in terms of their detailed wording and content. Policy detail</p> <p>6.2 The inference of a release of land at Apleyhead Junction (which follows in Policy ST8 and ST10) to meet employment needs is welcomed and logical. Fundamentally, without an intervention of this nature, it would not be realistic for the Local Plan to achieve the desired economic and social step change as referred to throughout the plan and its visions and objectives.</p> <p>6.3 However, it is essential that the plan enables delivery of the full quantum of employment land envisaged, in order for this step change growth to be realised. If any part of the employment need is not delivered, and particularly the 'strategic' release at Apleyhead Junction, then the overall vision and economic growth objectives for Bassetlaw would be unfulfilled. Indeed, the plan evidence base20 recognises the importance of all sites in the overall employment land offer.</p> <p>6.4 For example, the stated ambition to deliver at least 11,200 new jobs21 is entirely reliant on proposed employment land allocations being delivered in full, as demonstrated in the local plan evidence base22. The aforementioned evidence base does not distinguish between strategic and non-strategic sites when concluding on the quantum of land needed to achieve the 11,200 jobs target. Hence, the employment land requirement figure in ST1 must follow the evidence base and be expressed, in spatial strategy and objective terms, as a single target of 286ha.</p> <p>6.5 Policy ST1 would then require further minor changes to reflect this updated position regarding the scale and delivery of employment allocations overall, and a later amendment to ST8 is also necessary.</p> <p>6.6 Therefore, in summary, Caddick consider Policy ST1 should be amended to refer to the full provision of employment land as a single figure, for the reasons noted above. Further consequential changes are then made to the wording of ST1 to reflect the local plan vision. Suggested policy changes</p> <p>6.7 Caddick suggest the following amended wording to Policy ST1. ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy A. (no changes proposed). B. (no changes proposed). C. (no changes proposed). D. Creation of at least 11,200 jobs through the provision of at least 286ha of employment land which can enable economic growth by maximising the opportunities for significant levels of indigenous employment growth and meeting strategic employment needs. E. (no changes proposed).</p>	<p>It is appropriate for Policy ST1 to recognise that difference between the two categories of employment land.</p> <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</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
1671323	William Davis	<p>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Overall, the spatial strategy continues to be supported. Worksop is the considered to be The most sustainable settlement and provides a good range of services/facilities and employment opportunities. It is noted that the housing target has now increased to 589dpa (a minimum of 10,013 dwellings over the plan period). Paragraph 5.1.35 indicates that there is a supply of 11,214 dwellings during the plan period. No breakdown of this by site is provided; this should be done so that the figure can be interrogated to ensure that the sites are deliverable/developable during the plan period.</p> <p>Worksop Town Centre is to the location of some 700 dwellings. However, as indicated by no allocation are proposed in the Local Plan as these will be allocated by a separate Development Plan Document. At present only 40 dwellings currently have planning permission with Worksop Town Centre and the potential for the town centre to make up the difference is unclear. This is also likely to require a substantial number of flats which may not be deliverable given the post Covid demand for larger houses with private garden space.</p> <p>Overall the housing supply represents a 11% buffer over the identified housing target of 589dpa. While an increase in the housing target is welcomed the scale of the buffer has Reduced since the previous draft of the Local Plan (January 2020) when it was 13%. It is our view that, in line with the Local Plans Expert Group recommendation a buffer of at least 20% to provide flexibility; providing this would be consistent with national policy (specifically paragraph 59 regarding the need to significantly boost the supply of housing).</p> <p>This is especially important for Bassetlaw given the proposed allocation of a new settlement which may not deliver housing as anticipated, the assumption that some growth will be allocated through Neighbourhood Plans and the approach to Worksop Town Centre. As such the supply of housing should be increased to a minimum of 12,015 dwellings that are deliverable/developable during the plan period; this would necessitate the allocation of an additional 800 dwellings. As the most sustainable settlement, Worksop represents the most appropriate place to make these additional allocations.</p>	<p>The breakdown of the supply by site was provided in the trajectory which was included as an appendix to the November 2020 LAA. A trajectory will be included in the Submission Plan. As at 1 April 2021 there is an 18% buffer in the supply above the requirement which is considered to provide sufficient flexibility.</p>
REF204	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning on behalf of land owner	<p>ST1A- We lodged objections to this policy on behalf of our Client Mrs Jubb at the previous consultations stage. The policy remains unchanged and our objection is therefore repeated with the same background information/justification. Please see our letter of 26th February 2020 and attachments which set out the basis of our objection.</p> <p>We continue to object to the non-allocation of our Client's land as identified and for the reasons set out in our letter of 26th February 2020 and appendices.</p> <p>In the alternative we seek a more generous policy for the development of land for business purposes outside areas defined in the Plan where there are no overriding technical or environmental objections – also as set out in our letter. This would be consistent with the NPPF which confirms that all forms of business are acceptable in rural areas (subject to the specially protected areas identified in the Framework).</p>	<p>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.</p>
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>2) Policy ST1 should be modified by adding new paragraph F as follows:</p> <p>f) No less than 60 pitches will be allocated for static caravan development.</p>	<p>Local Plan policies must be evidence led. The Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2019 provides no evidence to support this approach.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST1 - SPATIAL STRATEGY			
REF230	Chesterfield Borough Council	Support the housing requirement of 478 d/p/a (Policy ST1) 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). It is suggested that the implications of such a higher level of housing growth are carefully monitored and discussed as part of regular Local Plan Liaison Meetings to highlight any 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
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF001	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Thank you very much for your presentation ..., it was very interesting and very clear. I just wish we could turn back the clock for Beckingham. Everyone keeps telling me we should have done a NP but they don't listen to me as to what happened. We started a plan but we could not encourage people to join us. We had 6 people and two of those were a couple so that was not good. Meanwhile about 5 planning applications had been put in at this time, all outside the village envelope, but because Bassetlaw did not have a five year building plan, it had not reached its quota, the applications were approved. I did my best, I spoke to the planning committee and most of them went to Bristol but we lost them because of the reasons above. Each time the Inspector said "because Bassetlaw do not have a five year "etcetc I wanted to scream!! If I can I am going to make a list of dates showing our NP meetings, name the planning applications, list the times I spoke to the Planning Committee, find the dates when the plans were approved usually by the Inspector in Bristol and see if we had managed to do a Neighbourhood Plan when it would have been finished. I think it would not have been finished until late 2019 or early 2020, much too late to have any weighting against the plans. They had been approved much earlier! Sorry to ramble but people do not really listen, they just say you should have done a NP.!! All the sites for planning had gone and we had done our best to stop them. One of them, was started July 2019 and is nearing completion, 2 others are starting soon. The NP would not have added any weight to these, the Plan takes over 2 years to write. Oh dear, we feel we are having another village built around us, over 200 houses when we have just over 600 before it all started! Thanks for reading this and thanks again to you.	Thank you for comment. If you, or the Parish Council require further assistance or information about the Neighbourhood Planning process, then please contact the Neighbourhood Planning Team.
1645938	Resident	It is vital that when development is considered it is in keeping with the needs and resources of the area. For example the approval of apartments in a rural location with no similar developments and poor public transport, where parking provision is inadequate seems to be totally lacking in understanding or common sense.	Development proposals are considered alongside relevant planning policies such as design and character. Infrastructure need is also a consideration and where required, then is agreed through the Section 106 process.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Particularly, Misterton Parish Council and the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group commend the importance attached to neighbourhood plans throughout the document. Once made, neighbourhood plans hold legal weight and their inclusion in this Local Plan (and the finished document) is important: inclusion recognises the efforts the community has made to develop a neighbourhood plan and, in Misterton, with over 91% of the votes supporting the Neighbourhood Plan in the September 2019 referendum, it really does have popular backing.	Thank you for your comment.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	Rural/Urban split of housing provision. In its comments on the January 2020 Draft Plan the Society expressed concern about the proposal to allow almost all villages to expand by up to 20%. We are pleased to see that this proposal has been dropped in the latest Draft Plan. Questions remain about the use of a standard 5% for all small villages – some might want more. We would hope for flexibility if villages aim for a larger increase through their neighbourhood plans.	The requirement for Small Settlements has been reduced. However, if individual settlements wish to plan for more growth, then they can do this through the Neighbourhood Planning process.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF057	Clarborough and Welham Parich Council	The Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Plan and the various changes which have been included in response to previous consultation exercises. 1. The changes implemented in the Local Plan, which reduce the impact of the housing requirements on the smaller villages and parishes are particularly welcomed. The reduction in that housing growth requirement from a 'cap' of 20% to one of 5% is a much more realistic figure in order to retain character of the smaller settlements. 2. Further, the facility for a Parish Council to chose to exceed that cap if it is felt that this would benefit the community and the community want it, is also welcomes in establishing true local control over the scale of development in a Parish.	Thank you for your comment.
REF060	Notts County Council	B Due to the absence of any transport choice most travel to/from the proposal at Cottam is likely to be made by private car. Based on the scale and mix of development a significant increase in peak period traffic flows are expected on rural roads through local villages with consequential negative effects in terms of vehicle emissions, air quality, noise, traffic capacity, road safety and local amenity. It is difficult to see how this could be effectively dealt with through rural villages without bypassing them due to land constraints. There are also likely to be a number of junctions requiring improvement. That would be prohibitively expensive requiring land and would do nothing to improve the site's sustainability credentials.	The former Cottam Power Station is now identified as an 'Opportunity Area'. This means that the site is available for redevelopment, but further work is needed to identify what forms of development are considered appropriate in that location. This will consider the level of constraint, including highways and public transport.
1665415	Resident	Neighbourhood plans should be updated ie every few years eg 5 or they go out of date and do not reflect the community. Will this be required going forward? East Markham classed as a small rural settlement but meets the criteria for large settlement, school, shop, pub, village hall etc. Will this be reclassified to large. Policy is against development on agricultural land but this is unfair if land is unproductive and unsaleable for agricultural use. Building should be allowed on agricultural land or if not allowed the Council should purchase it at full commercial value. Plan requires additional building to have community support. This is unrealistic as people oppose building for selfish regions. In East Markham there is for example a very vocal individual who opposes planning. He has been reported the Council for harassment, bullying and basically lying. He has implied that Council officers are corrupt and take bribes and people are to scared to ever say if they support housing. There need to be policies in place to stop people like this from holding public office. Overall I think there needs to be more investment in village expansion to ensure they have better infrastructure. I also think the Council planners should revisit the SHLAA and identify landowners who are happy for land to be put forward for social housing, traveller sites or to allow open space to be purchased from them. Where sites have been refused there should also be a right to reply for landowners where wrong assumptions made. More modern housing should be allowed, energy efficient sustainable housing and things like earth sheltered housing should be encouraged it just red brick and panties. Action should be taken to stop any further building of fake farmhouses. In East Markham have overpriced large houses where owners convert lofts and garages and add in velux windows in a conservation area. They should not be then permitted to object to planning on land they overlook as they should not have windows overlooking in the first place. The conservation officer should be required to work with landowners who seek permission not just refuse it and then say he will not work with them e.g. recent refusal of houses at Plantation Road.	<p>The requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be reviewed every 5 years remains in place. A review of a Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity for the community to produce robust planning policy against the latest legislation and local policy context.</p> <p>East Markham is considered a Small Rural Settlement where there is capacity for the village to grow by up to 5%. This can include smaller homes and affordable homes if required.</p>
1666840	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	I welcome the new figures (and the backdate to 2018) and believe this is a much fairer distribution of housing within Bassetlaw. It will also allow our rural communities to grow at a more appropriate rate which will hopefully be in line with resources.	Thank you for your comment.
1668141	Resident	With the objective of increasing the size of the 5 villages by 20% - how will the facilities & services be expanded especially school size. The current schools have limited ability to expand and oversubscribed. How do you propose to offset the carbon footprint you are creating by increasing the villages by 20%.	The education authority are a consultee through the preparation of the Local Plan. The information they provide helps us identify where there are deficiencies in education provision. Where there is a need for additional capacity, this is included as part of the infrastructure requirements to support the growth identified within the Local Plan.
REF061	Resident	The changes which reduce the impact of the housing requirements within the new Draft Plan on the smaller viillages and parishes are particularly welcome. The reduction in that housing growth requirement to a 'cap' of 5% from the original proposal of 20% is a much more realistic figure in order to retain the character of the smaller settlements. Allowing a Parish Council to chose to exceed that cap if the community want it is a good idea as it allows the community to have control over the way their village or Parish grows if that is what the community want to happen.	Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	The blanket approach taken to housing allocation (Policy ST2) in the “smaller rural settlements” is not fit for purpose and fails to consider or reflect the needs of individual communities. While acknowledging in section 5.1.52 that “the sustainable growth of Small Rural Settlements will help to sustain those villages in the long term”, in adopting a one size fits all policy the Plan fails to support this aim. The ever-changing percentage of housing required in smaller rural settlements from 10% in the 2019 draft Plan, to 20% in the early 2020 version to 5% in the latest version reinforces the Parish Council’s concerns over a lack of consultation. As we understand it the 20% figure has (we are told) been “tweaked” to 5% because some settlements were physically unable to find sufficient land to fulfil the 20% requirement (as acknowledged in para 5.2.4.), evidence that more consultation should have been carried out and that a one size fits all policy does not work. Please also note that the Parish Council does not consider a 75% change to a figure as a “tweak” but a considerable change which as noted above has big implications for Ranskill in terms of its Neighbourhood Plan.	The blanket approach to rural growth provides consistency among the majority of villages that are similar in size and scale. Where communities wish to plan for more growth, then they can do this through a Neighbourhood Plan if there is reasonable justification. The justification could include the need for affordable homes, a new community facility or infrastructure.
1661414	Planning With People	The number for 5% growth does not reflect the dwellings allocated in made Neighbourhood plans eg Cuckney 8 - but the NP allocated a sit for approx 31 on 3 sites. By providing the 5% growth figure for each settlement without identifying where some settlements have already allocated more, you create confusion within these communities about the status of the NP allocations. This needs to be clarified somewhere in the ST2 explanatory text or in the ST2 text box	Policy ST2 provides the mechanism for communities to plan for more growth if they wish to do so. The allocations within the Made Cuckney Plan remain in place.
REF078	Clayworth Parish Council	Thank you for the opportunity to comment further on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. Clayworth Parish Council have previously submitted comments on the 10th March 2020 to the previous Bassetlaw Local Plan consultation. These comments on the latest version of the Bassetlaw Local Plan are consistent and build on those previously submitted. We are encouraged that the Council has listened to our concerns, and no doubt the concerns of other Rural parishes across Bassetlaw, and reduced the housing requirement for small Rural settlements to 5%. As we understand that there are sufficient existing planning permissions already agreed across Rural Bassetlaw to meet this 5% target, this means that Clayworth would not be required to accommodate further housing growth in the plan period. Given Clayworth’s conservation area status, we believe this is the right approach. We would however like to reiterate a point made in the previous response, which we feel still requires clarification. Whilst it is encouraging that the Draft Local Plan states that robust, proportionate pre-application community consultation will be required as evidence of community support. In all cases, support of the Parish or Town Council will be required if Developers wish to exceed the 5% target. However, it is unclear how this community support should be demonstrated. Could the District Council provide clarity as to the role is expects Parish Councils to play as part of Policy ST2 and whether in a Conservation Area obtaining the Parish Council support will be essential prior to development being granted. We understand the Parish Councils position on each application would need to be consistent with the policies set out in the Local Plan and adhere to relevant planning legislation. A standing offer remains for a member of the Local Plan team to attend a future meeting to discuss the implications of the plan on the Village.	Where communities have met their individual growth requirements as identified in the Local Plan, additional growth may be supported through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan or through needs base such as rural exception sites, accommodation to support rural business and agriculture, replacement dwellings and the conversion of existing suitable buildings within existing settlements.
REF101	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%. Since August 2018 a further 16 houses have been built making the total housing stock 540 properties by 2020. In addition there an additional 54 houses in construction and planning permissions for a further 21 houses or conversions. When these buildings are developed the housing stock in the village will have increased by 125 houses (a staggering 25%) since 2011. The increase in dwellings over the last 9 years has produced a lot of pressure on our narrow village roads. Recent construction of dwellings on Beckland Hill and High Street have seen significant increases in congestion on the village’s roads. The Parish Council would also request that BDC review access to the village. At the time of writing, 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. We believe that this increase in traffic represents a danger as is evidenced by three car crashes on this stretch of road during the past 12 months. East Markham Parish Council 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 as a matter of urgency’. Another area where the infrastructure of the village has not kept pace with development is with regard to drains and sewers. In February 2020 the village suffered from the discharge of raw sewage from drains close to the school. This was attended by Severn Trent Water but the problem recurred twice again since. Church Street has also experienced raw sewage flowing across the road in front of the actual Church. In addition 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 (see below). There is little evidence that BDC have considered this in recent decisions. POLICY NP7: Reducing the Risk of Flooding 1. All development proposals other than residential extensions and other minor development within East Markham village will be required to demonstrate that; a) the development proposals will not have a detrimental impact on the foul and surface water drainage infrastructure; and b) the development does not increase the rate of surface water run off or increase flood risk in the area; and	The Council has recognised existing planning permissions in East Markham since 2018. When considering these against the 5% growth requirement, recent monitoring suggests that this requirement has already been met. This means that any additional development will only be supported if it complies with parts 2 or 3 of Policy ST2 within the Local Plan. If any of the sites with planning permission are not completed or lapse, then those numbers can then be re-added to the growth requirement and planed for accordingly. One of the reasons why the requirement had been reduced from 20% to 5% was the potential impact on infrastructure and the character of settlements.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
		<p>c) the scheme is designed and constructed such that it does not increase the level of flood risk in the area, and where appropriate can contribute to the reduction of flood risk; and</p> <p>d) the scheme protects existing watercourses and land drainage systems. In circumstances where this approach is impractical the developer will be required to propose a reasonable alternative in accordance with the most up to date local policy; and the scheme incorporates sustainable drainage techniques into their layout and design. In circumstances where this approach is impractical, the developer will be required to propose a reasonable alternative in accordance with the most up to date local policy.</p> <p>For the above reasons the Parish Council is of the opinion that East Markham should be classified as a village not suitable for further development from 2020 and for the life of this plan.</p> <p><i>Following section refers to January 2020 DLP:</i> 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 5% proportionate cap is not Government policy but is BDC policy. In the event of a conflict between BDC 5% cap and the Governments no upper limit EAST MARKHAM PARISH COUNCIL seeks clarification as to what takes priority.</p>	
REF122	NNLCRP (North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership)	We note that among the large settlements, Misterton is allocated an additional 194 homes. There is already a desire expressed by residents for a railway station which would enable Doncaster to be reach in 20 minutes and Lincoln in 30 minutes. Train travel from Misterton would meet the Government's Greening Transport desire to reduce emissions that add to global warming.	The Local Plan is not planning for a new Railway Station at Misterton, but this is something the Parish Council can proceed with through other channels if they wish to do so.
REF120	Barton Willmore on behalf of land owner	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised from the previous version of the draft Plan in January 2020. We have no objections with growth being directed to the main towns, providing there is sufficient infrastructure to support it and the allocations are backed up by evidence around deliverability; we have no specific comments to make at this stage. One of the key changes is a revision to the way Small Rural Settlements are dealt with. The previous 20% growth cap on all of these lower order settlements has been replaced with a 5% cap. The number of settlements which will see housing growth has been reduced following a review of their relative sustainability, as detailed in the Settlement Sustainability Matrix within the Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Update (November 2020). We support this approach, as it more clearly differentiates between the Small and Large Rural Settlements, and acknowledges that some Small Rural Settlements are not appropriate locations for growth. However, the revised housing distribution at Policy ST1 then goes on to direct 1,502 dwellings towards Small Rural Settlements compared to the January 2020 version's 1,090. Large Rural Settlements are reduced from 1,764 to 1,402 to reflect the removal of Cottam. This results in a total increase in rural development from 2,854 to 2,904, which is delivered by a reduction in development to Large Rural Settlements and a 38% increase in housing going to Small Rural Settlements, despite the cap being reduced from 20% to 5% and the overall number of settlements being reduced. It is difficult to understand how this follows from the findings of the Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Update and Spatial Strategy Background Paper (Update November 2020), which clearly set out the distinction between Small and Large Rural Settlements and their comparative capacity for growth. We appreciate there are a larger number of smaller order settlements, but it is not clear why a reduced growth cap across a reduced number of settlements results in a higher overall figure. The Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study Update (November 2020) acknowledges at page 4 that an outof- date Plan in the past has: "contributed to the inconsistent management of rural growth across Bassetlaw. Some settlements have grown by hundreds of houses and others have had none, contributing to a growing conflict between the balance of sustainable growth and the benefits that generally accompany new development. In Bassetlaw, these conflicts are translated – most apparently - into a lack of infrastructure being delivered to support a growing population and a large oversupply of residential planning permissions (or commitments) in areas – particularly those that, perhaps, do not have an adequate level of services and facilities to support such a high level of growth." If there are significant commitments at a number of Small Rural Settlements which result in the increased overall figure, then this should be factored into the target for net new dwellings at Policy ST2. The policy only sets out the new housing requirement for each of the settlements (collectively 473 dwellings), rather than how the overall target of 1,502 is made up. In our view it would be much clearer if the policy text provided a table which set out the existing commitments of each settlement (and how this has been reduced to reflect the lapse rate, where appropriate). This should inform whether the additional housing on top of this is justified in light of the issues around an imbalance of services, infrastructure and oversupply of housing. A percentage cap will just perpetuate this imbalance and unsustainable growth that has been created in a policy vacuum. Instead, further growth should be directed to Blyth, which is a higher order settlement that has a higher capacity for growth than the arbitrary 20% cap allows. Part B of the policy raises concerns given the strict adherence to the arbitrary 20% cap, when the policy should instead recognise that the housing target is a minimum (referred to as such in both Policies ST1 and ST2), to ensure consistency with the NPPF's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes (paragraph 59). We continue to object to Part E, which is the only mechanism to exceed the 20% cap. Whilst the opinions of the</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy provides an appropriate rural/urban balance in housing distribution. The majority of growth is directed to the larger settlements as they are considered more sustainable. However, as Bassetlaw is a largely rural District, it is reasonable to enable some of the more sustainable rural villages to expand. Policy ST2 has recognised that the villages across the District do differ in size and local service provision. Therefore the split of 20% growth for larger villages and 5% for smaller villages seems an appropriate split and distribution across the area. Where communities wish to plan for additional growth then this can be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Additional housing growth in these settlements will be supported if it can be demonstrated that there is a local need.</p> <p>Made Neighbourhood Plans should be reviewed every 5 years so that they provide the most up to date policy context for the area. Where allocated sites do not deliver, then this can be dealt with through a Neighbourhood Plan review and reallocated elsewhere if deem appropriate at the time.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
		<p>local community are important to consider through the planning process, there are a wider range of material considerations that should also be appropriately assessed. It is considered that this element should be removed and replaced with a more specific set of criteria to which applications should be assessed. This is particularly important given the points we raise above in relation to Policy ST1 and the potential for Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites which may not be ultimately deliverable or developable. Policy ST2 should also include a reference to the need for ongoing monitoring of delivery and supply within the Parishes. It should make provisions for instances where Neighbourhood Plan allocations (or permissioned sites) are not being implemented, and the 20% growth not being achieved (see LAA which states a historic lapse rate of 24% for such sites). The policy should state that in these circumstances a review of those allocations will be necessary and additional supply will be brought forward ahead of such reviews via a reasonable criteria-based policy, so as to ensure an ongoing supply of housing (in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 73-75) The criteria-based policy could reflect that of the current Bassetlaw District Core Strategy (2011) Policy CS1 and approach of the Council in relation to developments outside of the settlement boundaries (as stated in the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) 2016/17 in relation to Indicator H5: Number of houses built and permitted outside the settlement boundaries). We therefore continue to object to Policy ST2 as it is inconsistent with the evidence base around relative sustainability of settlements and will fail to deliver the required housing in the right places. This is contrary to the NPPF and the draft Plan's own Vision, as noted in our objection to Policy ST1. Suggested changes: 1. The Policy should set out clearly what the breakdown of housing supply from Small Rural in terms of commitments (including reductions for lapse rates) and new housing. 2. The draft Plan should revisit the arbitrary 20% cap applied to Large Rural Settlements and should clearly account for lapse rates. 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. 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. This should be replaced with a more appropriate set of criteria (see 4 below also). 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.</p>	
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	<p>Pages 34 and 35, Para 5.2.2 to 5.2.5, 5.2.7 and 5.2.9 – It is welcome to see some appearance of “common sense” now being applied to Rural Bassetlaw, the separation of Large and Small Rural Bassetlaw is welcomed as is the reduction in the housing requirement to 5%. It was always the case that most of Small Rurals would be significantly and unnecessarily affected to the extent that the nature of the settlement would be changed irrevocably. Additionally, the inclusion of the Neighbourhood Plan Process as a key part of the District's planning procedures are more than welcome and to be applauded. Page 36, Para C. – Of the Small Rural settlements listed in the Scrooby area are Ranskill and Scrooby. However, there is no mention of Torworth. Please clarify if Torworth is one of the “unallocated” small rural settlements. Page 37, Para D. 3) – This prioritises the use of Brownfield land over agricultural land. This MUST be strictly adhered to and policed, agricultural land must not be lost to “money”.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Torworth is not considered a Small Rural Settlement as it did not meet the necessary criteria.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF156	Babworth Parish Council	<p>We consider that the Council's wider approach to planning for the rural area is also flawed. We consider that a sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and it's settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. We 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 the Parish of 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 13 dwellings towards Ranby on the basis of that comprising a 5% uplift to the settlement's size, this is factually incorrect, as Ranby Village has c.89 Dwellings which would total 4.5 dwelling uplift at 5%. 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 13 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. BPC feel very strongly that any housing requirement imposed on Babworth/ Ranby should be absorbed within the Garden Village. 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 arbitrary (in particular a proposed 5% growth target for the small rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. We object to the approach taken by the planning strategy for the rural areas of Bassetlaw. As set out above, we have significant concerns in relation to the overall quantum of development that has been directed towards the District's rural villages. Policy ST2 sets out the housing requirements for Bassetlaw's rural settlements to grow appropriately in order to maintain rural vitality whilst retaining distinctiveness. Whilst we support the need to maintain the viability and vitality of rural services, this needs to be planned for by understanding the health and hinterlands of those services and the level of development that is needed to support them (and through locating that level of development in a location accessible to those services). The fundamental flaw of the Local Plan's proposed approach is that many of the 73 rural villages identified in the Local Plan for growth do not have any notable services to meet their day to day needs. It is not sustainable to encourage more households to live in remote locations where they are encouraged to travel in sporadic patterns to access remote facilities. It is much more sustainable for those villages to be sustained by their rural hubs (the main settlements) where trips can be linked, and journeys made by public transport, such as Retford. For example, if more houses were built in Ranby village, it would be necessary for more car journeys to and from Retford, Worksop and the surrounding area to access services and facilities, therefore producing more carbon and increasing the carbon footprint. We consider that the Council should abandon its proposed policy of allocating a minimum level of development across the majority of its rural villages and should, instead, target a modest level of growth to villages with existing suitable services and facilities that require support to maintain their existing levels of vitality and viability.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 provides a reasonable approach to rural development according to the size and level of services and facilities within each community.</p> <p>The District is largely rural and therefore some future growth is necessary to support the needs of those communities.</p> <p>The majority of the Districts growth requirements are located within or around urban areas or along key infrastructure links such as the A1/A57 or on large brownfield sites.</p> <p>The Council has incorporated the 5% requirement for Ranby into the Bassetlaw Garden Village housing requirement. However, if the community wish to plan for additional growth, then this can be undertaken through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF157	Resident	<p>Ranby village has approximately 89 dwellings. Those dwellings are spread out and separated by lots of green, open fields and spaces. Our very small village contains 4 listed buildings/monuments (a bridge, memorial, public house, dwelling). These also span from one end of the village to the other. The village has the Chesterfield canal running through the middle of it. There are many old, large trees, hedges and wooded areas. In my view, the village is one of the most rural and characterful villages you could get. There are no real services. There is only a tiny rural church (which has a service at most once a month), village hall, small school and public house. We have poor internet, a very skeleton bus service and nothing else. The villagers who live here like it like that. We choose to live here because we want to live in a very rural small village. The “blanket” proposal to build 5% more houses in every village is unfair and inappropriate, as some villages will want and can sustain (with their facilities and services) more houses, and other villages will not want as many, or any, and cannot sustain “servicing” more houses. Even if, as you propose under your “blanket” approach, to build another 4-5 houses, for a village like Ranby that is unsustainable and unsupportable, and would significantly and detrimentally alter the village. It is unfeasible, and you would be destroying its character. Your “broad brush” approach to all villages does not afford each village the specific attention to making a decision on development that they deserve. These development decisions and policies should be based on actual evidence about each village to determine the appropriate level of growth, if any. You cannot apply a “one size fits all” approach, because villages as small and as rural as Ranby would be more affected by a 5% increase than other larger villages. Any number of more houses built in such a small village will have much more of an impact than more houses built in a village of already 500. It would be disproportionate in its effect to Ranby Village. The increased houses would increase the traffic within the village and to/from the village. The road junctions from Ranby onto the busy, fast A620 and A1 are already very busy at certain times of day, and verging on dangerous at peak times. The “ruralness” of the village would be lost. Ranby does not have the services to support, or sustain any more houses being built. It would massively affect the village to have another 8 cars or more, coming to and from the village. It would also severely affect the village’s carbon footprint, congestion on the surrounding roads, and the green environment/added pollution generally. There is only a very skeleton bus service and so everyone would have to drive. The carbon footprint would be increased significantly, as there would be more residents to have to drive to access nearly all services. In my view, the council should look to develop areas closer to the main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. If other larger villages, like Carlton in Lindrick have the ability and desire to grow and can do sustainably, the council should focus developing these areas. In relation to Retford, more housing should be built closer to where there is already services that can support and need support from more residents. Transport networks already exist. Many existing services in the towns, especially Retford could be upgraded and extended if needed, with much less disruption and cost. Ordsall is on the outskirts of Retford, which could be further extended. North Road, London Road, and towards Welham similarly. Retford’s footprint should grow, and could grow sustainably and in a more “measured” way. The town centre would be enhanced.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy in the Local Plan classifies rural settlements into three tiers:</p> <p>Large Rural Settlements; Small Rural Settlements; Countryside.</p> <p>The classification is based on a settlements size and the level of services and facilities they contain. This enables us to direct the majority of growth to those settlements with services and restrict growth in those that have few or none at all.</p> <p>Although Ranby is considered a Small Rural Settlement, the Local Plan has now incorporated Ranby’s requirement into the growth figures for the Garden Village (which will be located within the Babworth/Ranby Parish area). Therefore, the growth requirement for Ranby in Policy ST2 is zero. Any growth proposed in the village will need to comply with parts 2 or 3 of Policy ST2.</p>
REF165	Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council	We are pleased that the Council has agreed to reduce the housing growth figure in Small Rural Settlements from 20% to 5% with the flexibility to provide a greater number of houses with community support, evidenced through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Dunham is the only community within our Parish Council that has an allocation and we could foresee problems with a 20% growth because of potential flooding issues.	Thank you for your comment.
REF027	Resident	I would sincerely hope that any further significant development in Beckingham village itself is heartily refused since we are now enduring many more times the number of properties we were meant to have in the original quota. In effect, that has changed the character of the village scene and only feeds landowners rather than preserves rural life. Some development has been needed and positive, but large scale estates such as we now have do not enhance the overall appearance of the village. Balance & proportionality have a sacred place in planning decisions in order to ensure parity across the rurality whilst providing homes fit to live in.	Thank you for your comment.
REF132	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	We object to Policy ST2, it is not clear if the figures on page 35 are a new requirement or include existing permissions Pages 36 and 37 lists the smaller rural settlements which collectively accommodate 1,502 of the housing requirement, again it is not clear if these figures include existing commitments.	An updated supporting text and background paper provides the necessary information on the housing monitoring framework.
REF135	Pegasus Group on behalf of land owner	Policy ST2 refers directly to Langold as a Large Rural Settlement and the housing requirement of 227 dwellings. As discussed above, it is considered that this housing requirement should also be considered to be a minimum figure as per the case made for Policy ST1.	Policy ST2 provides a mechanism for additional growth based on the needs of the community. This can be through the Neighbourhood Plan process or through justifying there is a local need for a particular type of accommodation i.e. affordable housing.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF137	Pegasus Group on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	<p>Policy ST2 Rural Bassetlaw confirms that the Small Rural Settlements will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1,502 dwellings of the District's housing requirement. For Normanton on Trent, a housing requirement of 8 dwellings is included. The table at Policy ST2 C) confirms the eligible Small Rural Settlements and the associated housing requirement for each. This totals 473 dwellings and appears to be based on a 5% uplift of existing settlement sizes (at August 2018). We would suggest that sub clause C) is amended to refer to additional sites being identified, rather than additional settlements, as follows: 'Residential development in the following eligible Small Rural Settlements will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1,502 of the District's housing requirement, unless other additional sites are identified through a Neighbourhood Plan.' Subsection D confirms that proposals in the Small Rural Settlements will be supported where four criteria are met: 1) Proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish by more than 5% individual or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission (granted since April 2020) or through site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans; 2) The proposal does not conflict with the character and built form or that part of the settlement; 3) The proposal prioritises the use of brownfield land and avoids the use of the most versatile agricultural land; and 4) The design positively responds to design principles identified at Policy ST37, and any relevant characterisations studies as part of a Neighbourhood Plan. Policy commentary at paragraph 5.2.4 states that the policy framework has evolved following the January 2020 Local Plan consultation; 'recognising that the Large Rural Settlements are identified by Policy ST1 as being more sustainable than the Small Rural Settlements, so growth should reflect that. Equally, many of the Small Rural Settlements would struggle to accommodate the required percentage of growth due to constraints, such as flood risk, and the availability of suitable land.' The growth percentage for the Large Rural Settlements remains at 20%, whereas for the Small Rural Settlements this has been reduced to 5% growth. From a review of the January 2020 Consultation Responses, it appears that this change in approach is in part as a result of a large number of representations from residents of one of the Small Rural Settlements, in relation to that particular emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The table at C) should be amended to include 10% growth for Small Rural Settlements, which for Normanton on Trent would be 16 dwellings. The overall minimum figure of 1,500 dwellings should also be revisited as necessary in the context of a 10% growth requirement for the Small Rural Settlements. The Draft Local Plan January 2020 included a growth requirement of 20%, and this reduction in requirement to only 5% is not appropriate and does not support rural settlements or take advantage of opportunities for small scale sustainable growth; 10% growth is therefore considered more appropriate. Subsection E) confirms that where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been met, additional development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and Council through the preparation, or review, of a Neighbourhood Plan. The Council is therefore reliant on the remainder of the minimum housing requirement being delivered through Neighbourhood Plans. Paragraph 5.2.7 advises that 'the Neighbourhood Plan is the most appropriate mechanism to demonstrate community support to justify a different level or distribution of growth within their designated area based on local circumstances and local needs.' Whilst the encouragement given to local communities in progressing Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites to meet their housing requirement themselves is supported, this should not preclude the delivery of sustainable sites in Small Rural Settlements where a Neighbourhood Plan is not being produced, such as Normanton on Trent. Policy ST2 D 1) should be amended as follows: 'Proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish, by more than 10% individually or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission (granted since 1 April 2018). Paragraph 5.2.9 advises that the delivery of growth in eligible settlements is being monitored monthly in order to provide the community, Neighbourhood Plan Groups, Parishes and housebuilders with an up-to-date account of the demand for development and the remaining requirement in each settlement going forward. It is confirmed that the base date for rural monitoring is April 2018 for Policy ST2, and planning permissions granted from that date are deducted moving forward. It is important that this monitoring. information is made publicly available on a regular basis. Figure 7 provides a housing trajectory; however, this is not considered to be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate how the Council intends to maintain a five-year supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF. The Local Plan should include a detailed trajectory to help identify if there are any delays in the delivery of sites.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 has been amended in terms of its structure to deal with the growth requirement and then to manage any additional residential development in areas. Additional residential development over and above the identified requirement will only be supported where it is planned through a Neighbourhood Plan or it is proposing to need a local need.</p> <p>The 5% requirement for small rural settlements provides a baseline for each settlement and was reduced from 20% due to concerns about impact on infrastructure and character. In addition, both large rural settlements and small rural settlements were proposed to grow by 20% which made the strategy unclear as there wasn't a distinctive difference between the two tiers.</p> <p>Due to the high volume of existing housing commitments within the rural area, a reduction of 5% for small rural settlements would help reduce the potential impact of development on local infrastructure.</p>
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>We welcome the addition of D. 3. (use of previously developed land and protecting good quality agricultural land). We do not understand why January 2020 D. 5. (preventing coalescence) has been removed given that D.5. was an important policy tool for protecting open countryside.</p>	<p>A reference to preventing coalescence between settlements has been added to the Policy criteria.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF151	Guy Taylor Associates on behalf of the land owners	<p>Policy ST2 confirms the allocations for the various tiers of rural development and in section C sets out the position for the smaller rural communities. Whilst the plan recognises the need to support rural communities via growth and allocates a minimum of 1,502 houses to be delivered over the plan period, it is clear that there is insufficient allocation within the table provided within ST2. In fact the table only allocates some 473 houses to the parishes named which represents only a third of the requirement. 260 dwellings have been permitted in the period 2018-2020 which contribute towards the trajectory, however it cannot be expected that the remaining 769 houses can be found via windfall sites. The policy indicates that the various parishes named in the table, identify the locations for these allocations but should not exceed the target figures by more than 5% unless allocated via a Neighbourhood Plan. It would appear that the figures presented are suggesting that the fixed position is only a third of the requirement and each parish is expected to identify and provide the excess to achieve the minimum target for the tier. Effectively each parish should be seeking to generate an allocation 3 times larger than the allocation via a Neighbourhood Plan if Bassetlaw are to achieve their minimum targets. As per the previous section, it would also be prudent to re-visit the allocation based upon the December version of the Standard Method of Housing Need as this has increased the housing requirement across the plan. Whilst the figures are under review, Bassetlaw should reconsider how Parish Targets are set as they clearly don't achieve the minimum target delivery as issued within the table contained within ST2. A worked example would be Treswell which has a base number of dwellings of 99 from August 2018. Within the Jan 2020 version of the plan the 20% allocation was set at 20 new dwellings. Within the November variant this is set at 5 dwellings effectively 5% this is diminished by an extant planning consent (commitment within the 2018-2020 timeframe) which reduces the allocation to 4 dwellings within Treswell over the plan period. The reality is that the requirement is 15% growth across the 31 parishes which are not washed over by flood zones and can deliver capacity in order to meet the min 1,502 target set within Policy ST2. This would require the Treswell allocation to be set at 15 new houses in order to fulfil the Local Plan trajectory minus the commitments from 2018-2020 which is one house giving an allocation of 14 new homes for the plan period, not the 5 contained within the table in ST2.</p>	<p>The distribution of Rural growth has also accounted for existing commitments, completions and made neighbourhood plan allocations. This reduces the number to roughly around 400 homes for the small rural settlements which is then delivered as part of a requirement for the identified settlements. These figures have been updated to reflect a more recent position and a monitoring framework provides the latest figures on the Council's website.</p> <p>Further information is explained within the Spatial Strategy Background Paper and the Rural Settlements Background Paper.</p>
REF151	Guy Taylor Associates on behalf of the land owners	<p>Within the Bassetlaw district 30 parishes are at various stages of the Neighbourhood Plan process with over half adopted and forming planning policy. Many of the Made plans are under review and those yet to be Made are in the development stages. The Neighbourhood Plans which have been adopted were created under the previous Bassetlaw Core Strategy 2011 and responded to the policies it contained. With reference to Rural Settlements the general rule contained within the Core Strategy was no development in 'other settlements' within Policy DM9. This position denied any parish within the definition any opportunity of growth other than replacement dwellings or conversion of existing buildings within Core Strategy policies DM2 and DM3, or those developments which would meet a local need for affordable housing. For parishes creating a new Neighbourhood Plan or those under review, the nature of the emerging policy has been problematic. Until the January 2020 edition of the Bassetlaw Part II Plan, all rural parishes knew there would be no allocation. The January 2020 Draft Plan asked them to consider a 20% uplift in housing. This being the case a number of Neighbourhood Steering Groups were facing the position of substantial growth figures to accommodate within their Neighbourhood Plans and as such started the process of considering site allocations. Committees have been formed and calls for sites issued. As a practice we are working for a number of clients in this position where emerging policy dictates that a client has professional representation in its site submissions as the stakes are high for this type of opportunity. On this basis both Parish Steering Groups, the District Council and professional representatives have been working to promote sites through the whole of 2020. This work however has been abortive for all parties with the publication of the November draft which removes allocation for a significant number of parishes and reduces the targets to a figure where an allocation is unnecessary for the majority. Based on the November draft, it would appear that only 22 parishes have allocations into double figures which may require the Neighbourhood Plan to consider the location of development. However, as is reported in our section relating to Policy ST2, only a third of the housing requirement is contained within the tabulated figures within Policy ST2, and it is therefore the expectation that Parish Councils find the remaining housing to hit the minimum targets during the plan period. As reported previously, our quick calculations identify that across the 31 parishes capable for accommodating additional housing, the 1,502 target would result in a target of 15% uplift (not including an increase as a result of the December amendments to the New Standard Method of Housing Need), for each eligible parish not the 5% contained within the table within ST2. On this basis, it would appear that Parishes have been misled by Policy ST2 into a position where the stated target is minimal and would not be worthy of allocation, however the target shortfall cannot be delivered without Neighbourhood Plans allocating three times the figures represented within the table. On this basis, we would encourage Bassetlaw to clarify its position on the Parish Allocations and in particular the requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to generate allocations far in excess of the Parish allocation within the table contained in Policy ST2, in order to deliver the targets contained within the Draft Plan and those increases generated by Government which are yet to be considered.</p>	<p>The Council is working closely with Neighbourhood Planning groups on how the Bassetlaw Local Plan could impact their plans.</p> <p>Some communities who had undertaken "call for land" consultation and site assessment to accommodate the proposed 20% were struggling to find enough suitable sites to accommodate their growth requirements. This was one of the reasons why the percentage requirement for small rural settlements was reduced in November. This reduction forms a baseline for communities to work to, but Policy ST2 also provides the mechanism for communities to deliver more growth through the neighbourhood planning process where there is reasonable evidence.</p> <p>This approach allows flexibility and gives more control on additional growth to the community affected. There are several communities who are currently planning for more growth through their Neighbourhood Plans to support local services or provide a particular housing type.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF164	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>Part C of Policy ST2 (Small Rural Settlements), sets out that these settlements will deliver “a minimum of 1502 of the District’s housing requirement, unless other settlements are identified through a neighbourhood plan”. A table in Part C of the policy sets out housing requirements for each of the Small Rural Settlements, based on allowing no more than 5% growth. For Treswell, a requirement of 5 dwellings is identified (the previous Draft Plan identified 20 dwellings). Whilst the overall target for the Small Rural Settlements is approx. 1,500 dwellings, the housing numbers assigned to the Small Rural Settlements through the 5% cap process and detailed in the table within the policy would only deliver approx. 473 dwellings (less than a third of 1,500). It is therefore clear that the Council needs to increase the housing requirements for the Small Rural Settlements, in order to enable the Plan to deliver the number of homes assigned to these communities. Without ensuring that the minimum of 1,500 homes is delivered, the Bassetlaw Plan will fail to be “positively prepared”, as required by national planning policy. In the supporting text to Policy ST2 (paragraphs 5.2.3 to 5.2.5) the following explanation for the 5% growth of Small Rural Settlements is set out: “In the January 2020 draft Local Plan the target for growth was set at 20% for each settlement in the rural area, both Large and Small Settlements. In response to that consultation, the policy framework has evolved: recognising that the Large Rural Settlements are identified by Policy ST1 as being more sustainable than the Small Rural Settlements, so growth should reflect that. Equally, many of the Small Rural Settlements would struggle to accommodate the required percentage of growth due to constraints, such as flood risk, and the availability of suitable land. In some cases, this has been demonstrated through the site allocation process of neighbourhood plans. On that basis, growth of eligible settlements listed in Policy ST2 is identified as a percentage based on the existing Parish dwelling number (as of 13th August 2018 - when the data was collected). The growth percentage for the Large Rural Settlements remains at 20%, whereas the Small Rural Settlements is now 5%”. It is not clear why the 5% cap has been chosen. It is not evidence based and as illustrated above will not enable the Council to meet its housing need. It is suggested that the Small Rural Settlements would struggle to accommodate additional growth; this is not the case. In the case of Treswell, the two sites promoted through the Plan making process at Cocking Lane and Town Street are not constrained by flood risk, heritage or ecological designations. Moreover, they are edge of settlement sites which are available for development now and therefore should be considered as being able to assist in delivering the housing numbers assigned to the Small Rural Settlements. The availability of these sites in Treswell demonstrates why it is entirely appropriate to allocate a higher housing requirement to the village and increase the growth cap from 5%. It is recognised that Part E of Policy ST2 seeks to address the shortfall which is created by the cap. It states that “Where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and Council through the preparation, or review, of a neighbourhood plan”. This effectively leaves it with Neighbourhood Plans to decide how to deliver the remaining circa 1,000 dwellings across the Smaller Rural Settlements. As practice shows, it is very unlikely that Neighbourhood Plans will choose to allocate more than the percentage housing requirement assigned to them. To seek to ensure that the housing need is met across these villages that the policy should be updated to reflect a minimum housing target that the individual Neighbourhood Plans should meet. This addition to the policy is needed to provide a clear framework for emerging Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Small Rural settlements should deliver 1500 new homes over the plan period. The majority of this is already committed through existing planning permissions. Any remaining part of this requirement will be delivered by the proposed 473 or 5% requirement for each of the identified settlements. In some cases, the 5% has also been committed or it has been planned within a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy ST2 provides a mechanism for individual communities to plan for further growth if they wish to do so through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan if it can be justified. Justification for an increase in growth could be to support local services and facilities or to regenerate a vacant or brownfield site.</p>
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owner	<p>As part of our earlier submissions to the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, we have set out our objection to draft Policy ST2 on the basis that it unjustifiably stifles housing growth (and the socio-economic benefits associated with this) in sustainable, rural settlements such as Ranskill. Our previous objection to draft Policy ST2 still stands and particularly so, now that it proposes even fewer new houses in Ranskill. Alongside the draft Local Plan, we note that responses to the consultation that was undertaken in January 2020 have been published on the Council’s website¹. With regard to draft Policy ST2, only the overall conclusions of our previous letter (dated 26 February 2020) are responded to in the officers comments, rather than the issues we identified regarding the detail of the draft policy itself. In the absence of these issues having been addressed, we do not consider draft Policy ST2 to be justified, positively prepared or consistent with national policy in terms of its approach to delivering new housing in rural Bassetlaw. Thus, we consider the policy to be unsound. Overall, Ranskill is an appropriate location to accommodate future growth, with earlier drafts of the Local Plan explicitly recognising it as one of the district’s “sustainable rural settlements”. To this end, new housing development would help support the longevity of shops, services and community infrastructure that are currently provided in the village, whilst also providing a critical mass of new residents with which to attract new facilities.</p>	<p>Ranskill is considered a small rural settlement and therefore it can accommodate some limited development. The reason why the requirement had been reduced for Small Rural Settlements is that there was previously no distinction between large rural settlements and small rural settlements as they were both set at 20%. In addition, some communities could not accommodate a 20% requirement due to the lack of available or suitable land. However, if a community does want to plan for more than 5% growth and has enough available or suitable land to do so, then this can be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process if justified.</p>
REF213	Treswell with Cottam Parish Council	<p>Members present note growth % for small Rural Settlements, such as Treswell with Cottam, reduced to 5% but welcome the opportunity to increase this % when supported by resident aspirations as documented in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and review. There is becoming an urgent, growing need in our communities to meet affordable housing needs of our young residents and families.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
1669649	Resident	One size doesn't fit all. Residential development in some small rural settlements of 5% may still be undesirable. In Lound the village was previously protected because it lacked basic infrastructure and amenities. E.g. no school, problems with sewage and poor transport links. Also the village is adjacent to an SSSI. This land is a nationally recognised habitat and any development in greenfield adjacent to this is putting this site and links with Idle Valley nature reserve at risk. The council should continue to protect this significant contribution to nature and also recognise its contribution to health and wellbeing which walkers and cyclists etc enjoy. The village also has historic links to the natural habitat with the willow being used as wattle for wattle and daub building of the past. The unique character of this village should be preserved and housing development not encouraged.	The proposed growth requirement of 5% for Lound is currently being planned for within the emerging Lound Neighbourhood Plan. This has identified sites to accommodate this development that have been through a series of public consultation events. Once this requirement has been met, then any additional development will require community support or be justified in terms of its local need.
REF220	Resident	<p>I am writing in response to the publication of the proposed Bassetlaw Local Plan. I live in Carlton in Lindrick and as part of the Bassetlaw Plan we were allocated a number of properties to be built in Carlton in Lindrick as were most of the villages around us. The number of houses required will greatly increase the size and population of the village. This applies to all the villages allocated housing quotas. People understand that some new housing is required but the amount of properties allocated is changing the villages, in some cases very dramatically. As many of the new houses being built does not fit in with the surrounding properties. In Carlton people are concerned about the number of properties being forced upon us and how it will affect the village as 150 of the properties allocated to the village are being built on the field opposite the Co-op. This field is a flood plain and was given planning permission despite objections from the local people and the Parish Council. In fact signs advertising this development were erected even before our Local Plan was voted on. The people of Carlton voted for our Local Plan because we understood that if we didn't then we could have even more development forced on us and that the Local Plan meant only the housing and other development we had agreed to in the plan would go ahead. I would like to know if Bassetlaw Council takes any notice of the Local Plans or if they can just be revised as the Bassetlaw Plan is being and overwritten as appears to have happened in Shireoaks. Do these Local Plans actually carry any weight? I am also concerned about the amount of development proposed for Worksop. In particular Peaks Hill Farm site. Houses are already being built on this site and some appear to be lived in. So the council is conducting a Public Consultation on housing already built. The proposed site is a very large area of farmland which slopes quite steeply down to Blyth Road and Carlton Road. The area of Carlton Road that runs along were the development would be gets a lot of water on it in heavy rain and does flood across the road near Red Lane. Has any consideration been given to how concreting over such a large area of steep farmland could cause more significant flooding along Blyth Road and Carlton Road? I am also concerned about new access road that is being built running from Blyth Road through to Carlton Road. The area of Carlton Road where the through road would have to exit has had several accidents, some of them fatal, over the years and there is no clear line of sight where traffic would be able to see vehicles pulling out onto Carlton Road. I think this will be quite dangerous. I am also concerned about how close this development will come to Carlton, both on the Carlton Road and Blyth Road ends. We are already being advanced upon by the rapidly growing Ashes Park/Eddison Park development. The houses there can now be seen from Owday Lane and Carlton Road. How many more houses are going to be built there on farmland and how close to Carlton are they going to come? Is Carlton eventually going to be swallowed up by Worksop and stop being a separate village? With housing developments being planned in Langold as well it won't be long before Carlton, Langold and Oldcotes are all joined together. Also, most of the housing developments in Worksop are being built on greenfield or farmland. As I mentioned before the Ashes Park/ Eddison Park development is already huge and still growing, the new housing at Tollbar (which is going ahead despite residents objections) is being built on farmland. The Peaks Hill site is Farmland. The housing being built at Shireoaks is on greenfields. The housing being built in Carlton opposite the Co-op is on a floodplain. The proposed development in Langold would be on Greenfields. Once the current development in Carlton is completed what's to stop developers just carrying on? They could just keep going and going as far as the eye can see. How big does a village have to get before it ceases to be a village?</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Local Plan has identified Carlton in Lindrick as a large rural settlement. This means that it can grow by 20% over the plan period. However, when considering housing monitoring data and the recently made Neighbourhood Plan, it shows that Carlton has exceeded a 20% increase in development. This means that any new development will be subject to a stricter criteria and policies identified within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The land to the North of the new development off Doncaster Road is proposed to be designated as a Green Gap due to its landscape character and openness. In addition, land between Carlton and Worksop has also been designated a green gap to prevent the two settlements from merging. These designations will help maintain local character and landscape quality.</p>
1670232	Resident	(Relates to Policy 17: HS1 Peaks Hill Farm Page 81) Further development within Carlton parish boundaries can only erode its village character and blur the distinction between Carlton and Worksop. Carlton residents voted for the village plan having been led to believe that doing so would limit development within the village to less than we have already seen since.	The Local Plan is proposing a Green Gap between Carlton in Lindrick and Worksop to maintain the physical separation between the two settlements.
1670589	Resident	D - Proposals in the Small Rural Settlements will be supported where all of the following are met: 1) Proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish, by more than 5% individually or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission (granted since 1 April 2018) or through site allocations in respective neighbourhood plans; This proposal is not supported. Sites for consideration in Sutton-cum-lound to come in scope are 276 and 281. This land is not appropriate.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
1670869	Resident	the criteria and definition for determining large and small rural settlements should be set out clearly in this section of the plan. most of us do not have the time (even if we have the inclination!) to keep looking up different and separate documents to work this out. This plan, and the assumptions behind it, must be clear to all. Again I refer to Cottam village, which is missing from the list of small rural communities yet proposals for this village include the potential for some 1600 homes to be added. how does this square with the policy?	The criteria for determining Large and Small Rural Settlements is defined and explained within the Rural Strategy Background Paper. Cottam doesn't classify as a Small Rural Settlement due to its size and lack of services and facilities.
REF049	Resident	We would like to add our comments again to the proposed Bassetlaw Plan, specifically that part which affects our local community in Tuxford. Tuxford is deemed as being able to accommodate a significant increase in dwellings without any reference to any additions, improvements or additional funding in infrastructure, schools or doctors. We would suggest that these dwellings would put an additional, serious strain on these services. Even during the pandemic crisis the traffic situation at peak times is dangerous - particularly between the junction of Ollerton Road and Eldon Street. The environmental impact on pedestrians has not been taken into consideration which has been exacerbated during the pandemic as people are queuing outside shops and the post office. HGV's meeting each other in the centre of the village often brings all vehicles to a standstill and endangers other road users and pedestrians alike. The impact of the additional dwellings between Ollerton Road and Long Lane is particularly problematical. Newcastle Street is bottlenecked at peak times with cars going to the school, vehicles coming off the A1 northbound, and vehicles and pedestrians accessing the Coop supermarket with street parking on both sides of the road. This would be increased by the number of new vehicles that additional dwellings would bring. We understand that the plan for the extra dwellings in Tuxford does not take into account the existing residential development that has been ongoing since 2018 as part of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. This should be looked at as part of the Bassetlaw Plan. May we also ask why our previously submitted opinions and comments cannot be considered at this juncture?	Although Tuxford is considered a sustainable settlement to accommodate additional development, it is also recognised that there are significant constraints within the town such as highways. The proposed site at Ollerton Road will need to provide suitable access points of Ollerton Road and a new footpath at the front of the site to connect with the existing one outside The Pastures. In addition, a footpath will also be provided from the site onto Long lane. Where mitigation measures to the existing highway network are required as part of the development, then these will be detailed through a Transport Assessment.
REF034	Nether-Langwith Parish Council	The Parish Council has no objections to the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan as it currently stands	Thank you for your comments
REF085	Resident	I would like to submit the following response to the Bassetlaw Local Plan consultation. They specifically relate to Clayworth. I note that the Council has chosen to reduce the housing requirement for small rural settlements, such as Clayworth, to 5% from the original 20% growth proposed in the 2020 draft Local Plan. Whilst this is welcomed, it still raises concerns about how the Council has factored in Conservation Area status when allocating these. Whilst 5% is a much more achievable figure in most rural settlements, it is still of a significant enough amount to potentially impact negatively on villages with Conservation Areas such as Clayworth. Further clarification is therefore required in the next Local Plan draft to set out appropriate safeguards to ensure the planned housing growth targets do not contravene policies designed to protect these types of villages. Not least, as the option remains for developers to seek to exceed the 5% figure if 'community support' can be demonstrated. It is unclear at the moment from the draft Local Plan how this community support should be demonstrated in areas, such as Clayworth, which do not have a Neighbourhood Plan in place. I suggest this should be demonstrated by the support, or not, of the Parish Council. If the Parish Council does not support exceeding the 5% growth target, then the application should be refused. I hope the Council will consider these comments when publishing the next, and potentially final, version of the Local Plan.	Heritage, including Conservation Area designations, are important factors when determining the location of growth or making a decision on a planning application. A conservation Area doesn't automatically preclude development, but any proposals will need to demonstrate how they preserve and enhance the areas historic qualities. This is generally done through the planning application process.
REF090	Resident	At the moment Misson Mill is the preferred site for housing in Misson by Parish Council and may be Bassetlaw Council but at the moment the owners of that site 1. Do not seem interested in developing it for housing, so while they sit around knowing they are the preferred site other sites around the village are at a disadvantage So a policy where a preferred site has a time limit on it (3 years) to start would make it fairer for other land owners to have their sites considered if they wanting to start applying for planning permission.	The community can look at these issues through a review of their made Neighbourhood Plan. If the community wish to see alternative or additional sites being development, then this can be done through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
REF077	Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council	The Parish Council is now generally supportive of the Draft Local Plan and acknowledges the additional measures included to create the open space area adjacent to the A60 highway, the retention of an established natural boundary inbetween Rural Carlton in Lindrick and the Urban Environment of Worksop and to protect from any further development in a northerly direction on both side of the A60 – North of the proposed new road and North of the developed Gateford Area in Worksop. It is also acknowledged that those proposals compliment a significant feature of the Parish Neighbourhood Plan representing strong community views that the rural and agricultural environment be maintained in and around the village.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF138	Resident	<p>Firstly, we would like to say how pleased we were to see that Small Rural Settlements, in the spirit of Localism and with a recognition that local residents usually know their villages better than most, have been given more sensible control over housing development than in previous versions of your Plan. Your minimum Housing Requirement of 5% of the existing number of houses in the Parish, equivalent to 10 new dwellings in Lound, is generally recognised as a reasonable contribution to the national housing shortage, given the very limited facilities in the village and our very narrow streets. Paragraph E says strongly and unequivocally “Where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and Council through the preparation, or review, of a neighbourhood plan.” This statement is also reinforced in a number of other places, for example at paragraph 5.1.53. However, a recent conversation with your Dr Will Wilson has thrown some doubt on this, when he said that only settlements without neighbourhood plans could regard 5% as a maximum as well as a minimum. For other settlements, such as Lound, which is in the process of producing a neighbourhood plan, we do understand that, while the neighbourhood plan can direct development towards particular sites, it cannot define exactly how many houses should be built on specific sites. A developer may apply for permission to build more houses than those envisaged on a neighbourhood plan site and, when a good case is put forward, these may be approved. While understanding this, we cannot really accept that the overall level of development of 5% for Lound could be breached, against the wishes of the community. This seems to directly contradict the words in Paragraph E on page 37.</p>	The Local Plan sets a requirement for Lound at 5% any additional residential development beyond this figure will need to be justified through a local need (i.e. affordable housing) or through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
REF141	Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	<p>In response to the consultation we support the recent change in the minimum requirement for development in Small Rural Settlements. The requirement for 5% of the existing housing, equivalent to 10 houses in Lound, has received substantial support in the village, and has been generally accepted as achievable. We are concerned, however, that the planning process may over-rule this 5% requirement in that a developer of one of our identified sites may apply for more houses than was initially allowed in the Neighbourhood Plan, despite opposition from the local population. We feel that this is in conflict with one of the reasons for developing Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	The Local Plan sets a requirement for Lound at 5% any additional residential development beyond this figure will need to be justified through a local need (i.e. affordable housing) or through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<p>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 therefore welcome the digital infrastructure plans for connectivity for our communities. Wi-Fi/connectivity to enable remote health care management is key in the current new ways of working and essential in some circumstances. It is important in respect to ill health prevention and wellness promotion that we also support our 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 developments in more rural locations consideration needs to be given to the provision of pharmaceutical services and we would welcome consultation with local pharmacy providers as part of individual consultation on developments in the area(s) as they come on board.</p>	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Undue competition for rural housing with the provision of so many on Apleyhead site. Most existing villages rely upon the “little and often” principle of development but this means land and construction costs are generally greater than larger scale developments. The garden village is to provide 500 new homes in this plan period, the equivalent of a village the size of Ranskill or East Markham and with this size comes the “economy of scale”. Dwellings would be cheaper and people will gravitate to these cheaper homes. This will mean that the only dwellings built in all villages will be large expensive homes, not what the mix requirements suggest. Villages will therefore not be able to retain services nor attract any new ones, they will become “dormitories” and not provide family homes for rural workers or workers at the new employment node points. This form of large scale residential development will have effects on the rural area for generations to come and it is having its effect already with the housing cap on smaller villages now being proposed at 5% rather than 20% which has been used by several Parish Councils in the preparation and adoption of Neighbourhood Plans. The establishment of a new large housing allocation will affect the following:-</p> <p>a. Equal provision of housing around the district given that economies of scale will provide much cheaper homes.</p> <p>b. Reduce further the amount of smaller family homes or senior citizen accommodation in villages.</p> <p>c. The amount of larger more expensive dwellings in villages will increase as these will be the only market that can afford these costs.</p> <p>d. Reduce the ability of villages to retain and attract services. However, numbers will less need for the shop, public house, village hall and, most importantly the nursery/primary school.</p> <p>e. There will be no investment or increase in the frequency of the rural bus services. People who buy large rural properties do not utilise the bus service.</p> <p>f. Once this process is put in place and homes start to roll off the construction line then it becomes irreversible, therefore all the negative effects on the existing rural area will last for generations.</p> <p>g. Much in the same way “out of town retail” was resisted, this form of “out of town residential” should also be resisted. Evidence for out of town development does have a major negative effect is clear when one looks at both Retford and Worksop town centres, both are shadows of their former selves. There is a glut of charity shops and what has been recently classified as non-essential shops but the vast majority of footfall traffic heads to the supermarkets given that many of these now stock clothes, household goods, furniture, tools, equipment etc. The need therefore to enter the town has diminished. The same will happen with housing although this time it will be villages and communities that suffer. If the number of families in our villages stays static and does not increase then the schools, shops and public houses will close meaning that children, shoppers and the general community will need to travel, it defeats the object. Evidence for the need of a garden village Other than the general shortfall of housing in the district and in particular affordable housing I do not see evidence that suggests a garden village is the way to resolve this. It is correct that it will provide houses, employment and services. The employment requirement is clear but the only reason we need services is because we are putting houses there. If we did not put houses, we would not need the services therefore if the houses can be located in existing areas the whole ethos of a garden village is unproven. Obviously a garden village can be seen as a panacea for all. All the obvious facilities would have to be provided by developers but I see little evidence of studies to investigate the impacts, either negative or positive, on surrounding villages and our rural area in general. These large scale allocations for residential development should be omitted and resisted strongly.</p>	<p>Policy ST2 doesn’t seek to stifle the development of rural communities, but manage it in a sustainable way. Over the past ten years, a number of communities have seen a large volume of development or planning permissions. If all are built, then it could materially change the character of some of these villages.</p> <p>When looking at the distribution of housing, it is important to consider this and identify what is an appropriate level of development when considering the role, function and character of each area.</p> <p>The Council recognises that the more general approach might lead to some issues where certain communities need additional development to support their local services and facilities. However, the Council also believes that this should be at the discretion of the community. If there is a need or desire for additional growth within individual settlements, then this can be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>In addition, Policy ST2 also provides a framework to support local housing needs where appropriate through the delivery of affordable housing or rural dwellings.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF181	Rural Solutions on behalf of Foljambe	Draft Policy ST2 (Rural Bassetlaw): states that residential development in the eligible Small Rural Settlements, “will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1502 of the District’s housing requirement, unless other settlements are identified through a neighbourhood plan”. This policy provides a further breakdown and it identifies a housing requirement for the village of Sturton-le-Steeple of 11 dwellings. The Draft Policy also states that “proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish, by more than 5% individually or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission (granted since 1 April 2018) or through site allocations in respective neighbourhood plans. Furthermore, Draft Policy ST2 states a housing minimum requirement, which would indicate that there is no cap on sustainable development but then the additional policy wording applies a cap of 5% of the total number of dwellings in the parish and its states that this figure should not be exceeded. Our commentary above is also applicable to this cap. The suggested 5% is far too restrictive and it will stifle development in the rural settlements required to ensure they remain sustainable. There should be no cap on sustainable development, as referenced in many planning appeals. Policies ST1 and ST2 are currently unsound with an unjustified cap on sustainable growth in the Rural Settlements. The wording of these policies should be updated to reflect our comments made above on the restrictive percentage but to also allow sustainable development to come forward, regardless of the identified housing requirement. The purpose is to ensure the vitality and viability of all settlements and to provide local communities with a choice of new homes. Policy ST1, Policy ST2To ensure the soundness tests of Policies ST1 and ST2 are met, we respectfully request change the wording to allow for a greater level of housing growth in the Small Rural Settlements. Furthermore, there should be no cap on sustainable development to be in line with national policy. It is important that the smaller rural settlements such as Sturton-le-Steeple are able to make a meaningful contribution to the future housing land supply in the Bassetlaw District and to ensure that they can maintain a healthy population within their local communities	Each of the identified Large and Small Rural Settlements have been allocated a growth requirement. This requirement is considered a reasonable level of growth to support the needs of the settlements, whilst considering the size, character and scale of the settlements. It is right for the Local Plan to distinguish between the individual settlements and their role, function and character when considering the distribution of housing across the District. Policy ST2 also provides the mechanism for additional growth if there is a need or it is planned through the Neighbourhood Planning process. There are communities that are already doing this. The Neighbourhood Plan process is considered the most reasonable and fair way to gauge the level of community support.
REF196	Savills on behalf of The Henry Smith Charity	Clayworth is classified as a ‘Small Rural Settlement’ within the Draft Local Plan. Draft policy states that development in the Small Rural Settlements accommodate a minimum of 1502 dwellings of the District’s housing requirement. The previous draft of the Local Plan included a provision for 20% growth within Smaller Rural Settlements. The current iteration of the Plan has reduced this provision considerably to 5%. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF supports growth in the rural areas: “To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies 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.” It is considered that the reduction to 5% is not sufficient to ensure the sustainable growth in many rural settlements. Clayworth is a village with local services and paragraph 78 emphasises the need for development in these particular locations to enable them to thrive. The 7 dwellings proposed is considered insufficient to maximise the potential benefits to local services both within Clayworth and other villages in the surrounding area. In addition, whilst the aspirations of criterion D.3) are supported, the requirement for a site to be previously developed in order for growth to be supported is considered unduly restrictive. It is recommended that this criteria is optional rather than a prerequisite for support. Part E of ST2 is considered to also considered to be contrary to the principles of sustainable development, particularly in Small Rural Settlements, which have facilities. Whilst there are many Neighbourhood Plans underway within Bassetlaw, not all areas are preparing these. It is important that areas are able to contribute to a higher growth target than 5% irrespective of whether or not a Neighbourhood Plan is underway. There is a significant time commitment associated with the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan and not all communities will be in a position to prepare one. It is therefore essential that the policy does not prejudice the growth potential of Small Rural Villages where a Neighbourhood Plan is not being prepared. It is recommended that part E is removed from policy ST2. The requirements of criteria 2 and 4 address the character of any proposed development and are considered sufficient to ensure that new housing responds appropriately to its context. Consideration should be given to the longer term application of policy ST2 to ensure that whilst growth takes place in suitable locations at an appropriate scale, the timescale of the Local Plan does not constrain development in the later years of the plan period. It will be important that when reviewing the Local Plan, consideration is given to the amount of housing built in the Small Rural Settlements in the previous years to ensure that villages do not stagnate once targets have been met. There may be opportunities within and on the edge of rural villages for the reuse of agricultural buildings for new activities, including residential. In some cases, these proposals can be undertaken without the need for planning permission via an application for prior approval under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO. In other cases, these proposals would need to be undertaken via a planning application, where Class Q would not be applicable. In all instances, where appropriate buildings are converted, this should be seen as a sustainable approach to new housing growth which makes use of existing resources. For this reason, it is important that planning policy allows for this type of development to take place. It is also essential that policy views these conversions separately from new build development in villages, and additional housing created through conversions should be excluded from any growth figures set out in ST2. Conclusions. Policy ST2 which supports some development in Small Rural Villages should go further an allow up to 20% growth as a means of ensuring that communities	<p>Settlements across rural Bassetlaw vary in size and scale. Their level of services, facilities and infrastructure also varies according to the location. The Council believe that it is important to support growth in the rural area, but it must be planned in a sustainable way. The feedback from previous public consultation was that 20% for smaller settlements should be reduced as it could lead to a significant change to a settlements size, scale and character. There was also concern that local infrastructure may not be able to support such growth. In addition, it was also pointed out that there was no distinction between the large and small rural settlements in terms of the percentage growth as they were both at 20%</p> <p>Therefore by reducing the percentage growth for smaller settlements is more consistent with their size and character. Policy ST2 provides flexibility where communities can plan for additional development is they wish to do so through a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Where there is a need for a particular type of residential development, then Policy ST2 provides a mechanism to support this i.e. affordable housing, First Homes and rural dwellings.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
		remain sustainable and local services supported. It is recommended that criterion E is removed as, at present it would have a negative impact on villages which are not preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.	
REF187	iba Planning	<p>Finally, we also have concerns about the amendments made to the criteria contained within Policy ST2 applicable when the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been reached. Policy ST2(E) states that where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and Council through the preparation, or review, of a Neighbourhood Plan. This is far more restrictive than the wording of the previous version of the policy in the January 2020 Local Plan, where additional housing beyond the percentage housing target was permissible under a greater range of circumstances, including where the proposal provides affordable housing or specialist housing to help meet a local need for that community, provides a community-led housing scheme, where it is part of a wider regeneration scheme or on an existing brownfield site within or adjoining a Large or Small Rural Settlement, or where it is essential to enable the redevelopment of a heritage asset. The amended wording, with its primary focus on Neighbourhood Plans, penalises communities which do not have a Neighbourhood Plan and may prevent sites coming forward on sites in such settlements even if they have high levels of community support. It could also prevent the development of sites in Neighbourhood Plan areas which have community support but are not specifically supported in the Neighbourhood Plan, perhaps because the site was not available at the time of the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan or because the views of the community or the perceived need for additional housing have changed since the making of the Neighbourhood Plan (Neighbourhood Plans provide a snap shot of overall community opinion at the time of their making but do not reflect changes in public opinion that arise over time). Such development could include schemes for affordable housing or specialist housing to help meet local needs (often highly valued in rural communities as evident in the HUGS Neighbourhood Plan, the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan, and the Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan), community-led housing schemes, regeneration of brownfield sites, or development essential to enable the preservation of a heritage asset, all important forms of development with tangible benefits to the local community previously supported under ST2(E). Having regard to the above, we submit that the previous wording of Policy ST2(E) encompassing the greater range of circumstances where additional housing above the cap will be considered is a fairer policy which does not disadvantage communities without Neighbourhood Plans or prevent communities with made Neighbourhood Plans from deviating from their plans as a result of a change in circumstances or public opinion, and provides greater flexibility to enable settlements to react to changes in circumstances, as advocated by the NPPF (paragraph 81). As such, we would request that the Council consider reinstating the previous wording to Policy ST2(E) set out in the January 2020 version of the Local Plan. In summary, we cannot support the Council's latest approach to rural housing growth set out in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020 which prevents growth in many smaller rural settlements in the District previously considered suitable for limited growth, and request that the Council reconsider its approach and revert back to the approach set out in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan January 2020 (as amended to take into account our outstanding concerns to this), or even better, the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan, which will result in the Local Plan which better supports the vitality of rural Bassetlaw and aligns with national planning policy.</p>	<p>The revised Policy provides a clearer criteria as to what types of residential development will be supported once the growth requirement has been met. This includes the need for affordable housing, First Homes, rural dwellings or conversions of existing buildings.</p> <p>The Council believe the Neighbourhood Planning process is the fairest way of judging the level of community support as the Plan is required to go through a strict process of public consultation and referendum.</p> <p>Bassetlaw has a number of Neighbourhood Plans that are seeking more development than the Local Plan requires due to local need or to support local services and facilities. This supports the view that this part of the Policy is reasonable and can work in practice.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	<p>In the previous stage of representation, we raised concerns over the proposed implementation of a 20% “cap” for growth in Large and Small Rural Settlements. We were concerned with the blanket cap’s lack of flexibility to meeting the overall objective of the National Planning Policy Framework of promoting housing in sustainable locations. The “cap” would also severely limit the flexibility for new sustainable sites to come forward throughout the Plan Period. Should larger, more strategic sites not come forward, smaller sites in locations lower in the Settlement Hierarchy can play a vital role in providing housing across the District. A “cap” would jeopardise this ability. It is therefore disappointing to see that within draft Policy ST2, the “cap” for Small Rural Settlements has been reduced to only 5% of the existing dwellings within the settlements. This will continue to place severe limitations on the land which can come forward for development across rural Bassetlaw. We would also be concerned that the cap will prejudice the committed growth in existing Neighbourhood Plans that would already appear to exceed the cap and demonstrate significant community support. Perhaps an exemption to any final cap, if it is chosen to be applied, should be given to those commitments so as to not derail the commitments of an existing Neighbourhood Plan or force their review into a downward projection? Paragraph 68 of the National Planning Policy Framework highlights the important contribution small and medium sized sites can make towards meeting the housing requirement of an area, noting their relatively quick built-out rates. Whilst it is appreciated that the number of dwellings allocated for development across small rural settlements is reflective of their placing within the settlement hierarchy, it is the very construct of this hierarchy that is questioned owing to the inclusion of a significant number of sustainable locations in the ‘small rural settlement’ category when they would be better represented in all aspects of the plan through a category above. The implementation of such a small “cap” on these settlements will inhibit the ability for a sufficient amount and variety of land to come forward across the Plan period. Furthermore, we note that the Government’s recently revised Standard Housing Methodology has redressed the balance and distribution of housing figures nationwide; in particular where there is not an up to date development plan, a cap will be introduced at 40% above whichever is the higher of the projected housing growth in the last adopted Core Strategy (2011) or the 10 year household projections from 2014. From our initial review of this situation in Bassetlaw, it would suggest that either scenario would place the District Council in a position where it will need to reforecast its housing requirements in the emerging plan. An inevitable consequence of this, in our view, will be that the Council cannot rely on the prospective Garden Village and its largest settlements alone. It must have to redress growth in the more sustainable settlements across Rural Bassetlaw as a key part of the reforecasting. P&DG would therefore continue to express its concerns over the application of a “cap”, whether at 5% or 20%. The expectation upon significant community support to deliver more than the desired cap is also not particularly progressive to respond to the eminent housing needs that exist now; communities that may not express a wish to commence a Neighbourhood Plan or Plan Review may experience delay in preparing a plan when the settlement itself is sustainable in many regards. With the onus upon delivery and ensuring plan viability through the course of the plan period, ‘under allocating’ sufficient housing numbers and sites in rural Bassetlaw will only place further risk and delay to the plan and there is a risk it may not truly grasp the precedent development demands placed upon the current plan at this initial stage. In paragraph 5.2.5, it states that the figures for existing Parish dwellings are from 13th August 2018. Given that this Plan is not likely to be adopted until Mid-2022, it is vital that the dwelling figures across Parishes are updated to reflect the most up to date data available. We also wish to ask for the District Council’s clarification if the prospective housing numbers for each settlement are inclusive or exclusive of the current commitments consented. The answer to this will have a particular bearing on the settlements with recent planning consents for residential development, including Nether Langwith and Cuckney. As highlighted within the previous consultation process, P&DG has reservations with the placement of Nether Langwith on the settlement hierarchy as a ‘Small Rural Settlement, despite its close social and spatial relationship with Langwith and Whaley Thorns. There are far too many settlements included in this category, with varying levels of amenities that are not particularly consistent to apply an accurate judgement of their sustainability. We believe there should be a further category between those of a large and small rural settlement, to illustrate those with particular importance as a rural hub and to provide consistency with Neighbourhood Plans. In the case of Cuckney, its role in this way is well defined within the made Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan (CNHW), in supporting all of the other settlements in the plan area. Cuckney already includes a number of Neighbourhood Plan allocations that would be prejudiced by the proposed capping of growth in the small rural settlements of the emerging Plan; its pivotal role as a hub should be reflected through our suggestion towards introducing a new component of the settlement hierarchy. To reiterate the amenity offer in Cuckney includes the following: • Primary school; • Village hall and café; • Public house; • Place of worship; • Car garage; • Homeware/interior décor shop; • Bus service between Edwinstowe and Market Warsop; • Community garden; and • Cricket club. Notwithstanding the above, because of the unique role this settlement has in its relationship with Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck, and the facilities across all four settlements, Cuckney is in proximity to a number of other amenities including the Welbeck Farm Shop, Harley Gallery and Portland Collection, Notcutts Garden Centre, Lady Margaret Hall and adjacent tennis courts. There is also a limited post office at Holbeck Woodhouse. Collectively, this is an above average range of amenities for Cuckney to be considered above a small rural</p>	<p>Growth in rural communities should be carefully controlled to enable sustainable development and resist developments where they would lead to an unacceptable impact on the environment and local infrastructure. In conjunction with Policy ST1, Policy ST2 sets an individual growth requirement for both Large and Small rural Settlements. These settlements have been divided according to their size, the level of services and facilities and their role and function.</p> <p>Large Rural Settlements are the larger settlements with key services and facilities. These settlements also provide a service centre role to nearby smaller communities who tend to use the larger settlements for shopping, health and education facilities.</p> <p>Small Rural Settlements have some services and facilities, but are limited in size and often only provides an internal function in contrast to the larger settlements.</p> <p>The distribution of growth compliments their distinction within Policy ST1 and supports National Policy which encourages development within sustainable locations.</p> <p>Cuckney does not meet the necessary criteria to be classified as a Large Rural Settlement. It is small in size and only offers limited services and facilities.</p> <p>The Cuckney Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites to accommodate development and those remain available for development. If the community feel that additional growth is required to support their local services and facilities, then this can be planned through a review of the made Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As individual settlements, Holbeck and Norton do not meet the criteria to classify as Small Rural Settlements. However, the growth requirement for Cuckney can be redistributed towards other settlements within the Neighbourhood Plan Area if there is reasoned justification.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
		<p>settlement, and similarly to exclude Holbeck and Norton from being considered as part of the open countryside. In the case of Nether Langwith, P&DG has raised a number of concerns with the assessments made of the sustainability of this settlement. We would suggest that such an assessment of Nether Langwith must absolutely be made in the context of the amenities that lie over the border into Bolsover, encompassing both the amenities of Langwith and Whaley Thorns. If an assessment were to be made in this way, it would undoubtedly change the category of this settlement from a small rural settlement to a large rural settlement. With the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in its early stages, it is essential that this corresponds positively with the correct definition in the hierarchy to determine the level of growth and infrastructure needs throughout the plan period. We therefore would like to ask the District Council whether this spatial relationship and level of amenities afforded to these settlements, within walking distance of the part of Nether Langwith located in Bassetlaw, has been appropriately considered in the settlement hierarchy and Sustainability Appraisal? The settlements combined provide, among others, the following amenities in walking distance of the part of Nether Langwith administratively included within Bassetlaw. This is by no means an exhaustive list, but does illustrate the significant amenity offer commensurate to a 'large rural settlement':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railway station with an hourly service each way from Nottingham-Worksop and connections to Sheffield, Retford and Lincoln; • Regular bus services to Chesterfield, Mansfield, Edwinstowe and Worksop; • Medical centre; • Poulter Country Park; • Primary schools; • Two post offices and local convenience stores (various); • Boots Pharmacy; • Coffee shop; • Florists; • Takeaway outlets; • Hairdressers and beauty salon; • Public houses (various); • Places of worship; • Motor garage; • Sports and social club; • Heritage centre; • Village hall; • Care home; • Sports pitches and play area; • A small but important commercial offer for local businesses; and • Community allotments. <p>The above amenity provision (when spatially considered together) suggests a very healthy provision of amenities, many of which are both in walking distance of the part of Nether Langwith located in Bassetlaw and we suggest would likely be used by households there. Alternatives would often require travel beyond the nearest settlements. P&DG suggest that the District Council reconsider their position to include Nether Langwith as a Large Rural Settlement for Growth. 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. Furthermore the sustainability merits of this settlement have been extensively proven in favour of existing planning consents 16/01216/FUL and 20/00634/RES south of Portland Road; with Reserved Matters permission granted in October 2020 there is every intention to press ahead with this site and discharge the relevant planning conditions. It will however mean further sites need to be considered here in the plan period the context of the adjustments to the settlement hierarchy we consider essential here. When compared to other settlements within the Large Rural designation, including Misterton and Carlton in Lindrick, the combination of Nether Langwith, Langwith, and Whaley Thorns present a similar, if not greater variety of services and amenities. It is clear that, if viewed in combination with the neighbouring settlements, Nether Langwith has the amenities and services to designate it a Large Rural Settlement. In addition to this, the accessibility of the settlement is much better than other Large Rural Settlements due to its railway station, offering hourly services to Nottingham and Worksop and onward connections. P&DG also raises concerns with the omission of Norton and Holbeck in the settlement hierarchy, for reasons given throughout our representations. With our suggestion that Cuckney should be considered above that of a 'Small Rural Settlement', the role of Norton and Holbeck within the Parish's made Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of allocations for growth. The emerging plan's restrictive cap is incompatible with this shared vision across all settlements within the Neighbourhood Plan and level of growth contained within it, which is being incrementally being delivered on the ground through planning permissions and implementations. It is our view that both settlements should be included as a small rural settlement.</p>	
1671403	Resident	<p>Small rural settlements-C page 37- have provided earlier response and on reflection want to add the following relating to the sites I have referenced sites 281 and 276 in Sutton-cum-Lound. My concern is that the land will remain dormant and unused if development is not permissible. Site 281, part of the former stackyard, is not large enough for use other than a building development. Many years ago it had outline planning for a house on it and could have been included within the farm buildings conversion done a number of years ago, but for reasons which I do not know it was not. This small plot of land does not have any alternative use. It will be unfortunate if other sites are developed when this small plot is available and has no alternative use. I understand this site to come within the development plan for the village received a significant number of supportive comments in the last review. The second site 276 is a field which has previously been let for livestock but has not had tenants using it for a number of years. It has been advertised and word of mouth used to find a new tenants but no-one has been found. The field is not appropriate for cultivation because farmers who have been approached are not willing to travel to one field. This site will remain unused for other purposes and provides potential for housing if included in the development envelop.</p>	<p>Sutton cum Lound is considered a Small Rural Settlement and suitable to accommodate limited growth. Policy ST2 provides a growth requirement for Sutton. However, when considering recent monitoring data, it shows that the growth requirement has already been met by planning permissions and Neighbourhood Plan allocations.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF200	Savills on behalf of land owners	<p>As mentioned previously, while we welcome growth directed to villages in order to maintain rural vitality there are two points to make. Firstly we question the categorisation of Elkesley as a smaller village rather than a large rural settlement and disappointed this results in a housing requirement of 5% compared to the expected 20% which we understood informally from officer's was the chosen approach in autumn 2020. Secondly we would advise against the use of a 'cap' figure as it is inconsistent with the NPPF. Elkesley as a Large Rural Settlement It is understood that the categorising the villages centres around the LPA's considered 'sustainability' of the these settlements to accommodate growth (figure 4 of the Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study 2020). However we note from page 10 that a Large Rural Settlement will: "Play a role as a 'service centre' for other settlements, have individually 500 or more dwellings and have all of the following; a primary school, doctors surgery/health centre, a community centre/hall, a convenience store, a church and a public house." (Page 10. Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study November 2020) Taking each in turn, firstly we would also consider Elkesley's role as a local rural service centre for other settlements (such as Gamston/ Markham Moor/ Rockley and West Drayton). We note it was excluded at the time of the 2018 Functional Cluster Assessment (page 4) but it clearly performs this settlement cluster role. In terms of settlement size we would welcome clarity that the figures include committed growth (for example the recently approved application for 39 units with a flexible commercial unit – reference 20/00959/OUT) which when completed would bring it broadly in line with the same population as Blyth at c. 1,200 residents. We would add that population size is also a crude estimate as it is relative to its area and should not be relied upon as the sole reason for allocating a settlement. We note the inventory and Elkesley itself is highly sustainable and benefits from a Primary and Nursery School, coffee shop, bakery, pop up post office and a takeaway/ restaurant. Further afield there is also a tea room and School Farm shop (during summer months), making it a sustainable location for development with future opportunities to only improve the current situation. Elkesley village also benefits from direct access on to the A1, improved as part of the recently completed new Elkesley Bridge Road infrastructure project which provides additional capacity and access to both Retford and Worksop. The village also benefits from four bus services departing from High Street, while run as a rural service, provide routes to Doncaster and Retford. Commercially, the village also benefits from Elkesley Park Industrial Estate which consists of warehousing and distribution uses for employment opportunities. A new retail (village shop) opportunity is being delivered as part of application 20/00959/OUT and as part of our proposed scheme a pub would delivered within the village to build on the service the coffee shop already provides. In terms of the 'inventory', we note that one of the eligible large rural settlements listed within draft Policy ST2 is Blyth. This is very comparable to that of Elkesley. Blyth has a primary school, pub, restaurant and church and village shop and a similar population. It has no health services like Elkesley so clearly flexibility can be applied to the criteria. Given the comparisons between these two villages, it is our view that Elkesley should be upgraded to a large rural settlement. It is therefore our recommendation that Elkesley is upgraded to a large rural settlement given the village has a range of key facilities and shops and the opportunity for future facilities to generally meet the criteria (similar to that of Blyth). In the interests of effective, justified, positive and consistent plan making. Planned and Future Sustainability There is also a final factor that needs to be considered. Not restricting housing has a fundamental role to play in the sustainability of villages, such as Elkesley. In doing so it will make a contribution in meeting the overall housing targets for the area and should be recognised as a key component to the overall growth strategy within the district and in encouraging sustainable development more generally in rural areas. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF and PPG (rural housing) are clear on this. It is important that rural settlements such as Elkesley are allowed to manage growth in a positive way through allocating deliverable sites to meet the needs and help sustain the critical mass and ensure facilities and services continue to thrive and expand as it has positively done so through the Neighbourhood Plan and will seek to do so again. The site, south of Coalpit Lane could help to alleviate the housing pressures and concentration of older generations and provide 'starter homes' to help affordability and home ownership within the village whilst also safeguarding the social infrastructure of the village. The landowners of the site are also keen on maximising benefits back to the village including providing a new pub and opportunities for other onsite facilities in agreement with the residents and Parish Council such as amenity greenspace. It is clear that the village should not be restricted should they decide this is a suitable option for growth and as such the 5% 'cap' should be regarded as a minimum figure and not a maximum. In accordance with paragraph 78 of the NPPF. Recommendation: remove 'cap' of % in favour of 'minimum' percent in the interests of positive and compliant plan making. Part E of Policy ST2 We would also like to draw attention to the wording of part E of the policy, which highlights the reliance on a Neighbourhood Plan for additional housing development above that prescribed within the policy. Such a requirement would mean that we would be inadvertently tied into a new Neighbourhood Plan which could take between 2-3 years to develop and adopt. We would therefore highlight that support by residents and Parish Council would be sufficient to allow additional growth in absence of the resources and timeframe to deliver a new neighbourhood plan and to ensure urgent needs are met. Such policies are commonplace in plan making for example with South Kesteven's policy SP4 adopted 2020 which largely mirrors what is being suggested. We therefore suggest the following wording for part E: "Where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the</p>	<p>Elkesley does not meet the criteria, as identified within the Rural Background Paper, to be classified as a Large Rural Settlement. Although the village does have some services and facilities, and is located adjacent to the A1 it is rural in character and has slowly grown over the last 20 years. The settlement's role is generally to provide for its residents and it doesn't provide a role to support other settlements' needs mainly do it is location.</p> <p>This approach has been supported through the production of the Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently being reviewed where smaller sites are favoured over larger developments.</p> <p>This Neighbourhood Plan allocates a site to accommodate new facilities and some affordable housing over the plan period. The growth ambitions within the made Neighbourhood Plan generally reflect those identified in the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>However, If the community feel that additional growth is required to support their local services and facilities or there is a need for a particular type of housing or employment related development, then this can be planned for within the review of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
		community or Parish Council”. In the interests of positive and effective plan making. In summary, we set out our recommendations on the Draft Local Plan as follows, in the interests of effective, justified, consistent and positive plan making Recommendation 1: Elkesley to be moved up the settlement hierarchy and be recognised as a Large Rural settlement which affords 20% growth given the facilities and shops within the village. In the interests of justified, positive and effective plan making. Recommendation 2: remove ‘cap’ of % in favour of ‘minimum’ percent in the interests of positive and compliant plan making. Recommendation 3: In the interests of positive and effective plan making, BDC should reword part E of Draft Policy ST2 as follows: “Where the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community or Parish Council”. Further, the land south of Coalpit Lane ‘Elkesley Fields’ represents an opportunity to deliver essential growth within the village of Elkesley. There are no known technical constraints (for example ecology, flood risk, drainage, ground and heritage) that would preclude this site coming forward. The landowners are willing and able to develop their land with the aim of creating a world class exemplar of rural development - maximising benefits back to the village for generations to come.	
REF198 Bevecotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>The above policy sets out the Council’s approach to support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Bassetlaw’s rural area over the plan period to 2037. Part B of Policy ST2 states that development proposals in ‘large rural settlements’ through site allocations, neighbourhood plans or appropriate development within development boundaries will be supported where certain criteria are met. Gladman consider that the use of settlement boundaries to arbitrarily restrict sustainable development from coming forward on the edge of suitable settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework. Gladman would object to an overly onerous approach such as this if it were to preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the District’s housing need, in accordance with the ‘Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Part C of Policy ST2 sets out that small rural settlements will be required to deliver a minimum of 1,502 dwellings over the plan period unless other settlements are identified through a neighbourhood plan. This represents a significant increase of 37.8% from the previous iteration of the Local Plan which proposed a requirement for small rural settlements of 1,090 dwellings. The updated Spatial Strategy Background Paper (November 2020) highlights that attempts have been made to rebalance housing distribution in Bassetlaw by ensuring that the majority of housing development is directed to the most sustainable settlements alongside addressing concern regarding the lack of planned growth at Retford. However, it is unclear as to how the revised housing requirement for small rural areas has been calculated when set against the overall housing requirement only increasing by 10.2%, particularly as the growth percentage for the Small Rural Settlements is now 5% to produce a more sustainable growth pattern. In addition, Gladman propose that further clarity is required between Policy ST2 C) and the corresponding table referring to Eligible Small Rural Settlements and housing requirements. Part C states that ‘eligible Small Rural Settlements’ will accommodate a minimum of 1502 dwellings, unless further settlements are identified through a neighbourhood plan. Yet, the accompanying table only sets a provision of 473 dwellings through the housing requirement column. It is therefore unclear where the additional 1,029 dwellings will be delivered. Part D of the policy lists criteria whereby proposals in small rural settlements will be supported. Gladman are largely supportive of the criteria listed, however we raise concerns that D(1) would set a development cap on settlements across the small rural settlement category with little regard to the site-specific sustainability merits of a development proposal. Indeed, Criterion D(1) would effectively act to preclude the delivery of sustainable development from coming forwards contrary to the explicit requirements of the Framework. Gladman recommend that this aspect of the policy is amended to ensure it does not place a cap on sustainable development. Similarly, Part E states that once the percentage housing requirement for an eligible settlement has been achieved additional housing will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and the Council through the preparation or review of a neighbourhood plan. Gladman are concerned that the proposed requirement for local community support for development goes further than that required by paragraph 40 of the Framework. This requirement may hinder and restrict otherwise sustainable development from coming forward and Gladman suggest this aspect is removed from the Plan.</p>	<p>The housing distribution tables and information have since been amended to consider the latest information. These are available within the Publication version of the Local Plan. Policy ST2 has also been updated to reflect previous comment and the criteria now includes additional references.</p> <p>It is important to give communities a clear guide on what level of growth they should be planning for. Policy ST2 aims to achieve by identifying a growth requirement for those affected settlements. Once those requirements have been achieved, then local communities can plan for this through the preparation or review of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Other developments such as those for needs base accommodation (like affordable housing), economic development and rural tourism are covered within other policies or through the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Willmore on behalf of land owners	<p>We object to the approach taken by the planning strategy for the rural areas of Bassetlaw. As set out above, we have significant concerns in relation to the overall quantum of development that has been directed towards the District's rural villages. Policy ST2 sets out the housing requirements for Bassetlaw's rural settlements to grow appropriately in order to maintain rural vitality whilst retaining distinctiveness. Whilst we support the need to maintain the viability and vitality of rural services, this needs to be planned for by understanding the health and hinterlands of those services and the level of development that is needed to support them (and through locating that level of development in a location accessible to those services). The fundamental flaw of the Local Plan's proposed approach is that many of the rural villages identified in the Local Plan for growth do not have any notable services to meet their day-to-day needs. It is not sustainable to require more households to live in remote locations where they are encouraged to travel in sporadic patterns to access remote facilities. It is much more sustainable for those villages to be sustained by their rural hubs (the main settlements) where trips can be linked, and journeys made by public transport, such as Retford. It is also unclear as to how the housing requirement for each village in Policy ST2 has been derived. There appears to be no logic behind this and whilst we accept that some communities might wish to have some development, other mechanisms such as Neighbourhood Plans are available to achieve this. 6.21 We therefore object to Policy ST2. The plan as drafted will direct a significant amount of housing to the least sustainable locations within the District and will not enhance their sustainability but simply increase the number of homes which are located unsustainably.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw is largely a rural District and therefore it is reasonable to plan for growth within some of its rural communities. The strategy has evolved over time and the Plan is now proposing a tiered approach to rural growth by directing the majority of development to larger settlements and providing a smaller individual requirement for the smaller settlements. The majority of this housing requirement has already been committed through planning permissions or completed. Any remaining growth is directed to those settlements that can accommodate some development which is at a similar rate to previous growth rates. Where there is the desire, additional growth can be planned through a Neighbourhood Plan or delivered through the local needs channel within the NPPF or Policy ST2.</p>
REF091	Consultant on behalf of land owner	<p>Within Policy ST2 residential development is proposed within Hayton and the adjoining settlement of Clarborough. The Policy proposes that the housing requirement at Hayton is only 8 dwellings and 25 dwellings at Clarborough. This is a total requirement for new homes within the settlements up to 2037. In 2019 within the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan the aim was to provide proportionate growth in rural Bassetlaw to support the vitality of rural settlements and as such it was proposed that the growth would be between 10% and 20% of the existing dwellings numbers within the settlement-this resulted in a requirement of between 16 and 32 new dwellings over the life of the Local Plan. Growth within settlements like Hayton is essential to support the broader sustainability aims of the settlement, new development can play an important role in sustaining existing facilities like the convenience store, pub, village hall and church etc. The only explanation of why the Council has reduced the requirement from 20% growth to 5% growth appears to relate to constraints such as flood risk and the availability of suitable land in some villages. This is not the case in Hayton as the Church Farm site relates to a brownfield site in a central location within the settlement and the site is not at risk of flooding. Many of the buildings on the site are no longer suitable for modern farming practices and in order to achieve greater efficiencies the owners now farm in partnership with another local farmer. The redevelopment of the site will provide the opportunity to improve the aesthetics of the Main Street within the village through the removal of old and unattractive agricultural buildings which are out of scale and character with their immediate surroundings. It is proposed that Church Farm is suitable and available for limited residential development within Hayton. The attached plans show a small residential scheme of 20 detached dwellings which includes a variety of sizes from 5x2 bed homes, 5x3 bed homes, 5x4 bed homes, 2x5 bed homes. The layout also includes 3 bungalows which could be built to the very highest energy standards for elderly residents. The proposal would include affordable housing in line with the requirement set out in the Draft Local Plan. The scheme would be able to fund its CIL requirement which would go towards the enhancement of facilities within Hayton subject to the approval of the Parish Council. The site has been submitted to the Parish Council as part of its initial work on the Hayton Neighbourhood Plan. Unfortunately, the Neighbourhood Plan which was designated in 2013 has not progressed. The Parish Council did try to progress work on the Neighbourhood Plan in 2020 but this was prevented through various lockdowns due to Covid 19.Planning consent for residential development at Corner Farm, Hayton was granted in 2020-however the same site was first granted planning consent in 1991 which is 20 years ago. Planning Consent was subsequently renewed on the same site in 2011, 2016 and again in 2020. To date no development has commenced which is not surprising as the site is occupied by a successful local business. In my opinion it is unreasonable to rely on this site to deliver the growth to support the settlement up to 2037 as the site is not available and deliverable which is proven by the fact that no development has taken place for 20 years.My client is willing to take part in discussions with the Parish Council through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. The owners have reduced the scale of their initial plans which were presented to the Parish Council in 2019 from 42 dwellings down to 20 dwellings. The proposed development is situated on the previously developed part of the site which is occupied by farm buildings and a yard area. The range of house types and sizes has been amended to encourage a wide range of new residents from first time buyers, affordable housing, family housing and retirement living. A wide range of occupiers will help to sustain the settlement of Hayton.</p>	<p>Although the housing requirement has reduced for Small Rural Settlements, communities can plan for additional growth through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. These plans can look at the type and location of additional growth which might be to help deliver affordable housing or regenerate a previously developed site for example.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST2 - RURAL BASSETLAW			
REF170	A&D Architecture	Policy ST2 should be similarly modified and include new sub -section F as follows: "F 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	This is covered through the housing mix and affordable housing section of the Local Plan

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
1647949	Resident	Reading the latest garden village plan rather confuses me, how can you justify cutting hectares of healthy trees down to promote a "green" labelled hub of employment directly looking across to a National Trust forest; please explain this contradiction as for the green village is sited next to the A1, not a good idea for our children to breathe in lorry pollution every day whilst growing up in this Green utopia. Let's think of how we will develop this area of good agricultural land, it will be with Diesel engined earth moving equipment again, the noise of this work will have a very bad effect for people and wildlife in Clumber park and the pollution to environment, the end doesn't justify the means. This shows a lack of empathy and understanding regarding the planners as to what a Village is and the word Green means. Look around outside your offices at Worksop High street (stagnant). Also, Retford town centre, all this is down to mistakes in past Planning still await a viable Plan.	The policy protects the existing woodland on site. A green buffer will be provided along the boundary to the A1 to help minimise potential impacts on future residents. The Council's Environmental Health have not raised any issues in relation to the allocation of this site. A Recreational Impact Assessment is being undertaken to ensure that any potential impacts upon Clumber Park are appropriately managed and mitigated. Natural England have agreed the approach. The emerging Worksop Central DPD and the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan promote the regeneration and growth of those town centres.
1661494	Resident	Appears to be a vanity project rather than a serious piece of planning. Building on farmland which drags the edges of Worksop closer to Retford should be prevented. Can think of villages that could benefit from expansion eg Dunham on Trent which has a school , shop , Restaurant, pub , village hall . The villages north of Retford appear to have space for development. Bevercotes is a brownfield site that could be developed. The garden village is an intrusion on the landscape and using the word ' Garden ' appears to be a bit of ' Greenwash ' to try and make this development more palatable .	There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that the Garden Village is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the development required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Local Plan promotes the sustainable growth of rural settlements. The Bassetlaw Rural Settlements Study sets out the approach to identifying eligible settlements where housing could be accommodated. The majority of Dunham on Trent is within Flood Zone 3 so housing development would not be appropriate. Bevercotes has planning permission for employment use so could be developed for business use. The Site Allocations: Landscape Study shows that the Garden Village can be accommodated without adverse impacts on the landscape.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>The concept of the Garden Village has direct links to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century concept of the Garden Suburb which itself had roots in the Arts and Crafts movement with its rejection of the industrial revolution and the unhealthy and noxious urban environments the revolution created. It was also dependent on good and affordable public transport links between the country and the city. For those who still had to work in the industrial cities but could afford to live outside it and commute they provided an ideal solution. Pastiche of a bucolic idyll that had never existed they may be but done well, they provided good houses that are still desirable, and a solution to an industrial age problem. So why not build a new Garden Village in Bassetlaw? The first reason is that there should be no new building until we have exhausted the possibilities of conversion of redundant commercial and industrial buildings. Second, now in a post-industrial age and solutions that were appropriate to an industrial age are inappropriate and anachronistic to our current housing crisis. Third, this harks back to the old twentieth century practice of zoning places of residence separate from places of work. The environmental impact of zoning is that it necessitates both the number and length of environmentally damaging car and public transport trips residents will need to make to access work, recreation, and shopping. Electric vehicles are only a partial solution and when the report argues that the new village will be convenient for the A1 and A57 this is, in fact, a statement of a major weakness of the proposal. Most redundant buildings fit for conversion are likely to be near places of work. Our cities are no longer noxious and unpleasant places to be in and town centres are ripe for regeneration where people might be able to live in walking or cycling distance to their place of work (with incidental health benefits). For all these reasons a new Garden Village should not be built in Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that the Garden Village is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the development required. The Garden Village identifies 10ha of employment land so that people can live and work in the same settlement, thus supporting the use of sustainable and active travel to move between home and work. The Plan supports the use of electric vehicles and the provision of infrastructure to support them. The benefit of having a new settlement adjoining the A1/A57 is that access is relatively direct reducing longer car journeys to reach the strategic highway network. The policy also promotes a new bus services to and through the site, and walking and cycling infrastructure. Further the proposal includes a new railway station which provides an opportunity to reduce the number of car journeys within the district and to South Yorkshire and Lincoln.</p>
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	<p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village provides a 'blank sheet' on which to develop many of the ideas described elsewhere in the document, e.g., quality housing, environmental benefits, healthy lifestyles, etc. Every effort must be made that these principles are not diminished over time. Misterton Parish Council is all too aware of the difficulties presented by inadequate, inflexible public transport, aged infrastructure (waste-water systems) that is not up to 21st century use, and lack of local services and facilities. Don't let this happen to the Garden Village! Page 38, para 5.3.1 This needs to refer to the adjacency of Doncaster Sheffield Airport.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Reference to accessibility to Doncaster-Sheffield Airport will be added.</p>
REF041	Retford Civic Society	<p>As indicated in response to the January 2020 Draft Plan, support the proposal for a new village at Five Lanes End. It is essential, that this development does not start until there is a mechanism in place to ensure that retail and other community facilities, including public transport services, are in place at an early stage to serve residents. This should be clearly stated in the Local Plan. There must be no possibility of the development ending up as little more than a housing estate in the countryside.</p>	<p>The Local Plan and planning application process will ensure that infrastructure is appropriately phased alongside new development at the Garden Village.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF047	Resident	For many years planning policy has favoured concentrating new housing in, and adjacent to, existing built-up areas to minimise the amount of travel by car to schools, shops, jobs and other facilities. New villages have been promoted elsewhere in the country largely only where green belt and other restrictions make it very difficult to find room for development. The proposed new village in Bassetlaw is not needed as housing need can be met without it. It would lead to much more travel by car than would be the case if the same number of houses were built in or next to existing built-up areas. The Draft Plan suggests that residents of the new village would benefit from good bus and train services, but this is unrealistic. It is very unlikely that a railway station would be viable even if the new village eventually reached 4000 houses. It would not be viable within the period of the Local Plan. Many Bassetlaw's villages now have no bus services at all, and the only villages with a regular service are those on routes between larger centres such as Retford to Doncaster or Retford to Newark. The proposed new village would not be on such a route. It is suggested that services would be subsidised by the development, but this is not sustainable in the long run. It is likely that most people in the proposed village would be wholly dependent on the car for travel. The Draft Plan suggests that the new village would have extensive cultural, recreational and shopping facilities. By the end of the Plan period it would have only some 500 homes. Few Bassetlaw villages of that size can now support even a shop. For many years the village is likely to be little more than a housing estate in the countryside. During that time residents will have become reliant on travel to larger centres for shopping, education, recreation and employment. There is a very serious risk that the extensive facilities suggested in the Draft Plan will never materialise even if the target of 4000 homes is reached. The concept of a new village in Bassetlaw is unnecessary and unsustainable. It should be removed from the Local Plan. If the scale of house building proposed is reduced, this could be achieved without wider implications for the Plan as a whole.	The Garden Village is economically led, needed to drive economic growth in the growth sectors. The Plan states that the Village would support growth of employment and housing over the next 30 years so provides a sustainable growth option for the long term. Evidence confirms that a railway station would be viable with 4000 homes. A new bus service would be introduced to support the Village which could support other villages as well. The Village will be plan led and there will be a requirement for infrastructure to be phased alongside new development.
REF057	Clarbrough and Welham Parish Council	More generally, welcome the proposals for the garden village. Concerned that other villages in our area are not adversely affected by the development in their vicinity.	Ongoing engagement with affected Parish Councils will ensure that all concerns are taken into account in the planning of the Garden Village.
REF061	Resident	The route from the B6079 (Retford to Worksop road) to the A1/A57 at Appley Head, ie Mansfield Road from the Babworth crossroads is currently used by many drivers from the Retford area to reach the A614 at the Appley Head junction. This route is used to avoid the need to access the A1 between Ranby and Appley Head and the dangers inherent in large numbers of slow moving local vehicles using this stretch of a fast and busy dual carriageway road for only a very short distance. The new Garden Village planning has deliberately eliminated the B6420 (Mansfield Road) as an access to the Appley Head junction. It is important that this access to Appley Head is maintained in order to avoid the dangers of large numbers of local drivers needing to use the A1. Seen in the past the dangers of mixing local, slow moving, vehicles and long distance, high speed vehicles with the very many road traffic collisions which occurred at the old A1, A57, A614 roundabout, which was eventually replaced with the current junction. The removal of the B6420 route to the Appley Head junction would be very much a retrograde step in road safety.	The Mansfield Road will remain. It will be re-aligned to travel through the development rather than bisecting it. It will be designed to ensure the safe movement of traffic.
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	Paragraph 5.3.22 states that the proposed Garden Village lies within an MSA/MCA. Confirm that the site does not lie within the MSA/MCA and so this paragraph can be removed from the Plan.	Comments noted. Reference will be removed.
1658674	D2N2	para 5.3.39 in agreement that development should be future-proofed. Covid-19 has exposed both the significant potential to drive up productivity through adoption of digital services and the development of digital skills, but also the potential risks of digital exclusion if infrastructure to enable digital working and learning is not in place. Like Bassetlaw District Council, are committed to supporting development that contributes to tackling climate change and that adopts high environmental standards. Look forward to continuing to work with the Nottinghamshire local authorities' Environmental Strategy Working Group to embed and share best practice in low carbon growth.	Support noted and welcome.
REF074	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	Have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets. Bassetlaw Garden Village (ST3 and ST6) XE ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: High Marnham – Thurcroft – West Melton. A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only. Please also see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets. National Grid is happy to provide guidance to the Council concerning their networks. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans	National Grid have been consulted on each iteration of the Plan and ongoing duty to cooperate meetings have taken place. The Policy will be amended to make appropriate reference to the transmission lines crossing the site and the requirement for mitigation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		<p>and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets. National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets. Electricity assets Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance. National Grid's 'Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines' promote the successful development of sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: https://www.nationalgridet.com/document/130626/download The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets', which can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets Gas assets High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines. National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement. National Grid's 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Gas assets': www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p>	
REF089	Resident	B13. The path and cycleway links to Worksop and are good but could there be a direct link to Retford with a shared path and cycleway along the B6420 to Babworth and the A620 to Retford. This would also provide a safe path and cycleway from Retford to Clumber Park.	A proposal for the long term is to improve the off road walking/cycling link between the Garden Village and Ordsall South currently a public right of way.
REF094	Network Rail	<p>Confirm its support for the principle of the Garden Village allocation and the provision of a station to serve the development subject to the impact of the stopping patterns on the timetable (including turnaround times at terminating stations). Think there needs to be more emphasis on the impact of the allocation on the level crossings in the vicinity. 5.3.37 for the need to improve the local highway network where the impacts are significant. However, there is no specific mention in the Policy of the level crossings affected. This is a significant omission given we have previously made reference to the crossings and the likely impacts that will occur, and that level crossings remain the highest single source of risk to the safe operation of the rail network. For information that previous advice is again given below. In terms of level crossings, advised that there are two and possibly three crossings that could be significantly 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). Starting point is that the closure of any level crossing is welcome and should be pursued wherever possible. In terms of the easiest first, Howard's No.1 is a simple occupation crossing which as far as we are aware has no right of way over it; any private rights would be lost if severance of ownership occurred through the re-development of the land but 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 examine the opportunities for possible closure of the Rushey Sidings crossing – as this is a current half barrier crossing it is more of a risk than the others). Ask that Policy ST3 is amended slightly at criterion 13, to include an additional criterion 13 (a) v – the closure of Howards No.1 level crossing and measures to reduce the risk at, or the elimination of, Mansfield Road and Rusheys Sidings level crossings.</p>	Support for railway station welcome. Reference to the closure of Howards No.1 level crossing and measures to reduce the risk at, or the elimination of, Mansfield Road and Rusheys Sidings level crossings will be added to the policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF097	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	This proposal was considered as a more favourable focus for the development of new housing in the Bassetlaw District. • The site is close to the main A1 arterial road network and so will not require any major structural road works. • It combines a large residential development with a current expanding economic business development, therefore new major services can be developed without considerable disruption and can very easily form a sub-regional Enterprise Hub. • It could offer significant employment opportunities to local and incoming Bassetlaw residents. HOWEVER: - • There would be a considerable negative impact on the valuable agricultural and woodland. • It would furthermore be imperative to ensure that infrastructure to support such a development included adequate access to public transport, retail opportunities, schools and health centres from the commencement of building work. • Consideration should be given to increasing the number of properties allocated to be built during the time frame of this plan to ensure it is feasible for partners to invest in the area from the start. NEEDS TO RE-PHRASING – CAN'T UNDERSTAND!	The Plan identifies brownfield land for development but there is not enough suitable and deliverable brownfield land available so some greenfield land needs to be used. The woodland on site will be protected by policy. Infrastructure is expected to be phased alongside development to ensure that infrastructure meets the needs of new residents. Based on evidence it is considered that delivery of 500 homes is reasonable for a garden village site.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	Given the present financial conditions created by the pandemic consider the provision of a garden village as an expensive venture. There is little chance of either government or developer contributions. There is no indication that the railway company will provide the necessary funding for a station at this site. East Markham Parish Council considers that 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.	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 indicates that developer contributions can be secured from the site. Network Rail have given their in principle support for a new railway station. It is vital that public transport and appropriate supporting facilities are put in place from an early point to ensure the development is not just housing in the countryside.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	The site allocation for Bassetlaw Garden Village is in an area of high archaeological potential which is recognised in the Draft Local Plan. A desk-based assessment is in production and the results reinforce the need for further geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation to identify areas of particular archaeological sensitivity so that an appropriate mitigation strategy can be designed and implemented before development work commences. The results of the evaluation work would ideally be available early enough to allow it to inform the design of the development. This will have the benefit of giving the development a sense of being rooted in a pre-existing, historic landscape but will also ensure the more significant remains can be preserved. Consideration should also be given to heritage as an excellent tool for community engagement. In many new towns of the 60s and 70s the archaeology was used as a tool to generate community cohesion with big excavations (e.g. Bordesley Abbey in Redditch and Bradwell Abbey in Milton Keynes). The archaeological fieldwork can be phased with construction but should be completed (including mitigation) prior to construction activity taking place. Section B12 of the Policy should also include a note on the geophysics and trenching leading in to a robust mitigation strategy that will help inform the final master plan of each phase of the site.	The desk top based assessment has been completed and agreed with Lincs Archaeology. A geophysical survey is underway. This is expected to identify areas of archaeological sensitivity so that appropriate mitigation can be put in place prior to development, and to inform the detailed masterplan for the site. The policy will be amended to include appropriate reference to archaeological works.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF120	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owner	<p>Raised significant concerns in the deliverability of this allocation. Appendix M of the LAA sets out the housing trajectory. It assumes the Garden Village will deliver 60 dwellings in 2031-2032, and 90 dwellings in each of 2032-33, 2033-34, 2034-35, 2035-36 and 2036-37. 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. 1000 dwellings”. As have previously raised, it is inappropriate to draw direct comparisons between the Garden Village proposed 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. Harworth Colliery is a site within single ownership in an established urban area that benefits from existing residents, services, facilities and public transport. The proposed Garden Village is relatively isolated from Worksop and Retford and has significant infrastructure requirements, including transport and utilities. The LAA states that the Harworth Colliery site had a lead in time of approximately 8 years. Assuming adoption of the Plan in 2022, this suggests a similar lead-in time for the Garden Village. Given it is some four times the size of the Colliery site, consider more evidence is needed to support the draft Plan’s assertion that this site will deliver housing in the Plan period, particularly given the lack of supporting evidence around viability. Support the ambition to plan for growth beyond the Plan period, do not think any reliance can be placed upon this allocation, even for the reduced 500 dwellings. Continue to raise concerns around the ability to deliver sustainable housing in the Plan period in line with Garden Community Principles. The LAA acknowledges the importance of this: “The suitability of the site for development would depend on the sites ability to deliver the range of services and facilities necessary to create a sustainable settlement.” The level of services, facilities and/or public transport early on in the life of the development is essential, and there is no detail to set out how this is expected to viably be delivered. This additional evidence around the feasibility of a new rail station is welcomed (Bassetlaw New Station Feasibility Technical Note 2 (November 2020)), but it is not conclusive that there is sufficient capacity on the line to allow the station to be delivered, particularly as the existing ‘slack’ which may currently be there may not be available at the point at which the new station is actually delivered (this will not be for some time). The estimated £8-11m cost is significant and this station is unlikely to be delivered early given there will not be any new dwellings before at least 2031/32, and even then the number of new residents will be so low that significant revenue support would be required to subsidise the service. A draft SoCG with Network Rail has only been discussed, rather than agreed. Policy ST3 is not clear when the station would be required (the IDP suggests from 2030), and what contribution the development would need to make. This needs to be carefully considered in light of the above, plus the other key infrastructure costs which could affect viability, such as access (increased cost given A1), other transport improvements (including costly A57 improvements), utilities and other social / education infrastructure and services / facilities to ensure a sustainable community is created. According to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the transport improvements, including rail, bus and cycling, could be in the region of £45m, although it is appreciated some of these costs may potentially benefit from other sources of funding (unspecified) and pooling with other developments. These costs are significant and will need to be considered in light of phasing requirements and cashflow. The Viability Assessment (October 2019) has not been updated to reflect the known costs within the IDP (as well as other unknown costs including utilities). The Viability Assessment 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” (page 28) 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 figure 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 that this site will be delivered in the timescales set out. Continue to consider that there is limited evidence to justify the trajectory for the Garden Village at this stage. In the absence of this evidence the 500 dwellings should be deleted from the supply and the site should be considered an ambition for growth beyond the Plan period. Without the changes below we would object to Policy ST3. Suggested change: Address the significant concerns in relation to the viability and deliverability of the proposed Garden Village. Further detail is required to demonstrate that it can contribute 500 dwellings within the Plan period in a sustainable manner in line with the Garden Community Principles.</p>	<p>Ten years is considered to be a reasonable time period from some delivery to be expected from a large greenfield site. The position can be reviewed in 5 years time. This has been achieved with other Garden Village developments. As a former Colliery the Harworth site required extra remedial work, and the comparison is therefore not unreasonable.</p> <p>The Rail Technical Notes have continued to look into the feasibility of a new Station at the proposed Garden Village. It does look at existing capacity based on existing service provision. Additional work will need to be undertaken with our partners to further look at the level of service provision needed to and from the station in its early phase. This work will need to coincide with other planned enhancements to service provision in the future.</p> <p>We are aiming for the station to come on line during the later part of this plan period, but this will be subject to obtaining external funding. Contributions from development will be proportionate and subject to the delivery of the first phase of the Garden Village. The plan has safeguarded land at the Garden Village to accommodate the station and its associated facilities.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with rail providers through the process and will look to formalise SOCGs from Summer 2021 through to the submission of the Plan in early 2022.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	<p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village encompasses 216 hectares of land adjacent to the junction of A1/A57, which is intended to be developed for a mix of uses, including both residential and employment, in accordance with the principles of the Bassetlaw Garden Village Vision Statement. The Framework, at paragraph 72, states that the supply of large numbers of new homes can best be achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities. In light of the guidance in the Framework, MPG do not object in principle to the proposal for a Garden Village within Bassetlaw. Have concerns over the proposal mainly due to its location away from existing development. The proposal is for a new settlement on a greenfield site that is located away from existing settlements. The principal reason it appears for choosing the site is its proximity to the strategic road network, which raises issues over whether this it is the most sustainable choice for a new settlement. Clearly, as the site is a completely new, there are no existing services, facilities or infrastructure to link in to and that everything will need to be created from scratch. Whilst in the fullness of time this is perfectly feasible, note that the Council are anticipating that 500 dwellings will be delivered on the site in the emerging Plan Period i.e. before 2037, but that a further 3,500 dwellings are planned for the next Plan Period. The acknowledgement that the Garden Village is intended to deliver more development in the next Local Plan is welcomed, as experience elsewhere indicates that it can take many years for large strategic sites of the scale envisaged here to come on stream. This can be due to the need to construct and implement significant new infrastructure to serve the development, which may be the case here due to the fact that this is a greenfield site with no existing facilities present on it or within the vicinity. Whilst the Council have been relatively conservative in their assessment of what the site is expected to deliver in this plan period, contend that whether the site will deliver the 500 dwellings it is anticipated to do so in this Plan Period. If not, contend that a flexibility allowance should be added to the housing requirement in case that the Garden Village site does not deliver the expected number of dwellings that have been identified for it. The Plan does not propose a flexibility allowance to take account of non implementation of any of the proposed draft allocations. Propose that a flexibility allowance of at least 15% above the housing requirement would be appropriate. This would not only provide an allowance if some of the smaller draft allocations did not come forward as expected but would provide a buffer if the Garden Village did not come on stream as quick as is hoped. By incorporating a flexibility allowance, this will enable the Council to maintain a five year supply of housing. If a flexibility allowance is to be incorporated consider that additional sites should also be allocated for development to the north of Bigsby Road, Retford is one such site that is considered suitable to meet the housing needs of the District going forward. Do not object to the intention to create a new Garden Village at the junction of the A1/A57. As this is creating a new settlement from scratch, consider that it represents a longer term development option and that it should be planned for now in terms of identifying the site but that the Council should look to the next Plan Period for any development on it to go towards meeting future housing and employment land needs. This will provide greater certainty that the site will deliver in the longer term. Consider that an alternative allocation or allocations should be identified now to accommodate the 500 dwellings that are currently planned to come forward on the site instead. As it stands, the Council have identified 500 dwellings to be delivered on the Garden Village site by 2037. In light of the inherent concerns about getting a site of this size underway in a timely manner, consider that if the Council do decide to include the 500 dwellings in its housing supply for this plan that a flexibility allowance of at least 15% is applied in case of non-delivery on this, and other allocated sites. This will guard against any shortfalls in the supply to meet the Council's housing needs over the Plan Period.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is requiring 500 homes in this plan period. That is considered to be a reasonable rate of delivery towards the end of the plan period. The housing supply also has a significant buffer to provide flexibility should the site not come on stream when intended. The site at Bigsby Road has had planning permission refused and this was upheld on appeal.</p>
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	No specific comments as are not in this vicinity, however it does seem a bold move to deliver a simple solution.	Comments noted.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	<p>The garden village could have a significant impact on Elkesley and would appreciate it if there could be some direct consultation with the villagers to help decide how the communities could support each other and not leave Elkesley as a remote satellite village Develop access to the new rail and bus links for other communities. Elkesley is another community that could benefit from this, will there be extra parking available at the station to accommodate travellers from outside of the garden village?</p>	<p>The directly affected Parish Councils are consulted on proposals for the Garden Village and this has involved Elkesley. The delivery of a Garden Village should bring benefits to the wider community particularly by improving accessibility for the rural community to a range of services.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF153	Natural England	<p>5.3.14 - Welcome the intention to provide an extensive green/blue infrastructure network which will cover 40% of the site. 5.3.17 - Welcome the requirement for 20% net gain on the site and the provision to provide breeding opportunities for protected bird species from Clumber Park SSSI. 5.3.19 - pleased to note that this recognises the potential impact of the proposed Garden Village on Clumber Park SSSI as well as the Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC and Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA). Welcome the requirement for Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) which should be established in the earliest phase of development to ensure impacts on designated sites are not adversely impacted by increased recreational pressure. Welcome the provision for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). Pleased to note that the Recreational Impact Assessment being prepared will provide evidence which will inform appropriate mitigation measures. ST3 -</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the positive approach which this policy takes with respect to Green Infrastructure provision; the requirement for biodiversity net gain; the enhancement of woodland cover; and biodiversity-led water management. Welcome the requirement for project level HRA (this would be a “shadow” HRA until the ppSPA designation is confirmed). Welcome the requirement for Winter Bird surveys in connection with the designated sites. The provision for both SANGs, a GI buffer adjacent to the A1 and 20% net gain in habitat enhancements will contribute to the mitigation for the potential increase in recreational disturbance to Clumber Park SSSI and the Sherwood ppSPA. Support the preparation of the Recreational Impact Assessment which is being undertaken which will provide strategic evidence of the potential recreational impact on the Clumber Park SSSI, Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC and the Sherwood NNR. Natural England will continue to work the with the Council and the RSPB as the RIA proceeds to ensure that, a satisfactory level of evidence is gathered so that appropriate management and mitigation measures can be included into future iterations of the Local Plan and HRA. Welcome point B10 regarding the need for a robust water management scheme and suggest that integrated water management rather than just a traditional SuDs scheme would improve resource and energy inputs to the site. The following link may be useful regarding CIRIA’s new guidance on integrated water management which has recently been released: https://www.suds-authority.org.uk/2019/12/ciria-release-new-guidance-on-integrated-surface-water-management/</p>	Support noted and welcome. The Council will continue to work in partnership with Natural England on the Recreational Impact Assessment, the Garden Village and other projects as the plan progresses.
REF156	Babworth Parish Council	<p>Oppose the Council’s plans and vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. Consider that the Garden Village will harm the vitality and viability of Retford and will be detrimental to the community. Feels strongly that it should be the Council’s priority to enhance existing larger 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 consider not to be viable.</p>	<p>The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right and will not adversely impact the viability of Retford. Rather having more people within the town’s catchment may help the prosperity of the town centre. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE	
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION				
REF190	Babworth Council	Parish	Oppose the Council’s plans and vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. Consider that the Garden Village will harm the vitality and viability of Retford and will be detrimental to the community. Feels strongly that it should be the Council’s priority to enhance existing larger 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 consider not to be viable.	The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right and will not adversely impact the viability of Retford. Rather having more people within the town’s catchment may help the prosperity of the town centre. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term.
REF156	Babworth Council	Parish	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. The Parish is of the view that the allocation of 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 the large towns of Retford and Worksop having more dwellings. Such a far-reaching, enormous, single concentration of development should not be “inflicted” on the Parish of Babworth by building a “garden village” on 216 hectares of the parish. It is more important than ever, that development in rural parishes is sustainable and maintains the character of that parish. Supportive of the Local Plan’s ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the proposed Garden Village as a matter of principle that 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. Have a great deal of 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 consider will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the very serious risk of simply allocating a large proportion of isolated homes into 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. Although Bassetlaw District Council have “put more meat on the bone” when discussions have taken place about the Garden Village many questions have not been able to be answered. The time scale and funding for the Railway Station, the time scale for the School. The exact nature in which cycle routes will enter and exit the Garden Village. The total scale and proposal for the alteration of the B6420, railway crossings and junctions, including safety measures. 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. The proposed Garden Village and Apelyhead development will see an increase in traffic using the A1 which in turn will see increased noise and air pollution for the residents of Ranby Village. Paragraph 11.1.8 of the Draft Local Plan states that public funding for transport infrastructure is likely to be limited and will be largely developer funded. It is our view that this is not a realistic expectation. The financial viability of creating a new transport hub and train station alongside the Garden Village Development has not been adequately considered and it is our position that more sustainable development option is represented by development at the main towns. Any funding available should be allocated to improve existing transport infrastructure. While the development is taking place, in excess of 20 Years it is will cause massive congestion on the B6420 (Mansfield Road) into Retford which is already a very dangerous and congested road at peak times, with a level crossing, sharp corners, flooding areas and difficult junction at Babworth. 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. Lack of comprehensive consideration for the creation of a new Garden Settlement and the cost of associated infrastructure. If the viability of the	The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right and will not adversely impact the viability of Retford. Rather having more people within the town’s catchment may help the prosperity of the town centre. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term. This is a long term proposal, and as such, the detail will be added at each stage of the planning process. The Vision Statement will provide the basis for the masterplan framework and subsequent detailed parameter plans and design codes. All will involve community consultation. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the known infrastructure costs associated with the development. These will be refined as the Plan progresses. The Bassetlaw Transport Study identifies the known impacts on the highways network; the development will provide financial contributions to support their improvement. This evidence shows that the

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		<p>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. Evidence provided within 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 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 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). It is 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. Hope that any future planning will be done more interactively with our Parish, in more “normal times”, when individual parishioners may have their personal opportunities to discuss matters, for example at public consultation meetings.</p>	<p>additional traffic can be safely accommodated on the transport network, in some cases with mitigation. The level crossings will be appropriately managed in consultation with Network Rail. The Sustainability Appraisal considers development without mitigation; it is considered that the impacts identified can be addressed through mitigation. An archaeology assessment is underway; this will inform the masterplanning for the site. Severn Trent have not objected to the Garden Village being located within a source protection zone provided that appropriate drainage and water quality enhancement measures are put in place.</p>
REF190	Babworth Parish 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 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. The Parish is of the view that the allocation of 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 the large towns of Retford and Worksop having more dwellings. Such a far-reaching, enormous, single concentration of development should not be “inflicted” on the Parish of Babworth by building a “garden village” on 216 hectares of the parish. It is more important than ever, that development in rural parishes is sustainable and maintains the character of that parish. Supportive of the Local Plan’s ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the proposed Garden Village as a matter of principle that 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. Have a great deal of 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 consider will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the very serious risk of simply allocating a large proportion of isolated homes into 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. Although Bassetlaw District Council have “put more meat on the bone” when discussions have taken place about the Garden Village many questions have not been able to be answered. The time scale and funding for the Railway Station, the time scale for the School. The exact nature in which cycle routes will enter and exit the Garden Village. The total scale and proposal for the alteration of the B6420, railway crossings and junctions, including safety measures. 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. The proposed Garden Village and Apelyhead development will see an increase in traffic using the A1 which in turn will see increased noise and air pollution for the residents of Ranby Village. Paragraph 11.1.8 of the Draft Local Plan states that public funding for transport infrastructure is likely to be limited and will be largely developer funded. It is our view that this is not a realistic expectation. The financial viability of creating a new transport hub and train station alongside the Garden Village Development has not been adequately considered and it is our position that more sustainable development option is represented by development at the main towns. Any funding available should be allocated to improve existing transport infrastructure. While the development is taking place, in excess of 20 Years it is will cause massive congestion on the B6420 (Mansfield Road) into Retford which is already a very dangerous and congested road at peak times, with a level crossing, sharp corners, flooding areas and difficult junction at Babworth. 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. 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. Evidence provided within 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 negative effects on the SA objective 7 (transport), 10 (air quality) and 11 (climate change). This is largely</p>	<p>The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right and will not adversely impact the viability of Retford. Rather having more people within the town’s catchment may help the prosperity of the town centre. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term. This is a long term proposal, and as such, the detail will be added at each stage of the planning process. The Vision Statement will provide the basis for the masterplan framework and subsequent detailed parameter plans and design codes. All will involve community consultation. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the known infrastructure costs associated with the development. These will be refined as the Plan progresses. The Bassetlaw Transport Study identifies the known impacts on the highways network; the development will provide financial contributions to support their improvement. This evidence shows that the additional traffic can be safely accommodated on the transport network, in some cases with mitigation. The level crossings will be appropriately managed in consultation with</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		<p>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 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). It is 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. Hope that any future planning will be done more interactively with our Parish, in more "normal times", when individual parishioners may have their personal opportunities to discuss matters, for example at public consultation meetings.</p>	<p>Network Rail. The Sustainability Appraisal considers development without mitigation; it is considered that the impacts identified can be addressed through mitigation. An archaeology assessment is underway; this will inform the masterplanning for the site. Severn Trent have not objected to the Garden Village being located within a source protection zone provided that appropriate drainage and water quality enhancement measures are put in place.</p>
REF157	Resident	<p>The proposed garden village, also in the parish of Babworth and Ranby, should not go ahead. The proposed site is wholly on greenfield, agricultural land. Should be trying to use brownfield sites first, and if necessary only thereafter greenfield sites nearer town centres to reduce the impact. The proposed enormous site is isolated. It would be massive. There are no "villages" (even with uplift) in the entire district as large as this proposed. Try to justify its existence by suggesting it would be self-supporting, and have its own services- shop(s), doctors, school, train station. Note you would only build 500 homes in the short- term. In my view, 500 homes will not justify, or support building such services. There are NO existing transport links or services. Funding will be lacking, and it will be unfeasible. All those new residents will be dependent on cars. At least 1000 cars will be travelling by car to and from that isolated site to the services in the towns and larger settlements. They will be driving to the very areas that need developing, but also further afield given the proposed village's proximity to the A1. Local towns may not even feel the benefit of those residents. Hang much hope on a railway station being built. This is not feasible with 500 homes in my view. It is not guaranteed that the second phase of the other hundreds of homes will ever be built, which would underpin and undermine all the arguments for building the first phase of 500 homes. Bids would have to be made to fund the station, and other services. Do not believe this will happen, and have not seen any evidence to suggest it will, or might. Doubt very much 500 homes would justify any of the proposed services. There are already 2 local train stations at Worksop and Retford which could be developed further and used, if more houses were built nearer those towns. Retford is on the mainline, which is more useful to residents in any event, than a little station in the middle of nowhere. Developing the towns would alleviate current traffic congestion, pollution and also decrease it further if public transport was used, as it is much more accessible in the towns, and on the outskirts of towns. 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. I have 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. They 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.</p>	<p>The Garden Village will be a self-sustaining settlement in its own right. The plan period runs to 2037 but the development t will not stop at that point it will continue. From a planning perspective the Council plans for the whole site and then determines what infrastructure is needed and when; infrastructure will be phased with development. The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Network Rail have provided their support in principle for the railway station. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the proposal can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme in the long term. This is a long term proposal, and as such, the detail will be added at each stage of the planning process. The Bassetlaw Transport Study identifies the known impacts on the highways network; the development will provide financial contributions to support their improvement. This evidence shows that the additional traffic can be safely accommodated on the transport network, in some cases with mitigation. The Plan identifies brownfield sites but there are not enough available sites to meet needs. So greenfield land needs to be used. A 20% gain in biodiversity value will be secured on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF157	Resident	Generally, the level and scale proposed to build in every village and the 3500 homes in a garden village will ruin our rural community. Do not want to have this proposed “urban sprawl”. Want to live in a rural area, not an urban one. The necessary development should be within and nearest towns, or within the larger villages, where the services are, or can be better developed/extended and supported, and the need to use cars and resultant congestion and pollution is minimal. The world needs less carbon footprint, not more! Ranby village cannot sustain the proposed new developments (or 5% uplift of its actual houses) and its character would be destroyed. The required services and infrastructure are not there. The vast majority of the residents (who attended your consultation meeting last time), like me, do not want such development. In such a rural community, where there are only c.250 homes in the whole parish, it is totally unfeasible to build another 3500 on one greenfield site, and then another 5 in our very rural small village (within the same parish), which has only c.89 houses to start with. Do not think your “broad brush” approach works. If you propose to build the garden village, Ranby should not have further housing built within the village as well. Any “allocation” should be included within the garden village. It would be wholly wrong and unfair not to do so.	The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. Ranby village will not be taking 5% growth – the parish growth will be subsumed by the Garden Village.
REF132	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. 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. It is proposed that the Plan be redrafted to do: • 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	The spatial strategy promotes growth, including economic growth, in the Main Towns as a priority, because they are the most sustainable locations for growth. But to be sustainable in the long term it is considered that the Garden village provides a unique opportunity to attract employment and infrastructure improvements to the District, dependent on its location. It will provide a sustainable growth option in the long term. Cottam is not identified as anew settlement. It will be a broad location for regeneration in the long term should the provisions of the relevant policy be met. The number of dwellings attributed to the smaller villages is considered to be sustainable and appropriate to local character, and in line with the level of accessibility that tier of the hierarchy has to local shops, services and public transport.
REF168	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	The Council previously commented on this proposal and welcomes the response provided in the consultation statement and recognition that further transport assessment work will be required.	Comments noted.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	The garden village could have a significant impact on Elkesley and would appreciate it if there could be some direct consultation with the villagers to help decide how the communities could support each other and not leave Elkesley as a remote satellite village. 5.3.33 Develop access to the new rail and bus links for other communities. Elkesley is another community that could benefit from this, will there be extra parking available at the station to accommodate travellers from outside of the garden village?	The directly affected Parish Councils are consulted on proposals for the Garden Village and this has involved Elkesley. The delivery of a Garden Village should bring benefits to the wider community particularly by improving accessibility for the rural community to a range of services.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is keen to promote the development of ‘Water smart communities’ including as part of the proposed 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 multifunctional water features • Deliver water efficient homes to reduce household bills and support affordability Fully support the requirement to provide a robust water management scheme which includes water recycling /rainwater harvesting together with water efficiency measures. Supportive of the requirement to incorporate strategically designed and appropriately phased utility infrastructure including that provided by Anglian Water.	Support noted and welcome. Integrated water management has been added to the policy to ensure a sustainable approach to water management is secured.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome 4.a.iii (co-location of railway station and bus interchange); 5. (green and blue infrastructure and connectivity); 13. b. and c. (financial contributions to the railway station and bus service).	Support noted and welcome.
REF035	Resident	The Councils earlier decision, following public consultation on the Draft Strategic Plan in 2019, to relocate the garden village development is strongly supported and avoids the closure of Gamston Airport, for now! The new site for the garden village affords much better travel connectivity by road and rail and provide a large number of dwellings over and beyond the plan period. Believe that the Gamston site requires ‘safeguarding’ for the current authorised use as one of the best licensed General Aviation airfields in the UK. Indeed, the airfield is a strategic aviation asset in Bassetlaw with a historic past and potential for further aviation related employment once its future is assured in the emerging Plan.	Support noted and welcome. General aviation airfields are afforded protection by national planning policy.
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Generally, this policy is supported. It is an ambitious area for strategic growth for 4,000 dwellings and 15ha of employment, which will require significant front-loaded development infrastructure. Note that the development will not only need the broad range of community infrastructure but also significant off-site highway contributions. The Viability Assessment concludes that this green field site cannot contribute towards CIL, but it can deliver the necessary infrastructure requirements. The Viability Assessment shows a net Viability Margin of -£10.929m when assessed against CIL. The cost of the new junction onto the B6420 is £3m in itself. Policy ST3 at Part 4 sets out the transport requirements; in addition to the £3m there are contributions to the A1 slip road south, the B6420/A620 junction and the A614/A57/A1 junction. There are also contributions to a Public Transport network including a new railway station on the Worksop to Retford rail line. Cannot see where these requirements are fully quantified and whether delivery is dependent on the public purse at a time when public funding is likely to be squeezed. These are huge infrastructure commitments. Strategic sites of this scale are very challenging and whilst we recognise that some housing will be delivered during the plan period, consider it unlikely that the less profitable employment site will come forward. There is nothing in the policy which sets out a triggered link between residential and employment delay. The site is very close to Site ST10 - Apleyhead Junction. In view of their scale and proximity they will compete, and this could suppress delivery. The employment element on this site will not be delivered in the Plan Period.	At a strategic level the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the Garden Village can be delivered through a financially viable scheme. Many of the infrastructure requirements identified involve proportionate contributions and are not expected to be funded solely by the Garden Village. The employment offer at Apleyhead is expected to be very different and aimed at different markets. There is not evidence to suggest that the employment provision is undeliverable; it is adjacent to the A1, equidistant between Worksop/Retford and could be delivered alongside and/or in advance of the housing element of the scheme. The Council is therefore confident that both sites are capable of coming forward in the plan period for employment growth.
REF197	Resident	Why only 500 houses and why start so late? In order to provide sufficient demand for rail services, this will need to be more, unless it is being looked on as a park and rail for the area – which it may become, in which case sufficient car parking with EV chargers will be required. Why a hotel with only 500 houses? What is the target audience?	Garden Villages have a long lead in time to enable necessary infrastructure to be brought into the site. The Council considers 500 homes is realistic in this plan period. Network Rail have given in principle support for the station and the evidence states that the station can be sustained by the Garden Village and use from the wider area. Electric vehicles charging will be a requirement. The Village will be a new settlement so a hotel, adjoining the A1 would be an appropriate use.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Paragraph 5.3.14 & 5.3.16 Note that the Garden Village is proposed to incorporate interconnected multifunctional Green Blue infrastructure and the effective management of surface water through the development. Supportive of this approach as it will enable the conveyance of surface water through the development, increasing flood resilience and resilience to climate change. Paragraph 5.3.29 supportive of the approach to implement water efficient design and technology and meet the water efficiency target or design commercial areas to me BREEM Standards, so that new develop is design to be sustainable and manage key resources such as water appropriately.</p> <p>Supportive of the principles within Policy ST13, in particular points 10 and 11 which focus on managing water sustainably from reduced consumptions to sustainable discharge of surface water such that it can be utilised by the natural environment, creating space for water that can be enjoyed by people and nature together. Supportive of the Green/Blue Infrastructure section of Policy ST3 such that it proposed to retain the connectivity of water and the natural environment.</p>	Support noted and welcome.
REF211	National Trust	<p>No in principal objection to the concept of a Garden Village to meet the future housing needs of the district both within and beyond the plan period and support the use of a Consultative Group to guide the preparation of this document. Concerned to ensure that the scale of the proposed development and potential impacts on the Sherwood Forest ppSPA identified in the Habitats Regulations Assessment are carefully considered both within the plan and on an ongoing basis. Note that a landscape-led masterplan will be required to ‘creatively address the key site constraints and sensitively respond to the unique qualities and opportunities afforded by its landscape, heritage and environmental setting...’. However, remain concerned that the scale and spatial configuration of the proposed site allocation, particularly in combination with Policy ST10 (Apleyhead Junction), will close the gap between Worksop and Retford creating urban sprawl from Worksop to the A1 and onwards to within 2.5km of Retford. The implications of this in terms of loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land also need to be better understood. ST3 B1 remain concerned about the proposed scale of the development - at least 4000 new homes – and what mechanisms will be put in place to ensure that development will not come forward earlier than envisaged and inhibit regeneration elsewhere. Suggest that the scale of development ought to be influenced by the genuine housing and economic needs of the district and sub-region, and by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development while maintaining green gaps between settlements and the distinct identities of Worksop and Retford. Concerned to ensure that the basic parameters of the site – such as housing and employment allocations – are only set once the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment have been taken into account. For example, in order to mitigate impacts on Clumber Park SSSI and Sherwood Forest ppSPA a 400m green buffer is proposed along the A1. Does this, along with the other stated requirements of Policy ST3, not considerably reduce the amount of housing and employment that the site can reasonably accommodate? ST3 B4a support the proposal that the Garden Village should be supported by an Integrated Transport and Business Hub – promoting sustainable travel by incorporating a railway station, bus interchange, electric vehicle charging hub and cycling hub. ST3 B5 support the proposal for a multi-functional green and blue infrastructure network covering a minimum of 40% of the site. ST3 B6 support the proposal for 30% tree coverage across the site and retention of existing woodland, to contribute to reforestation of Sherwood Forest. ST3 B7 cautiously supportive of the proposed (i) Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, and (ii) 400m green infrastructure buffer along the A1, to mitigate recreational and predation impacts on Sherwood Forest ppSPA and Clumber Park SSSI and international sites. Further information is needed on how these features will be designed to achieve the stated aims. The 400m buffer is not yet included on the Concept Plan within the Garden Village Vision Statement (which shows a buffer of perhaps 50m along the A1) and could have a significant impact on the Garden Village concept overall. Welcome the requirement for a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment, concerned that the impacts and mitigation requirements of Local Plan proposals (particularly in relation to traffic and air quality) are not yet fully understood and have not been taken into account in setting the basic parameters – such as housing and employment targets – for the Garden Village. While the HRA Appropriate Assessment of the Local Plan highlights the potential issue of cat predation between the Garden Village and Clumber Park, it does not address whether the proposed pedestrian bridge – a green bridge to support wildlife movement according to the Vision Statement – could have any implications in this regard. Welcome clarification. ST3 B8 Welcome the commitment to at least 20% biodiversity net gain. It is not clear how this ties in with the commitment to provide 40% green infrastructure 30% tree coverage across the site. Welcome further information on the proposed habitats within the site and how these will be designed to be unsuitable/unattractive to ground nesting bird populations associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA and Clumber Park SSSI. ST3 13d open minded about the concept of a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the A1. Require further information on the following to support the proposal (i) an appropriate design that manages landscape and visual impacts, (ii) a strategy to manage recreational impacts on the sensitive habitats within Clumber Park, and (iii) clarification of the potential positive and negative effects for wildlife if this was designed as a ‘green bridge’.</p>	<p>The scale and potential impacts on the Sherwood Forest ppSPA are considered by the Plan and will continue to be progressed, and in future monitored on an ongoing basis. The Plan identifies a number of brownfield sites for development but there are not enough to support growth. Some greenfield land needs to be used. The impacts on agricultural land have been appropriately considered. Evidence indicates that the lead in time for the Garden Village means that it is unrealistic to expect housing delivery before 2032. This provides sufficient time to enable the regeneration proposed elsewhere in the District to establish, confirmed by the draft Worksop Central DPD. The Vision Statement for the site provides a flexible design framework to accommodate the policy requirements including the housing and employment capacity and necessary 400m buffer along the A1. The Vision Statement was developed and approved by the Consultative Group of which the National trust is a member. The green bridge could be designed to ensure that cat predation is not an issue. The type and mix of habitats on site will be considered in further detail as the scheme progresses. However the vision statement gives an indication is to the type of habitats the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have recommended. The policy requires a landscape strategy to ensure the impacts upon landscape are carefully managed. This can be expanded to include a landscape and visual impact assessment. The Clumber Park SSSI Recreational Impact Assessment is underway, work undertaken to date has informed the Local Plan and will continue to do so. The process has been agreed with Natural England. The National Trust are a partner in the Recreational impact</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
			Assessment and have been actively involved in the work undertaken in the project to date. The green bridge is not expected to be sought until the next plan period. Further detail will be discussed through masterplaning; the National Trust will continue to be positively engaged in that process.
1669241	Resident	Note the Council may have taken on board previous representations from us and others offering cautious support for the 4000 dwelling new garden settlement at the A1/A57 Apleyhead Junction, provided that any delays in this site coming forward did not lead to an overall shortfall of provision across the District in this incoming plan period. BDC have therefore reduced the planned first phase delivery of homes within the plan period to from 750 to 500 dwellings by 2037 which is supported, yet there should not be a complacency that even these 500 dwellings will be delivered in such uncertain times. Do not propose further reduction to the first phase delivery of homes in this policy/ allocation, do not think it is appropriate for the Council to reduce the growth targets for the small rural settlements as set out in our representations to ST2 as this restricts this deliverable form of supply and sterilises legitimate, moderate and sustainable growth opportunity.	Comments noted.
REF214	Historic England	The Garden Village principles set out at Para.5.3.5 are noted, and it is acknowledged that the historic environment would be addressed in cultural elements referred to in Bullet Point (BP) 8. The heritage references in paragraph 5.3.13 and 5.3.20 are welcomed. The archaeological assessment referred to in paragraph 5.3.21 is noted but it is not clear how this sits with other aspirations for the site including effective water management and surface water run-off suggested in 5.3.16 which are expected to include wetlands and balancing ponds - these could result in a loss of heritage assets that would not be able to be compensated for. When the significance of any archaeology at the site is currently an unknown, it is not possible to consider the potential harm to heritage assets as part of the Plan process so there is an issue of soundness at present. Section B-12 - It is not clear at present how the proposed allocation has been considered in respect of the nearby designated heritage assets at Clumber Park as well as any, as yet unknown, archaeological elements. Would recommend that the policy wording, and/or justification text, as well as the SA and Heritage Statement address these elements clearly in order to establish expectations as to how the proposed site allocation would respond to the historic environment and any harm resulting from the proposal. Depending on archaeological outcomes from the assessment currently being considered it may be appropriate to have more of a heritage led masterplan than is currently proposed. In order to address some of the concerns in relation to the historic environment it may be necessary to undertake some of the work set out in Section A of Policy ST4: Bassetlaw Garden Village Spatial (typo 'Spacial' in Draft Plan) Design Framework as part of the Plan process to demonstrate that the Plan will be able to achieve its aspirations for the site. Welcome opportunity to discuss this further and ahead of the next round of consultation and to continue engagement with the Council as the SPD progresses.	The concept plan for the garden village is indicative and is expected to be refined as the masterplanning process continues. A desk top archaeological assessment has been completed and a geophysical survey is underway. This will inform the evolution of the design of the site. Historic England have been involved with discussions with Lincs Archaeology and the Council about the approach to archaeology on site and the agreement has been reached in relation to the policy approach. This is evidenced through the draft Statement of Common Ground for both parties. The Heritage Paper sets out how heritage has been considered in the site selection process, the Site Selection Methodology paper confirms this. The Heritage Paper has been agreed with Historic England. The policy has been amended to make reference to a heritage /landscape led masterplan.
1670988	Resident	Ensure that these houses will have safe access to main roads, and potentially for safety, the A1 may require a new speed limit along that stretch.	Appropriate access to main roads will be provided. Highways England confirm that no improvements are needed to the A1 in this plan period.
1670549	Resident	If a new Garden Village is needed, it should be situated on a brownfield site such as at Bevercotes Colliery. It goes against green credentials to destroy countryside when there is an alternative available.	Bevercotes has been considered and discounted as Garden Village because of the extent of biodiversity designations that exist on site. Development would be contrary to national policy and national legislations.
1671492	Resident	Consider the new railway station and associated hub a waste of money so 1 of the main basis of this position is removed and it would be better to go back to using the ex Bevercoates pit site.	Bevercotes has been considered and discounted as Garden Village because of the extent of biodiversity designations that exist on site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
			Development would be contrary to national policy and national legislations.
1671492	Resident	The cost of setting up the garden village would be better spent developing Retford, Worksop and surrounding villages so that the main facilities for sport and recreation are developed instead of trying to create an extra area of housing with limited facilities.	An appropriate amount of housing has been identified for the Main Towns and also the surrounding villages over the plan period, appropriate to each settlement's place in the hierarchy. This is considered appropriate to support sport and recreation facilities.
1670589	Resident	Active Travel, Public Transport and Connectivity 5.3.31 Transport – Small Rural Settlements within a 3 mile radius of towns should be considered for more growth and in particular to benefit from the provision of cycle routes. An example of this would be a cycle track from Sutton-cum-lound to Retford, a distance of 3 miles.	The Local Plan can only secure infrastructure related to growth identified by the Plan. Other infrastructure may be pursued by the Council and partners, such as for cycling.
1670869	Resident	Does the Authroity see any relationship between the proposed Garden Village and the Cottam Power Station site? if so, can this be explained in the plan. is there any underlying expectation/assumption that over time these two sites will effecitlvey merge into a single 'new town'..?.which would no doubt be at the detriment to the countryside, habitats and carbon foot [rig of the District?	Cottam is in close proximity to the Trent on the eastern side of the District. The garden Village adjoins the A1 a reasonable distance apart. There is no functional link between the two or no expectation that these will merge in to one single town.
1671143	Resident	The concept of a Bassetlaw Garden Village is a good one and will in particular find support amongst those Rural communities that see it as taking the pressure off of their own communities. It will find “little support” in the Parish in which it is located. Say little support and find myself unable to quantify just how much or little support the concept might have garnered. The problem with this consultation is that however laudable the Councils intentions were to undertake an effective consultation, the consultation itself, hampered by the Covid 19 restrictions barely scratched the surface of a community involvement. The Council tried hard, presenting some very well designed and fulsome information virtually but this was a poor substitute for the face to face events of last year. Understand that there was a need to make progress with the Plan but feel that our communities and Officers alike missed out and wonder how effectively the consultation will reflect the views of the community at large. Concerns about the siting of the Garden Village. Primarily that I find it does not make effective use of land as required in the NPPF clause 118. “give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land;” Believe that there are brownfield sites in Bassetlaw that might better be used. The decision to give up on earlier intentions to develop part villages at Bevercotes & Gamston was premature. The former dismissed on ecological grounds and the latter as there is a wish not to see airports closed (how long term is Gamston airport anyway?). Instead we are presented with a development of a greenfield site and the displacement of an established farming family to make way for the Garden Village. There are also other sites that might be considered, perhaps a power station site? It seems that the development on the proposed site in Babworth Parish is being driven landowners who will likely do very well out of it and the very idea that the site is close to, and might at some time in the future feature a rail connection. It is very unlikely that money will be found to develop a station, a connection to a rail line that runs diesel trains, how green is that? The likelihood of electrification of that rail line is an expenditure too far and battery driven trains an even more remote prospect. Not a lot going for a rail connection! But, quite a lot to be liked about the Bassetlaw Local Plan. In fact it is mostly all good. Just let us give some more consideration to the siting of the village itself. In a post Brexit world we need all the agricultural land we have and then we need to comply with NPPF do we not?	In line with Covid legislation and planning legislation the Council undertook an effective virtual consultation that generated the largest response to any strategic planning consultation. The Plan identifies brownfield land for development but there are not enough available, suitable sites in the District so greenfield land needs to be used. Bevercotes has been considered and discounted as Garden Village because of the extent of biodiversity designations that exist on site. Development would be contrary to national policy and national legislations. General Aviation Airfields are afforded protection under national policy. The former Marnham power station is identified for employment use. Cottam is earmarked for growth in the future subject to provisions of the policy being met. Network Rail have provided their in principle support for a railway station.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	The Bassetlaw Garden Village provides a 'blank sheet' on which to develop many of the ideas described elsewhere in the document, eg quality housing, environmental benefits, healthy lifestyles, etc. Every effort must be made that these principles are not diminished over time. Living in a rural area, am all too aware of the difficulties presented by inadequate, inflexible public transport, aged infrastructure (waste-water systems) that is not up to 21st century use, and lack of local services and facilities. Don't let this happen to the Garden Village! The Bassetlaw Garden Village could follow the example of Chelmsford Garden Village, which is future-proofing itself for when driverless cars are the norm. While there will be parking spaces for cars in the first phase of development, these will gradually be converted into new uses, such as communal gardens, and residents will instead be able to summon driverless vehicles from a car park on the outskirts of the town of Chelmsford. An access point should be created in the north-east corner of the site (or where most convenient) to give pedestrian access to Babworth Parish Church. This needs to refer to the adjacency of Doncaster Sheffield Airport.	Support for Garden Village noted. Reference will be added to Doncaster Sheffield Airport. Improvements to walking and cycle routes will be made where reasonable and appropriate to support the new development.
REF058	Sport England	Para 5.3.15 – Supported Para 5.3.23/24/28 – Supported Para 5.3.31/33/34 – Supported Policy ST3 supported with particular reference to A1 – Active Design and section 4 with the use of evidence to lead the development. Should section 9 make reference to either on site facilities or a contribution to off-site as evidenced.	Support noted. In line with the evidence the preference is for sports facilities to be provided on site to create a community hub and sense of place. Amendments made accordingly.
REF072	Resident	Support this proposal as did when it was made in the previous Draft Plan in early 2020: - The site is close to the main A1 arterial road network and so will not require any major structural road works. - It combines a large residential development with a current expanding economic business development. Therefore new major services can be developed without considerable disruption and can very easily form a sub-regional Enterprise Hub. - It could offer massive employment opportunities to local and incoming Bassetlaw residents. The downside would be that valuable agricultural and woodland would disappear under concrete constructions but would not have enormous infrastructure challenges as in other local areas. This development must not start until there is a mechanism in place to ensure that retail and other community facilities including public transport and logistical services are in place at an early stage to serve Bassetlaw residents.	The Plan identifies brownfield land for development but there is not enough suitable and deliverable brownfield land available so some greenfield land needs to be used. The woodland on site will be protected by policy. Infrastructure is expected to be phased alongside development to ensure that infrastructure meets the needs of new residents. Based on evidence it is considered that delivery of 500 homes is reasonable for a garden village site.
REF100	Resident	How are the residents of the 4000 homes going to be employed?	10 ha of employment land is being provided on site as well as commercial space and local shops and services.
REF104	GESUKLTD	Express our objection and concerns regarding the proposed garden villages both at Ranby, and Cottam There are a myriad of objections, and reasons these should not be permitted: any new garden village or villages with their vast number of new homes will mean that new homes in the existing villages will not get built, simply because of the numbers allocated to the new garden villages. Not allowing, and or drastically reducing, and limiting the ability to correctly and for the benefit of the areas and local communities in those and surrounding those villages Lots of these existing villages require new development, and housing for many reasons including, and not limited to keeping the villages alive for the ongoing use, and maintenance of the village halls, shops, post offices, pubs, schools etc These garden villages by virtue of their scale will give a very unfair advantage to those developers of the garden villages over the smaller developments, companies, developers and family run house builders that ply their trade building out smaller sites, up to 15 No. in our existing villages, so competition in both numbers and finances will have a very detrimental effect on existing rural development as we know it	The Local Plan's spatial strategy proposes growth in a number of locations which are considered the most sustainable to accommodate additional development. This growth will be delivered through a combination of large urban extensions, smaller sites, regeneration of brownfield sites, via a new settlement and through proportionate growth in the rural area. The proposed mix in the nature of development will help make sure that growth is balanced across the District, meets local needs and doesn't overburden particular areas in terms of existing services and infrastructure. New service and infrastructure provision is also planned in those areas that need it. It is expected that some infrastructure improvements will benefit the wider area rather than just within the new developments. The combination of the size and location of planned development across the District will help make it attractive to a range of developers and investors.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
			In addition, rural growth is being promoted through a number of Neighbourhood Plans across the District. These give local communities a greater say in where new development is located and also provide opportunities to plan for more growth where it is needed.
REF109	Resident	5.3.33 Residents will already be car dependent prior to moving into the new developments. The developers have allocated 2 parking places for each house on the Trinity Farm, Retford site, and are expecting people to drive rather than use public transport or bike to their destinations. The revised plans also raise concerns about safety as the new road layout could allow inconsiderate car users to use it as a race track and runs adjacent to green spaces where families, children and dog walkers may be. There appears to be a few traffic calming measures in place but not sufficient to prevent excess speed and road noise. The plan does not outline the infrastructure of charging points for the new electric cars following the Government announcement that new petrol and diesel cars will no longer be sold from 2030.	The re-alignment of Mansfield Road will help manage traffic flow and speeds through the site. Public transport and cycle access will be a requirement of the policy and should be in place from an early stage to ensure the residents do not become car dependent. Requirements for electric vehicle charging are set out in the Plan's climate change policy.
REF110	Resident	There seems quite a lot of support for a new village. With the plan only allowing for 500 out of the 4000 home to be built in the length of this plan how can you guarantee that the infrastructure be in place including the station, retail and other community facilities, including public transport services, from the early stages to serve those who have invested in their homes as stated on page 21 " The Beginnings of the New BGV will be growing around a new transport hub and employment offer" and in 5.3.33" In the early stages of development it is important that residents do not become car dependant" To meet the above statement it is clear that the plan need to upscale the amount of properties required from the outset and the life of this plan and cut back on other lager developments giving those area time to integrate and develop strategies to cope with increasing numbers? The plan shows that the route down Mansfield road will be altered to slow traffic down by sending it through the new Garden Village. What plans have been made to cope when the A1 has to be shut as happens at least twice a year? 5.3.37 What plans and consideration has be taken to cope with the increase of traffic using both Elkesley and Ranby junctions rather than using Mansfield Rd? Policy ST3 point 6 Will this include the trees lining the Bridleway / footbath that run through the centre of the proposed site and maintain this right of way?	The policy will ensure that the infrastructure requirements are clearly identified. The infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify the timeframe for delivery. Through the masterplan for the site a developer will put together and implementation strategy which will ensure that development is aligned with appropriate infrastructure. Highways England have confirmed that no improvements are needed to the A1 as a result of the Garden Village in this plan. The tree canopy cover includes existing trees on site and new planting. Public rights of way will be protected and incorporated into the design.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF129	Resident	<p>Read these proposed developments with genuine disappointment that projects such as these, requiring large areas of countryside space, are deemed acceptable in modern times given the environmental pressures to maintain what is left of our open space. The area is largely surrounded by open country and forestry and indeed, one of the few spaces that retains its rural feel. Any development in this area will have a heavy visual impact. Have excellent historical assets close by including Sherwood, Clumber and the Dukeries which are internationally respected and require special preservation and enhancement rather than projects that could impact negatively and move to a more urban feel in the area. It is a great pity we rely on international hotel and leisure companies to promote these great assets and should be doing more in my view to develop this in environmentally sustainable ways which would go hand in hand with natural development. Compare Sherwood forest with the New forest in the South which retains much of its historical and natural character. Given that Sherwood is arguably the most famous forest in the world, it is rather pitiful what remains and how little has been done to restore and enhance this amazing legacy. The Bassetlaw area is changing and developing, increasingly losing its rural character. Housing and commercial development should only be permitted within (or be part of) existing settlements. Remaining open country should be preserved and ecologically enhanced at all costs, without presuming that undeveloped land is a useable commodity. There should be no removal of mature trees and extra space made available for forestry and biodiversity to offset any negative impact. This is more important than ever, given the dire state of our natural world and rapid loss of natural species, not least through loss of habitat. This is important for this area which could be of greatly increased benefit and a valuable asset as we move to an increasingly developed and urban environment. Can and must do better than this to preserve our precious and unique resources.</p>	<p>A landscape and visual impact assessment will be required to ensure impacts are appropriately mitigated. Where possible brownfield sites in the settlements are used but there are not enough available sites to meet needs so some greenfield sites are required on the edge of settlements and elsewhere. Mature trees are protected by the policy and 20% additional biodiversity value will be secured on site.</p>
REF139	Resident	<p>Most of the points were discussed at a meeting with the planning team on the 11th January 2021 but feeding these into the consultation process to ensure these are captured and Council factor and take action into the next stage. As plans indicate, there will need to be a long period of infrastructure development required as there is limited infrastructure on site (water, sewerage, Phone lines / broadband etc.) Existing Local residents who are undoubtedly going to be affected by this development should not be forgotten about, therefore as part of the next stage planning process / masterplan for delivery (if this proposal goes ahead), this should include requirements to ensure existing residents are included in the developments and are also provided with the same level of infrastructure that the Garden Village is going to get such as improved sewerage, water supply, broadband and telephone lines. This will include upgrades required for telecommunications as the phone line service is poor and fixed broadband capability is non-existent locally at present. The provision of water for us, comes via the water supply to Morton Hill Farm and not directly with the water company. The water supply pipe comes down one of the farmer's fields, and looking at the initial plans this is an area which has been designated for housing. This needs to be included in the delivery plan to ensure water provision continues to local families and infrastructure upgraded as part of the development (water meter needs to be re-sited at our property and not as part of the farms supply). From discussion at the meeting, plans for the byway are not 100% clear / finalised as there are ongoing discussions about it. Have right of way on the top half of the byway and will require continuing access for our vehicle and for delivery of essentials such as access for Oil tankers and Waste Removal tankers (as we currently have a septic tank). Access to big vehicles providing basic services to our property due to the lack of mainstream facilities – no mains sewerage or gas supply for heating, will need to be allowed for. Beyond our property, the byway could be pedestrianised in order to reduce traffic exposure for us, as we currently enjoy little traffic on the byway and building 4000 houses will have an impact on us if traffic were to flow down the byway. The peaceful environment that we live in at present is essential to be maintained for us. Feeding in our concerns about existing privacy and security as currently the area is open fields and hedgerows with little human / vehicular throughput. With the development of the initial 500 houses rising to 4000 houses in the longer term, will no longer be in an isolated location but surrounded by this new development. This will affect our current view and amenities. Expect fencing all around our property and planting of hedgerow and trees to protect and maintain our on-going privacy that currently experience. Feeding this in to ensure that these are captured now and addressed in the masterplan. Also the B6420 which is currently pretty quiet will become busy with 4000 properties being located here. Consideration needs to be given to change the speed limit from 60mph to that appropriate for residential area as the increased traffic sound will have an impact, not to mention the increased pollution this will bring. The plan is detailed in terms of what the proposed development is going to include. Would like to see in the plans a commitment that these will actually be delivered upon, as normally what happens is that plans mention these, but developers find ways of getting out of actually delivering these. So some form of accountability would be beneficial to ensure delivery is actually made of the amenities. As a local resident to the proposed Garden Village would welcome the chance to be more involved in</p>	<p>The local community will continue to be consulted on the Local plan as it progresses and the Garden Village proposals. Further discussions are required with the infrastructure providers in relation to connectivity to utilities infrastructure for neighbouring properties. All existing infrastructure that crosses the site will be protected and access for maintenance maintained. Neighbouring properties legal right of access will be maintained. The masterplan will provide more detail on the layout and approach taken to design across the site. The policy ensures residents will experience an appropriate level of amenity. Boundary treatments will be a matter for the masterplan and subsequent planning application process. The re-alignment of Mansfield Road will help reduce traffic speeds but as the road would in the long term be taken through a residential area, the speed limit should be set appropriate to place.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		the development of these plans in order that these are not imposed upon us, and have an opportunity to ensure our concerns and worries are factored in.	
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	It is recognised that the council has an obligation to provide housing stock. If this development is to go ahead, work should not begin until arrangements are in place to ensure that community facilities and public transport services are delivered early on in the development, to mitigate the risk of it becoming a simple housing development in the countryside. Public transport services are particularly important as in the early stages, residents will need to travel for work, education and shopping. A good public transport service will help to keep increased numbers of cars off the roads. What is the impact and loss to local wildlife?	The policy ensures that the infrastructure will be phased alongside new development to ensure the right infrastructure is available for future residents/businesses. This will include public transport. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will provide broad parameters for delivery. This is a living document and will be updated on a regular basis to ensure infrastructure is appropriately phased. A 20% increase in biodiversity value will be required on site to strengthen the ecological value of the site.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	This will have an impact on Retford and Villages Primary Care Network (PCN) due to location, Whilst service and infrastructure includes health facilities it is not specific what is meant by this and the plan references 'health care facilities of an appropriate size to meet the needs of the settlement's population'. Community pharmacy provision is determined under the Pharmaceutical Regulations and would need an application to be successful and approved by NHS England Pharmaceutical Regulations Committee. There will be a need for this, so this requirement will need to link into the Nottinghamshire County 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.	The policy is flexibly worded to provide the CCG and its partners with a degree of flexibility to ensure that health care facilities can be delivered to meet the changing needs of the settlement. The Council will continue to work with the CCG to ensure that infrastructure is delivered at the appropriate time to ensure no adverse impacts on existing services.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>The considerable amount of work so far undertaken by the Council Officers is to be applauded and the general principle of garden villages is quite acceptable although relatively new, in particular to this district. Bassetlaw is predominantly a rural area and we do have an eclectic mix of villages that can easily accommodate more housing if carried out in a very methodical and planned way. In a much earlier edition of this draft local plan it was suggested that villages would “cluster” around larger villages and these larger villages would provide all the necessary services and infrastructure to serve the cluster of smaller villages. That worked very well and with the ever increasing use and provision of electric cars and home charging points the allowance for people to drive to these larger service centres cannot be classed as unsustainable. More and more electricity is being produced in a sustainable and renewable way and cars are being manufactured utilising a vast majority of recycled products and even new cars have to have a very large end of life content of 100% recyclable materials. The circle therefore has been joined and the reliance upon private cars to get people from A to B is no longer an unsustainable problem. It will in the very near future become a sustainable method of transport which will allow people to live in our rural areas. If there is one thing we have learnt with the Covid pandemic it is that isolation is the way forward, forming new large conurbations would be against this principle. Have 2 concerns regarding this particular allocation. Firstly, the location in terms of the employment sector is admirable being so close to the A1 and having the great benefit of such a good link onto the A1 and also the railway but as a housing location it is as bad as it gets. Seeking to locate in total 4000 homes and therefore families adjacent to the A1 with the hope that a green buffer will somehow reduce the negative impacts of both noise and air pollution with no mention of light pollution. Constantly reminded of the dangers of traffic fumes and pollution which affect people’s breathing and general health. This is evidenced by many schools trying to reduce the instance of vehicular movement around the roads to and from. Even the M1 is restricted to a speed limit of 50mph adjacent to junction 34 (Meadowhall) simply in an attempt to reduce pollution. This new village will place children in an area very close to the A1 with all its associated fumes and pollution together with its proximity to the interchange where studies have shown fumes are generally greater. The proposal in Policy ST4 part B4 that a deep green infrastructure buffer adjacent to the A1 will somehow resolve the issue of both noise and air pollution is somewhat difficult to comprehend unless the Council have had an in depth fully compliant pollution study carried out on this specific site. It is too late to ensure that potential developers carry this out. If the site is allocated it should be only on the basis that it is safe. Live over 1.5 miles from the A1 and with the prevailing westerly winds noise is clearly audible particularly through the night. Trees and all forms of green infrastructure will, without doubt, help by removing carbon dioxide but green infrastructure struggles more with other gases such as nitrous oxide. Any new planting will take many years, up to 20, to become established, greater than the timeframe of this particular local plan yet, if permitted, development could commence straightaway which will have the negative effect of homes being built and occupied and families put at risk whilst they await the green buffer zone to be established. If we get this location wrong then we may have a massive health problem for the long term future of families and their children. The site lies on the east side of the A1, the prevailing winds are from the west which clearly means any noise or fume pollution produced by vehicular movements on the A1, A57, A614 and the junction itself will wash over the site. For employment, which is a less sensitive receptor, this is less of a problem. New offices and factories have air conditioning and there is often little need for employees to be outside other than at break times or coming and going whereas with residential it is 24/7. As an allocation for employment this is first class, as an allocation for housing it is not and is unsafe and not in the correct location, particularly when there is an excellent opportunity to redevelop an existing brownfield site located in an unbelievably beautiful woodland setting. This alternative site is located approximately 6 miles south along the A1 on the old Bevercotes Colliery site. This site is surrounded by established woodland mostly planted to screen the original Bevercotes Colliery, is on the east side of the A1 and not affected by prevailing winds and is located approximately 1500 metres from the A1. The site has planning permission for commercial but the costs of improving the A1 junction are excessive and could prove unacceptable rendering the proposal for industry unviable as the majority of users will access or leave the A1. This does not occur with residential, the majority of which will probably go to either Ollerton or Mansfield to the west, Retford to the east and the rest will utilise the A1 to Worksop and the north and Lincoln, Newark and the south. With this split vehicular movements utilising the A1 will be reduced considerably and the improvements to the A1 junction may well be more palatable to developers. The development could include some retail but other main services are located locally and contributions from the development would see these flourish. There is a very good new primary school at Gamston less than 4 miles away, there is an excellent secondary school academy at Tuxford, investment in both would secure their future. Tuxford also boasts a doctors surgery, 2 pharmacies and various shops. Employment would be located just up the road at the new node point at Apleyhead junction or at the expanded offer that should be provided at Markham Moor where land is available and is not adjacent to major residential areas. Tuxford as a major service centre is around 4 miles from the Bevercotes site. It is a win-win situation. A brownfield site gets redeveloped. A new vibrant employment site is established at a major crossroads junction</p>	The council’s Environmental health Team have identified no concerns in relation to air quality/noise and through discussions it is considered that the site can accommodate appropriate mitigation to address potential impacts from the A1. All relevant assessments will be carried out to support the masterplan process and again to inform a planning application for the site. Bevercotes was considered as a new settlement but has been discounted because of the extent of environmental designations on site, meaning that designation is contrary to legislation and national policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
		<p>and housing is provided in a brilliant woodland setting with all the requirements to make it attractive with extensive walks, cycling, pony trekking, fishing etc all on the doorstep. If this location was in Europe it would have been redeveloped for the benefit of people some time ago. It is an absolute waste of an opportunity to provide homes for families in a safe, beautiful location with all the social facilities available for a healthy lifestyle. The housing numbers do not have to be great but a clear mix is required, it is not in a flood risk area and therefore provision for senior citizens would be acceptable although there is already a 66 dwelling proposal for over 55s at Springvale Park approximately 1100 metres to the south. These types of sites do not become available every day and such an opportunity to redevelop should not be missed.</p> <p>To sum up:- Bevercotes Colliery site already has its own identity. It has a very good junction onto the B6387 which in turn has a junction on to the A1 for north and south moving traffic. It has good existing roadway links to Ollerton, Mansfield, Nottingham, Retford and Gainsborough. The site is located within established woodland such that screening and landscaping is not a problem, it mostly exists. These woods offer great opportunities for wildlife and habitat enhancement. There are vast areas given over to walking around the restored areas provided by Notts County Council with full access available without having to utilise a car. It is located adjacent to the National Cycle Network. It has a bridleway running through it. It is a brownfield site. Other recreational offers such as angling are located adjacent to the site. There is another major environmental benefit to this site that could truly make this residential proposal zero carbon. Located at Springvale Farm some 1600 metres due south of the old colliery site is an AD Plant which generates electricity from waste fruit and vegetables and energy crops and feeds back the electricity into the national grid. This plant has the capacity to provide electricity to over 3500 homes.</p> <p>With nominal infrastructure put in place consisting of an underground cable and floor mounted transformer, some of this electricity could be routed directly to serve this new residential allocation. Coupled with this is the new technology that allows the gas produced by the AD Plant to be cleaned and put back into the national grid pipeline. With this facility the new homes would be served with both gas and electricity generated from waste. That is truly an eco-friendly village and unlike Cottam, the energy provider is already in place and it does not have to wait before coming online. Putting all the above together this must surely be the best opportunity to provide an eco-village set in wonderful wooded countryside adjacent to all the requirements to promote a healthy community which should be a showpiece for the district and of course the Council.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Undue competition for rural housing with the provision of so many on Apleyhead site. 2. Most existing villages rely upon the “little and often” principle of development but this means land and construction costs are generally greater than larger scale developments. The garden village is to provide 500 new homes in this plan period, the equivalent of a village the size of Ranskill or East Markham and with this size comes the “economy of scale”. Dwellings would be cheaper and people will gravitate to these cheaper homes. This will mean that the only dwellings built in all villages will be large expensive homes, not what the mix requirements suggest. Villages will not be able to retain services nor attract any new ones, they will become “dormitories” and not provide family homes for rural workers or workers at the new employment node points. This form of large scale residential development will have effects on the rural area for generations to come and it is having its effect already with the housing cap on smaller villages now being proposed at 5% rather than 20% which has been used by several Parish Councils in the preparation and adoption of Neighbourhood Plans. The establishment of a new large housing allocation will affect the following:- a. Equal provision of housing around the district given that economies of scale will provide much cheaper homes. b. Reduce further the amount of smaller family homes or senior citizen accommodation in villages. c. The amount of larger more expensive dwellings in villages will increase as these will be the only market that can afford these costs. d. Reduce the ability of villages to retain and attract services. Numbers will less need for the shop, public house, village hall and, most importantly the nursery/primary school.</p> <p>e. There will be no investment or increase in the frequency of the rural bus services. People who buy large rural properties do not utilise the bus service. f. Once this process is put in place and homes start to roll off the construction line then it becomes irreversible, therefore all the negative effects on the existing rural area will last for generations. g. Much in the same way “out of town retail” was resisted, this form of “out of town residential” should also be resisted. Evidence for out of town development does have a major negative effect is clear when one looks at both Retford and Worksop town centres, both are shadows of their former selves. There is a glut of charity shops and what has been recently classified as non-essential shops but the vast majority of footfall traffic heads to the supermarkets given that many of these now stock clothes, household goods, furniture, tools, equipment etc. The need to enter the town has diminished. The same will happen with housing although this time it will be villages and communities that suffer. If the number of families in our villages stays static and does not increase then the schools, shops and public houses will close meaning that children, shoppers and the general community will need to travel, it defeats the object. Other than the general shortfall of housing in the district and in particular affordable housing do not see evidence that suggests a garden village is the way to resolve this. It is correct that it will provide houses, employment and services. The employment requirement is clear but the only reason we need services is because we are putting houses there. If we did not put houses, we would not need the services therefore if the houses can be located in existing areas the whole ethos of a garden village is unproven. Obviously a garden village can be seen as a panacea for all. All the obvious facilities would have to be provided by developers but see little evidence of studies to investigate the impacts, either negative or positive, on surrounding villages and our rural area in general. These large scale allocations for residential development should be omitted and resisted strongly.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for the rural area is considered appropriate in relation to local context and the level of accessibility each village has in terms of services, local shops and public transport. The housing mix policy and those identified by made Neighbourhood Plans will help ensure that a more appropriate housing mix can be achieved in the rural area. New build housing does not necessarily equate to cheaper homes. The requirement for the villages is considered appropriate to enable the sustainable operation of the rural area’s shops and services. The level of services that could be secured at the Garden Village such as a railway station cannot be secured elsewhere in the District. By delivering a range of services and delivering public transport it make a greater range of services more accessible to the rural community.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF228	Sutton-cum-Lound Parish Council	<p>Support the concept of the phased development of the new “Garden Village” given the clear sustainable development opportunities the project will bring including the new transport hubs and cycle links. Such a proposal will enable the best available technologies to be applied to the housing scheme and introduce green infrastructure to the new settlement. It will ease development pressure on local villages where unwelcome and inappropriate housing developments have been promoted which diminish the rural and historic character of such small settlements. Given the site’s location strategically situation close to the Five Lane Ends A1 intersection, this will essentially be a new “gateway” to Retford and surrounding villages and this “gateway” should not be interrupted by extraneous commercial development when other more suitable sites are available to develop commercial uses including that of a service station. There is a site being promoted to the north of the A1 which could more readily accommodate commercial development The concept of a “green” service station similar to that at Gloucester Services sounds “nice” but as a local planning authority there are no controls in place to ensure this will come to fruition and stop one of the national commercial groups taking over the site. It is not considered that a service station is an appropriate part of the “gateway” into the new settlement and then on into Retford itself. Question the need for additional service station facilities when there is Blyth only a few miles to the north and Markham Moor a similar distance to the south. A meaningful buffer should be provided between the new settlement and the A1 within which a wider green corridor (say at least 250m wide) could be located including strategically located tree covered screening mounds which would separate the future housing from the A1 providing both a visual and importantly acoustic barrier to the new settlement. There are several examples along the M1 and other strategic highways where housing developments are being constructed adjacent to these busy carriageways and the only way these can acoustically be screened is by incongruous high fencing. At the “Garden Village”, the opportunity exists from the outset to incorporate a more naturalistic and sustainable solution which would enable the residents of the new settlement not to be constantly disturbed by the drone from A1 traffic 24/7. Off-site highway works, consider that given the increase in traffic related to the development (new residents and construction traffic) then either prior to or at an early stage of the village development there should be a clear commitment to undertake highway improvements to the cross-roads in Babworth (A620/B6420) and the rail crossing point close to the development. In summary • Sutton-cum-Lound SUPPORT the concept of the “Garden Village” • commercial development is appropriate on the site which is also the “gateway” to Retford; alternative sites are available in the immediate area • It is not considered that a service station is appropriate; (same reason as for objecting to the commercial development) • A significant landscaped and acoustic barrier (minimum 250m wide) should be provided between the new settlement and A1 • Early off-site highway improvements implemented</p>	It is considered that an appropriately designed commercial area could be an attractive gateway to the new settlement. The green buffer along the A1 would need to be approx. 400m wide to address biodiversity impacts. The Garden Village will make appropriate financial contributions to off site highways infrastructure. This will be phased so that delivery is made at the right time to mitigate impacts from the new community.
REF224	Sheffield City Region	<p>Proposals for a new Garden Village in the Draft Plan as well as the Renewable Energy Hub are also supported. These are exactly the type of innovation needed to help close the divide between north and south and level up our areas. Transport policies in the Draft Plan, for both rail and active travel, support key planks of our own work in South Yorkshire, helping to improve connectivity and sustainable travel modes whilst tackling issues like poor health and air quality. Importantly, the Garden Village proposal includes provision for a new public transport facility including a rail station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line. This will complement other initiatives in SCR as well as strengthen rail connections to Sheffield from the east. The SCR Integrated Rail Plan (July 2019) provides more detail on how we see these services developing in the future.</p>	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<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 change. It is essential 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, Second Edition, February 2020). 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.</p>	<p>The lead in times for delivery will be carefully evidenced in line with the reports identified to ensure the most up to date position is referenced. Statements of Common Ground will be in place to demonstrate areas of agreement with interested parties. The housing supply indicates a strong buffer and a windfall allowance providing sufficient flexibility in the supply moving forward, ensuring the Council is not overly reliant on the Garden Village to maintain a 5 year supply towards the end of the plan period.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER		ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION				
REF117	(Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Recognise the Council’s aspiration to create a new settlement but have previously questioned the need for this strategy given: • The Council has a Vision and Strategic Objectives focusing growth on the main towns, including supporting their growth and regeneration; • There are no policy or environmental constraints in Bassetlaw which means that growth cannot be accommodated at existing settlements; and • The Garden Village is unlikely to make any significant contribution to delivering homes during the plan period to 2037. Disagree that there is a pressing 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. Supportive of the Local Plan’s ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the proposed Garden Village on the basis that it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of existing Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Policies ST3 and ST4 provides for a loose policy framework rather than a mechanism that the Council can use to control delivery of the Garden Village. The Policy needs to be reworked. Part A of ST3 should set out very clearly what the land uses are to be provided and the essential infrastructure. Part B should not set “parameters”. It should set out very clearly what specific criteria are to be achieved if the Council is to grant permission. At present, part B reads as a list of ideals rather than specific requirements.</p> <p>Policy ST4 is a list of statements rather than a specific Policy and it is unclear for developers as to what the Council expects. Policy ST4 does not actually require applicants to do anything. Is it the intention of the Council to have a specific masterplan framework to be prepared as Supplementary Planning Guidance that can be subject to public consultation and adopted by the Council? Paragraph 5.3.33 states that it is important that residents are not car dependent. In the event this project advances, we would agree with this. Policy ST3 is written as a general statement rather than specific criteria which must be achieved. Equally, Policy ST4 makes no mention of a new railway station. Overwhelming lack of evidence to support the feasibility and viability of the proposed sustainability features required to deliver the Garden Village which, consider will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the serious risk of 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. 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’. Significant concerns as to the level of detail contained within the assessment. The assessment takes a generic approach to all allocations in terms of costs, including abnormalities (assumes a standard approach with no utility diversions or similar), plus a non-specific approach to obligations that would have no relevance to a new settlement in a relatively isolated position such as this 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 at the Garden Village, there appears to be no real certainty on how that station would be delivered or the costs of doing so. The strategy underpinning the Garden Village is not based upon achieving sustainable growth. The intention that it should not be car dependent is undermined by the lack of an ‘infrastructure first’ approach before any homes are built and the Plan is largely silent on how key infrastructure, like a new Railway Station, is to be delivered. For all other allocations in this Plan (Sites HS1-HS13), the Council has set out a specific list of criteria which proposals ‘should’ meet. This is a more rigid approach to the Policy framework for the Garden Village site, where a list of broad statements has been provided. The Plan is inconsistent in this regard.</p>	<p>The Vision and Objectives will be revisited to better reflect the long term approach to be taken to the spatial strategy. The evidence base indicates that the main towns will have more limited capacity in the longer term. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to future proof growth in the District in a sustainable manner. The policy confirms the Garden Village will only provide for 500 homes in this plan period as well as 10ha of employment land. Two urban extensions have been identified in Worksop and Retford to cater for the needs of those settlements in this plan period and contribute to the next. The Garden Village will be a self sustaining settlement with services to support the needs of its residents. The growth of Worksop, Retford & Harworth will support the vitality and viability of the Main Towns. Policies ST3 and ST4 have been revisited to provide an appropriate policy framework to take the Garden Village forward. A masterplan framework is a requirement for the site, to have Council approval and be subject to community consultation. At a strategic level the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the Garden Village can be delivered through a financially viable scheme. The Rail Station Feasibility Study confirms the railway station is technically feasible and Network Rail have given in principle agreement for the scheme. A new bus service will be a requirement along with new cycle access to ensure that residents do not become car dependent in the early phase.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF202 GV Site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>Generally approve of the Garden City Principles being set out as part of the pretext to the policy itself. This reflects our client's commitment to ensuring that development is undertaken in a sympathetic and sustainable way, clearly setting the scene for the following policies. Green Infrastructure and Landscape Paragraphs 5.3.13 to 5.3.19 go to the heart of the landowner's aspirations for the site, with a commitment to a landscape led design which has been influenced by the local character and distinctiveness of its rural location, reflects key characteristics of openness, landscape and heritage, whilst significantly contributing to environmental quality. Para 5.3.14 clearly emphasises the Garden Villages commitment to incorporating "an extensive green/blue infrastructure network. Covering 40% of the site, green infrastructure is at the forefront of the Garden Village's design". It is essential that the 40% figure is correctly noted as aspirational, as the artificial heightening of this figure may have unintended consequences on density – for example, leading to issues with viability and good place-making. Without understanding the next stage in terms of detail it is critical that this figure is specifically noted as indicative. Healthy Place-making highlight support of the healthy place making ethos underpinning the garden village. A key element are the '10 minute neighbourhoods'. This integral design concept ensures residents are encouraged to adopt active lifestyles, by being able to walk/cycle, skate and scoot to reach local services and well-connected green infrastructure easily, or reach public transport to take them there. This is fully supported as an overarching aim for the majority of homes, yet whilst appreciating it may not be achievable with every plot. Paragraph 5.3.31, transport, and the movement of vehicles and people, are vital to the successful development of the Garden Village. Support the promotion of travel choices via walking, cycling, bus and rail over the use of the private car. There are a range of different sustainable transport projects to help deliver the Garden Village, including opening up old railway station, pedestrian/cycle bridge over the A1, re-routing Mansfield Road and new bus provision. These are all supported in principle. The next stage, as you are aware will be to test the financial implications at this stage that has not been carried out. The costs associated with implementing any garden village especially in relation to the transport infrastructure are often significant so the policy should record these as aspirations. Note that policy ST5 references open book viability assessments, this would come at the rear of the process rather than frontloading to ensure deliverability at the outset. This will be one of the first areas of work on appointment of a developer with the final transport projects would likely be brought forward and agreed during completion of the Masterplan framework.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome. The Vision Statement will recognise that the concept plan is indicative, however the principles of the policy in terms of development capacity can be achieved with 40% green infrastructure. At a strategic level the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2021 states that the Garden Village can be delivered through a financially viable scheme. The infrastructure requirements have been identified by evidence as being required to support the delivery of 500 homes in this plan and the 3500 thereafter.</p>
REF202 GV Site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>The landowners support the overarching policy objectives in principle at this stage as set out in A-B and 5-12. Commitment to 3 hubs but do however raise specific concerns over the commitment to a number of components detailed as part of the initial masterplan for the reasons set out above. Having reviewed Policy ST3 in more detailed query the explicit reference to the three hubs at part 4. Recognise this is the preferred approach and indeed may be the design which comes forward it seems rather restrictive at this stage to be setting out the policy in terms of the three hubs. Suggest refining section 4 to be more flexible in this respect. Unclear as to the amount of employment being phased early, it cites various figures, including 15ha at paragraph 5.3.7 but then within policy ST3 part B2 it states "at least 10ha of employment". Need to clarify the amount and phasing of development including on my client's land (i.e. 5ha) for the early stages. Note at point 13 a list of new and enhanced transport infrastructure to be included to support sustainable and active modes of travel. Support these in principle note the extensive list of provisions and believe they should be cited as aspirational options subject to viability testing to ensure the scheme can be delivered.</p>	<p>One of the principles of the Garden Village is a healthy place. It is important that residents/occupiers are able to use active travel to access everyday services, transport and work. Having three activity nodes supports the principles of the 10 minute neighbourhood and reinforces healthy place-making principles. The concept plan will be identified as indicative so the location of the hubs is not fixed although some of the infrastructure at each is. 10ha of employment land will be identified in the policy, with commercial land as additional.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF193 GV Site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>Our client welcomes the overall approach and level of detail within the policy and the commitment to a ‘landscape-led’ masterplan. The details within ST3 are supported and could be further refined as follows:</p> <p>A.2 In addition to Garden City and Active Design Principles, the policy should make reference to the WHO Guidance on Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviour published in 2020. This provides evidence-based public health recommendations for all groups in society about the amount of physical activity (frequency, intensity and duration) required to offer significant health benefits and mitigate health risks.</p> <p>B.2 The inclusion of employment land as part of the Garden Village is welcomed and important to creating a sustainable community, as is ensuring a mix of different types of employment premises and sectors. In the development of the Plan, our client has highlighted the importance of ensuring that the types of employment uses are complementary to the residential and other uses proposed on the site. Reiterated the need to locate large/national scale warehousing uses to dedicated employment sites elsewhere in the district and to ensure that there is a positive relationship between employment areas and housing and open space. Uses which would cause excessive noise or pollution should be directed to other parts of Bassetlaw. B.4 The creation of three distinct hubs is supported. In relation to b) iii which concerns the creation of a built community facility including changing accommodation and outdoor space for sports facilities, it is important that these are truly useable facilities. For the green spaces to be truly utilised as active spaces the design should ensure that there are accessible toilets, good lighting, shelter, and wifi. B.5. The figure of 40% of the total land area (minimum) for a ‘connected, multi-functional green and blue infrastructure network’ is supported and should be seen as a vital element of the Vision for the Garden Village. B.6. The aim of ensuring that tree canopy cover of the development site is a minimum of 30% is supported as well as the retention of existing woodland. It is important that in considering tree cover and new planting, further detailed assessment is undertaken. Trees and woodland present the opportunity to contribute to the scheme as an exemplar in sustainable design. Planting should be planned by looking to the future and considering how it can help with climate adaptation, rather than assuming that recreation of the historic landscape is the only option. Bigger areas of woodland could be included along with linear strips to create a mix of habitats and strong landscape character. B.8. In relation to net biodiversity gain, the inclusion of a target of 20% is welcomed. This must be sought on site as part of the Garden Village as it goes to the heart of the vision for the site. B.13.b. welcomes the comments in relation to the new railway station, which reflects their position that all railway infrastructure, car parking, bus interchange and cycle facilities should be on the southern side of the railway line. Only a platform of the minimum necessary specification should be located on the northern side to minimise intrusion into this area of land. C. The suggestion that permitted development rights (PDR) are removed to restrict the type of alterations and extensions that can take place to properties once built is supported. The design principles are an essential part of creating an attractive and cohesive Garden Village. By removing PDR, it enables the decision maker to assess proposals for changes as they come forward to ensure that they would be in keeping with the character of the development, and would not erode the sustainable design principles which underpin the scheme.</p>	<p>Reference to the WHO guidance will be added to the supporting text. The employment land is being promoted for growth sector use rather than large scale warehousing. The sports/community facilities will be designed to be a community hub with a range of facilities designed for all ages and abilities. Reference will be added to the supporting text to ancillary facilities at outdoor spaces. An arboriculture plan will be required by policy to ensure tree canopy cover is appropriate. This will ensure that the canopy cover is appropriate to place and the species mix reflects the local context. The allocation confirms that only the platform is identified on the northern side of the railway line.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>The principle and ambition of a new settlement is supported, particularly where it can (alongside other strategic objectives) deliver a step change in the regeneration and growth prospects for Bassetlaw, and result in the co-location of major employment and housing growth to create sustainable places. Object to detailed wording within ST3 to ST5, particularly where the policies relate to potential offsite infrastructure and accessibility requirements that could burden other landowners who fall outside the new settlement boundary but are required to provide new settlement related infrastructure. As detailed in our previous representations, new settlement policies must not directly link its delivery to the Apleyhead Junction allocation (Policy ST10) which then creates unnecessary and unjustified interdependencies for the sites. Policy ST3 currently, and perhaps inadvertently, places new settlement infrastructure and delivery requirements on the Apleyhead Junction site potentially creating disproportionate interdependencies between the sites. Such requirements could adversely impact the ability to deliver the significant employment development at Apleyhead Junction in the short to medium term. For example, Policy ST3 refers to the ‘Provision of cycling links across the A1, including alongside the railway line to Apleyhead Junction...’ as an intervention for the Garden Village. Such an intervention may require agreement with or delivery by other parties or may place unreasonable burdens on those who control land out with the new settlement. Further evidence is needed to justify the new settlement proposition, particularly in terms of infrastructure requirements and provision. This additional evidence may then mean an alternative infrastructure solution is needed, which is not overly prescriptive in terms of new settlement details, to ensure the local plan remains sound.</p> <p>An appropriate way of addressing such issues would be for the local plan to identify the broad location for a new settlement rather than set specific site details (such as infrastructure requirements) which is the current approach. That way all reasonable options for the extent of the new settlement, its infrastructure requirements, and layout, for example, can be properly considered. The Draft Garden Village Vision Statement could still set a framework for new settlement aspirations and objectives. The final detail would be omitted from the local plan and Vision Statement and subject to further assessments and appraisals informed by further evidence base work. The detail of the new settlement could then be defined in a later development plan document or supplementary planning document, as informed by further evidence, without delaying delivery of the new settlement. Such a strategy would be consistent with the approach taken by other non-Green Belt local planning authorities where the principle of a new settlement is enshrined in the local plan with the detail fixed through subsequent separate plan documents. Such an approach would not necessarily delay new settlement delivery as the current local plan housing trajectory envisages only limited delivery late in the plan period. The subsequent development plan document can then assess in detail the most appropriate layout, mix of uses, infrastructure requirements and delivery, to deliver a new settlement in the most sustainable way. Where feasible, reasonable, and appropriate, Caddick could also assist in supporting new settlement aspirations. For example, the Apleyhead Junction site could incorporate opportunities to link with new settlement infrastructure. However, the detail of these interventions would be considered at the planning application stage provided the requirements are reasonable and proportionate. It is fundamentally critical the infrastructure expectations are proportionate to the relative development proposition(s) on the constituent sites. The new settlement policy should enable identification of a broad location for a new settlement but not go as far as define a specific site proposition nor set fixed infrastructure requirements which may change over time.</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements associated with the Garden Village will be revised to reflect the most up to date evidence position. Where evidence shows that more than one scheme will have an impact on infrastructure such as a road junction then it is reasonable to expect a proportionate contribution to mitigate that impact. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will clarify the proportionality. The requirement for cycling links to the Garden Village will be revised as a request to consider options for... in the long term. An allocation is considered an appropriate tool to take forward the Garden Village particularly as development is not identified until late in the plan period.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST03 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SITE ALLOCATION			
REF228	Sutton-cum-Lound Parish Council	<p>Sutton-cum-Lound Parish Council wish to support the concept of the phased development of the new “Garden Village” given the clear sustainable development opportunities the project will bring including the new transport hubs and cycle links. Such a proposal will enable the best available technologies to be applied to the housing scheme and introduce green infrastructure to the new settlement. It will additionally ease development pressure on local villages where unwelcome and inappropriate housing developments have been promoted which diminish the rural and historic character of such small settlements. However, given the site’s location strategically situation close to the Five Lane Ends A1 intersection, this will essentially be a new “gateway” to Retford and surrounding villages and we feel this “gateway” should not be interrupted by extraneous commercial development when other more suitable sites are available to develop commercial uses including that of a service station. There is a site being promoted to the north of the A1 which could more readily accommodate commercial development. The concept of a “green” service station similar to that at Gloucester Services sounds “nice” but as a local planning authority there are no controls in place to ensure this will come to fruition and stop one of the national commercial groups taking over the site. In any event, it is not considered that a service station is an appropriate part of the “gateway” into the new settlement and then on into Retford itself. Moreover, we would question the need for additional service station facilities when there is Blyth only a few miles to the north and Markham Moor a similar distance to the south. It is considered that a meaningful buffer should be provided between the new settlement and the A1 within which a wider green corridor (say at least 250m wide) could be located including strategically located tree covered screening mounds which would separate the future housing from the A1 providing both a visual and importantly acoustic barrier to the new settlement. There are several examples along the M1 and other strategic highways where housing developments are being constructed adjacent to these busy carriageways and the only way these can acoustically be screened is by incongruous high fencing. At the “Garden Village” site, the opportunity exists from the outset to incorporate a more naturalistic and sustainable solution which would enable the residents of the new settlement not to be constantly disturbed by the drone from A1 traffic 24/7. In respect of off-site highway works, we consider that given the increase in traffic related to the development (new residents and construction traffic) then either prior to or at an early stage of the village development there should be a clear commitment to undertake highway improvements to the cross-roads in Babworth (A620/B6420) and the rail crossing point close to the development. In summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sutton-cum-Lound SUPPORT the concept of the “Garden Village” • It is not considered commercial development is appropriate on the site which is also the “gateway” to Retford; alternative sites are available in the immediate area • It is not considered that a service station is appropriate; (same reason as for objecting to the commercial development) • A significant landscaped and acoustic barrier (minimum 250m wide) should be provided between the new settlement and A1 • Early off-site highway improvements implemented 	It is considered that an appropriately designed commercial area could be an attractive gateway to the new settlement. The green buffer along the A1 would need to be approx. 400m wide to address biodiversity impacts. The Garden Village will make appropriate financial contributions to off site highways infrastructure. This will be phased so that delivery is made at the right time to mitigate impacts from the new community.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	Welcome the proposed rewording of the supporting text and inclusion of Policy ST4 when compared to the February 2020 draft, which make more explicit the need for development to promote off-site improvements to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in vicinity of the proposed Garden Village. Part D refers to the need for development to promote public rights of way improvements within the site and through connections to the network outside the site boundary. This would help to ensure that it becomes clear to decision makers that demands upon the existing walking and cycling infrastructure, including the towpath of the Chesterfield canal, will be assessed as part of the future masterplanning for the site.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF060	Notts County Council	The provision of a 3ha site within the proposed Health & Well-Being Hub to accommodate a future primary school and early years facility is agreed. A mitigation strategy to accommodate the pupils generated by the first 500 dwelling phase is required. This would be in the form of financial contributions to transport pupils to surrounding schools prior to the opening of a new school onsite.	Comments noted. The requirement for school transport contributions will be reflected in future policy.
REF087	Highways England	The Bassetlaw Garden Village has been proposed to accommodate a total of 4,000 dwellings, note that a minimum of 501 have been allocated for this Local Plan period. In relation to Bassetlaw Garden Village, 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.	Comments noted. This will be a matter covered by the masterplan and future planning application for the site.
REF122	North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership	Encourages walking and cycling by virtue of "10 minute neighbourhoods". Consider a footpath and cycleway from the Garden Village into Retford be added to give additional encouragement for walking and cycling. Note that 5.3.34 states "Access to Retford will be achieved on road or in the long term off road via public rights of way to Ordsall South. " Discourage walking and cycling on the existing road network and encourage the development of a footpath and cycleway to Retford at the start of the garden village development to encourage the use of active travel as opposed to car travel by the earliest residents rather than add the facility "in the long term". Thus in Policy ST56 3a and 3c should be combined.	The provision of a walking and cycling route to Retford would be generated by the number of residents/occupiers in the development. The provision of infrastructure will be phased to reflect the demand generated by the new development.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	ST4 identifies a footbridge giving access to Worksop and potentially Clumber Park. Cycle tracks, footpaths etc should link up to Elkesley and through to Bevercotes to encourage exercise, not just for the residents but also the tourists who have such a big financial input to Bassetlaw and the businesses located here. The rail-line that ran past Bevercotes could become another recreational trail to link communities from further afield (5.3.34).	The green bridge would potentially be available to all users of the development.
REF153	Natural England	Pleased this policy is following a landscape led approach to ensure that the proposed village fits in with the surrounding countryside and respects the historic setting of Clumber Park. Welcome Green & Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity which recognises the importance of providing connected natural areas for the benefit of both nature and people. The requirement for SANGS will ensure that new residents will be able to access local green space for everyday recreational needs and dog walking without putting additional pressure on the nearby Clumber Park SSSI. Acknowledge that the additional tree cover will assist in providing nature-based solutions for climate resilience.	Support noted and welcome.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	ST4 identifies a footbridge giving access to Worksop and potentially Clumber Park. Cycle tracks, footpaths etc should link up to Elkesley and through to Bevercotes to encourage exercise, not just for the residents but also the tourists who have such a big financial input to Bassetlaw and the businesses located here. The rail-line that ran past Bevercotes could become another recreational trail to link communities from further afield (5.3.34).	The Local Plan can only identify proposals that are necessary to deliver the site allocations. The Council will continue to work with partners to secure improvements to the cycle network in the District.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome D. (transport and accessibility).	Support noted and welcome.
REF211	National Trust	ST4 3ii welcome the provision that sensitive design, height and form of development along the western boundary should respect the character and setting of historic Clumber Park. ST4 4i states that the design will incorporate important views such as those from Clumber Park. Not aware of any views of the Garden Village site from Clumber Park and this is unlikely to be a key design consideration provided that boundary planting and building heights are carefully managed.	Comments noted. Reference will be removed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF214	Historic England	The Garden Village principles set out at Para 5.3.5 are noted, and it is acknowledged that the historic environment would be addressed in cultural elements referred to in Bullet Point (BP) 8. The heritage references in paragraph 5.3.13 and 5.3.20 are welcomed. The archaeological assessment referred to in paragraph 5.3.21 is noted but it is not clear how this sits with other aspirations for the site including effective water management and surface water run-off suggested in 5.3.16 which are expected to include wetlands and balancing ponds - these could result in a loss of heritage assets that would not be able to be compensated for. When the significance of any archaeology at the site is currently an unknown, it is not possible to consider the potential harm to heritage assets as part of the Plan process so there is an issue of soundness at present. To address some of the concerns in relation to the historic environment it may be necessary to undertake some of the work set out in Section A of Policy ST4: Bassetlaw Garden Village Spatial (typo 'Spacial' in Draft Plan) Design Framework as part of the Plan process to demonstrate that the Plan will be able to achieve its aspirations for the site. Welcome opportunity to discuss this further and ahead of the next round of consultation and to continue engagement with the Council as the SPD progresses.	The concept plan for the garden village is indicative and is expected to be refined as the masterplanning process continues. A desk top archaeological assessment has been completed and a geophysical survey is underway. This will inform the evolution of the design of the site. Historic England have been involved with discussions with Lincs Archaeology and the Council about the approach to archaeology on site and the agreement has been reached in relation to the policy approach. This is evidenced through the draft Statement of Common Ground for both parties. The Heritage Paper sets out how heritage has been considered in the site selection process, the Site Selection Methodology paper confirms this. The Heritage Paper has been agreed with Historic England. The policy has been amended to make reference to a heritage /landscape led masterplan.
1671033	Resident	Commend and draw attention to Transport and Accessibility section in the Bassetlaw Garden Village Spatial Design Statement. Agree with all the points in this section and want to emphasise point 4 and the importance of 'creating safe, direct, new and improved pedestrian and cycling links from the site to Worksop, Retford, Clumber and Apleyhead junction.' This is a really important opportunity to create safe cycling links between our main communities, work, leisure and school sites. This is essential to create healthy sustainable communities in the future. Hope BDC will continue to work with NCC and stakeholders, such as Sustrans, to develop these routes.	Support noted and welcome.
REF058	Sport England	Supported – particularly section B and Healthy, Active Buildings and spaces Section C? and section D	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF202 GV site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>This policy could be condensed within ST3 limiting the opportunity for policy conflicts and overlapping. It also seems to overlap with the purpose of the Garden Village Vision Statement. This policy should be deleted with the design considerations deferred to Garden Village Vision Statement. Landscape Led, High Quality Design and Distinctive Character welcome the reference to density at point 5 of Policy ST4 as it is important have some understanding of what densities are being assumed on the net developable areas. There is no specific dwellings per hectare/ acre mentioned within the policy and so it is hard to understand the densities providing as part of the Garden Village and if indeed the initial masterplan is deliverable (in terms of being both market facing and delivering the quantum envisaged). Note instead the inclusion of a density plan at Appendix 3 of the Garden Village Vision Statement which assumed would provide further clarity in this respect. However the plan does not include specific dwellings per hectare/ acre. Recognise the council's detail may not be established at this stage it would be useful to include some approximate figures to help provide clarity and understand if the 40% Green/Blue for example does not comprise on other Garden Village principles and overall deliverability. Green/Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity support the design of green/ blue infrastructure as an integral part of the layout. Need to raise another fundamental issue for our client, which is the boundary planting on the south-eastern side, to ensure a clear separation with our client's farm. Recognise the text touches upon a 'deep' tree buffer, needs the reassurance this would be c. 100m deep and would request that this specific figure is written into the text and within the Vision Framework Document. Need to have a commitment to provide hard boundary treatment in this location to ensure the operational aspects of the farm are unhindered, designing out any opportunity for trespassing. Note that there is reference to fencing within the pretext of Policy ST3. This is supported but again the overlapping nature of the policies appears some elements are being missed. Transport and Accessibility As detailed at paragraph 5.3.36 the Garden Village will require the partial re-alignment of Mansfield Road. While our client accepts this in principle it is appropriate that due care and diligence has been given to the phasing and timing of the changes to Mansfield Road, especially as this impacts on our client's existing business. This re-alignment should not take place within this plan period and where possible should be pushed back as late as possible into the development. Recognise such details as road access maybe premature at this stage but need to ensure such considerations have been made to demonstrate unhindered (dedicated) farm access from both north and southbound along Mansfield Road. Welcome further discussions with BDC in this respect. Like part D, which is dedicated to transport and accessibility, to include reference to the need for access to be maintained through the development to the farm holding which is important to our client and operation of their business and should be emphasised within the text. Recognise this is touched upon within paragraph 5.3.18 given it is of significant importance to our client request that the maintaining of our client's access is detailed with part D.</p>	<p>The policy will be amended to better reflect the design principles and priorities at the Garden Village and to avoid duplication. As a long term proposal it is not necessary to include a detailed density plan at this stage, as that is a matter for the detailed design and development process. It is possible to include 40% green infrastructure and infrastructure on site with the quantum of development proposed. The buffer on the south western boundary would be 100m deep. Detailed boundary treatments are a matter for the detailed design and planning process. The re-alignment of Mansfield Road will be delivered off-line so should not cause any unnecessary impacts on local business. The timing will need to be agreed with the Local Highways Authority to reflect the phasing of development. The Vision Statement maintains dedicated access to the farm adjoining the south-west of the site. Reference will be added to the policy accordingly.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST4 - BASSETLAW GARDEN VILLAGE SPATIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK			
REF193 GV site	Savills on behalf of land owner	<p>A clear policy which sets the parameters for future masterplans/designs for the Garden Village is welcomed. Landscape Led, High Quality Design and Distinctive Character A.6. In addition to the principles set out for new development, it is suggested that opportunities for providing a green energy supply to development on the site should be incorporated. Green/Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity B. The principles are supported. The criteria should be widened to include the need for any proposals to enhance the existing green infrastructure on the site, such as the brickyard, the woodland at Morton Hill Clump and the old byway running west to east along the site. Along with the aspirations of part C, keen to emphasise the importance of ensuring that any masterplan is based upon creating useable and valuable natural resources. Whilst achieving a broad range of green infrastructure is, and should be, at the very heart of the vision for the Garden Village, it may not be possible to achieve everything (tree planting, wood pasture, species rich grassland, orchards etc). It would be a significant achievement if all types of greenspace space could be achieved within the Garden Village, however, ST4 should encourage a masterplan which has properly researched and explored these concepts, and includes an exemplar approach to green infrastructure. It would be better to meet the objective to a high standard, even if this means focusing on fewer types of habitat and but delivering them with excellence.</p> <p>B.7 It is important that cycle and footpaths throughout the site are well lit to encourage their use throughout the year and at all times of day and night. The Garden Village should provide local cycle routes connecting it to Worksop, Retford and the countryside, ensuring that wherever possible, these are truly segregated to encourage people to change their transport behaviour and cycle. D C. 4 The principles in this section are supported although should be reviewed within the context of the new WHO guidance. With specific reference to the integration of space to grow local food through allotments orchards and community gardens within 10 mins of each hub, it is important that any masterplan is based on creating useable and valuable resources. It would be a significant achievement if all three types of space could be achieved within 10 mins of each hub, however, ST4 should encourage a masterplan which has properly explored these concepts and includes an exemplar approach to community food production. It would be better to meet the objective to a high standard for all hub areas, even if this means focusing on only one or two approaches.</p>	The policy makes reference to use of renewable and positive energy schemes. Policy will ensure protection and enhancement of on site green infrastructure. The proposed habitats mix has been guided by the Notts Wildlife Trust, but the detailed provision will be a matter for the masterplan and subsequent decision-making process. Safe cyclepaths are covered by the sustainable travel policy. Reference to WHO guidance will be added to the supporting text. Access to local food growing will be maintained but the requirements will be flexible to ensure the provision can be design responsive.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - WORKSOP CENTRAL			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	<p>The 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. In order 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. Welcome the wording of part A.6. of this policy, when compared to the February 2020 document, which provides more detail as to what is expected within the future Development Plan Document (DPD) and of developers with regards to the relationship between the town and the canal. The 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.</p>	The Chesterfield Canal is designated as a Major Green Corridor and is considered a significant environmental asset for the town. It forms a central role in the Regeneration of Worksop Central and will provide a multifunctional purpose for recreation, habitat protection, walking and cycling infrastructure alongside and future development working with the canal rather than against it.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - WORKSOP CENTRAL			
		Paragraph 5.4.8 To avoid confusion, advise that “Canal and Rivers Trust” should be amended to “Canal and River Trust” (with River being singular).	
1661750	St Anne's Church	Good to see improvement of the town centre taking place but how will you attract shops to take up places as there are so many empty shop spaces now. A vibrant town needs investment from large companies. When we are already putting off companies like Lidl for not building in the right place we are giving the wrong message. Welcome new housing but what infrastructure will be put in place particularly with the strain already on local GP and dental services. What is the incentive for young people in these plans to stay in the town? Families and the elderly but 18-30 group. Will need housing be targeted at them and affordable?	The Worksop Central DPD provides a comprehensive regeneration strategy for the area. This includes improving the public realm, allocating sites for development and transport infrastructure improvements. The creation of new people friendly spaces will help to provide an attractive town centre that will help to give confidence to existing and new businesses that Worksop as a place to stay and invest in.
REF059	WSP-Priory Shopping Centre	<p>The policies that are referring to from our previous representations and these new representations have changed. Therefore, to clarify, “Policy ST4, Worksop Central Area” (WCA) (of the January 2020 draft Local Plan) is now referred to as “Policy ST6, Worksop Central” (WC) within the November 2020 draft Local Plan, whilst “Policy ST13, Town Centres and Local Centres” (of the January 2020 draft Local Plan) is now referred to as “Policy ST14, Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Service” within the November 2020 draft Local Plan. The PSC is the main shopping centre in Worksop town centre and comprises approximately 40 retail units. The PSC has been working closely with the Council to invest in the shopping centre, and they secured planning permission in September 2019 for its redevelopment for a new foodstore which will not only improve the shopping centre, but also improve the vitality and viability of the town centre. As a key stakeholder in the town centre, the PSC has a strong interest in future planning policy in Worksop town centre and across the District. Previously made representations to the draft Local Plan (January 2020) supporting the inclusion of the PSC in the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) of the town centre. Supported draft Policy ST13 which stated that “retail development on a site outside a Primary Shopping Area or development of main town centre uses on a site outside a town centre will be expected to follow the sequential assessment approach” and that an impact assessment will be required for all applications for retail and/or leisure development that are outside Worksop town centre if they are over 929sqm. Raised concerns in respect of Policy ST4, the draft Local Plan (January 2020) given this appeared to support retail and main town centre uses within the WCA even if they are located outside the town centre. Requested that Policy ST4 was amended to state that applications for main town centres uses proposed outside of the town centre in the WCA should satisfy the sequential and impact test as set out in Policy ST13. In the current draft Local Plan (November 2020), the Council continue to seek to protect and enhance the town centre as highlighted in Policy ST14 which is welcomed. Our representations to Policy ST4 have not been taken into account and this policy remains largely unchanged. For this reason, the Draft Local Plan (November 2020) is unsound and does not comply with Paragraph 35 of the NPPF. The Plan has not been positively prepared as it fails to protect the town centre. Paragraph 6.7.3 of the draft Local Plan states that Policy ST14 should promote the continued vitality and viability of the District’s town and local centres in a flexible way whilst supporting the role they play “at the heart of the local communities”. Furthermore, the “Spatial Strategy: Worksop” document, prepared by the Council states that their vision is to revitalise Worksop town centre through creating distinct retail and leisure zones. However, draft Policy ST6 allows for main town centre uses that are located outside of the town centre which could have a detrimental impact on it. The Local Plan, as currently worded, cannot be considered to be positively prepared in respect of the town centre. JUSTIFIED The draft Local Plan is not sound because there is no justification for allowing main town uses in parts of the WC designation falling outside of the town centre without having to comply with the sequential and impact tests. The Council’s own vision seeks to revitalise Worksop town centre, however, allowing main town centre uses (particularly retail uses) to locate outside of the town centre without assessing whether there are any sequentially preferable sites within the town centre or whether they will result in a significant adverse impact, goes against national policy and is contrary to draft Policy ST14. The omission of referring to the retail tests within draft Policy ST6 is not justified and is not sound. EFFECTIVE Paragraph 6.7.1 of the draft Local Plan states that “town and local centres...provide a focus for growth in retail, commercial and leisure sectors” and centres “act as a focal point for local communities and ensure that valued services are available in accessible locations”. However, without amending draft Policy ST6 to refer to the sequential and impact tests, the Local Plan will not deliver its vision and objective of revitalising Worksop town centre and thus it is not effective as currently written CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY Paragraph 86 of the NPPF specifically states that local planning authorities should “apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses which are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an up-to-date plan”. Paragraph 89 adds that local planning authorities should require impact assessments for retail and leisure development if it is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold. In this case the Council sets a threshold of 929sqm. However, draft Policy ST6 is not consistent with either paragraph 86 or 89 of</p>	<p>It is important that Policy ST6 and the Local Plan itself is consistent with national planning policy. On that basis, Policy ST6 will be amended to ensure that any retail and/or town centre uses outside the primary shopping area or town centre boundary has no adverse impact upon the effective functioning of the primary shopping area or town centre. Policy ST6 will be amended accordingly.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - WORKSOP CENTRAL			
		<p>the NPPF given it fails to require a sequential or impact assessment to be submitted for new development in the WC designation if they are located outside of the town centre. This would have a detrimental impact on Worksop town centre. Policy ST6 fails to protect and support Worksop town centre from “out of centre” development including main town centre uses. The draft Local Plan is unsound: It has not been positively prepared; There is no justification as to why main town centres uses can be provided in out of centre locations within the WC designation without having to comply with the sequential and impact tests; It is not effective to deliver the Council’s own vision; and It is contrary to National Policy. Furthermore, draft Policy ST6 conflicts with draft Policy ST14 which requires sequential assessments to be undertaken for main town centre uses and impact assessments for retail and leisure proposals in Worksop if they are over 929sqm. The draft Local Plan is unsound and should be amended accordingly. Strongly urge the Council to amend draft Policy ST6 to accord with Paragraph 86 and 89 of the NPPF and draft Policy ST14. Suggested amendments to the wording of Point 2 of draft Policy ST6: “The provision of commercial, education, health, retail, community and other services and facilities and temporary uses, of a suitable scale to meet identified needs subject to the sequential and impact assessment as set out in Policy ST14 if proposing a main town centre use outside of the designated town centre.” Without this additional wording, the Local Plan is contrary to the NPPF and unsound and should not be adopted. The PSC helps to anchor Worksop town centre and its success is vital to reviving the fortunes of the town centre. Welcome the Council’s vision for the revitalisation of the town centre and that it should be protected, remain concerned that draft Policy ST6 will result in proposals for new retail and main town uses being permitted outside of the town centre without having to satisfy the sequential or impact tests. Urge the Council to reconsider the wording of Policy ST6 as requested and recognise the importance of supporting the town centre first approach and to encourage future investment to the town centre.</p>	
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	No specific comments as these are areas we are not close to. Supporting the “comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield sites...” will always be supported by Scrooby SNAP.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF201	Severn Trent	Supportive of the approach outlined within Policy ST6, in particular bullet point 8 to develop an integrated strategic flood Management Scheme that supports regeneration without increasing flood risk. Note there are opportunities through the use of multifunctional space to further enhance the regeneration and further reduce existing flood risk.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF211	National Trust	Support the aims of Policy ST6 to regenerate the central area of Worksop, in particular its commitment to ‘the positive re-use of underused or vacant land’. Concerned that the Spatial Strategy along with Policies ST10 (Apleyhead strategic employment site) and also ST3 (Garden Village) if not properly designed and phased will undermine this aim. This is because the availability of surplus greenfield land for employment and housing is likely to make it even more difficult to attract investment to redevelop more complex and challenging brownfield sites in the town centre.	The reuse of brownfield land focuses heavily within the Local Plan and Worksop DPD. Both documents allocate a substantial level of brownfield land for development and provide a good balance between the use of Brownfield Land and Greenfield Land across the District.
REF221	Resident	<p>Writing as an interested member of the public, not as someone with expertise. I was born in Worksop seventy years ago, after a short break to train as a teacher, I returned to work here in primary education for forty years. As a teacher knowledge of the history of the town was important and interesting and would encourage interest, pride and care of the environment. My history curriculum in class began with the development of the town from Norman times. The pupils went on a historical walk through the town and they went on to produce their own guide book. Unfortunately I don’t think any school does this now:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Castle Hill- site of wooden motte and bailey castle. 2. The Old Ship Inn- Tudor building, could this be redeveloped as a tourist information centre, residential would be preferable to losing the building. 3. Original settlement was centred around a market cross where the market was at the top of Potter Street, in Norman times it was called Werchesope. 4. Going along Potter Street east is the Boundary Inn, marks the boundary between the Norman settlements of Werchesope and Redforde. Locally produced goods would be exchanged along this route. 5. The Gatehouse- very rare building where the monks from the Priory offered shelter for travellers. 6. Market Cross was south of its present site and marked the site of the market for Redforde so called because there was a wood and stone bridge across the river Ryton here and the sand under the water turned the eater red as the supports were sunk. 7. The Priory was a big and important church, it was an Augustinian Priory twice its current length. The 13 monks used the piece at the back and the ‘commoners’ the front until Henry VIII had it knocked down. Dates back to early 12 Century. 8. Water wheel, opposite Priory Church, this was used to provide power at a farm/mill here. 9. Chesterfield Canal- designed by James Brindley in 1777 (I think). It was unusually narrow and special boats were built to use it called Cuckoos. Passing places were built and the wharfage at Town Lock was called Cuckoo Wharf. 10. Smiths Flour Mill dates back to 1706? My grandfather drove steam lorries at the beginning of 20th Century making cross-Pennine journeys with flour 	<p>The regeneration strategy for Worksop Central plays on its strengths such as its heritage, the CANCH, River Ryton and Chesterfield Canal and seeks to maximise opportunities through the redevelopment of underused or vacant land. It is also important that these sites and assets are linked through better connections and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Reducing the threat of flooding is a key priority to give the community and businesses confidence that their investment in the town is secure.</p> <p>The redevelopment of vacant or underused sites will focus on providing the right housing need such as affordable homes and homes for older people. These will compliment other</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST6 - WORKSOP CENTRAL			
		<p>11. The railway station. Town Centre Worksop has become a commuter town. In the 1950's it was a thriving market town with some up-market shops. Don't think it is an achievable goal to aspire to that now. Online shopping and out of town centres have put a stop to that. Would be a shame for a pretty town centre to become lost and die. 1. Develop the Old Ship Inn 2. Turn more of the town centre into residential/office space 3. Eateries/coffee shops to be considered 4. Toilet facilities are desperately needed, supervised would suggest 5. The canal- think this a very important under-used resource at the moment both as a waterway and a walkway, both west towards Shireoaks and east towards Retford. a. Develop wharfage for residential narrow boats while putting in supporting infrastructure e.g. water supplies, fuel etc. b. Parking spaces for short stay boats c. Improve the walkway (towpath), develop cycle path and install lighting d. Develop café culture e. Provide hard standing for stalls e.g. hot potatoes, hot dogs, pizza. This would be seasonal but good for spring to autumn f. Summer, Christmas, Easter markets selling crafts or artisan products e.g. cheese, breads, brewed beers etc. (Welbeck may be interested here). g. Develop Gateford Road access to town, the approach from St Johns Church to the traffic lights is poor. h. Land north of the Railway Station, then Lidl is wasted. Consider development for the elderly e.g. McCarthy Store, types of accommodation/ or charging station for electric cars. The only charging points in Worksop are at Bannatyne's or near the Savoy Cinema.</p>	market-led development sites within the town centre and wider area.
1670988	Resident	<p>The Bassetlaw Plan needs to detail HOW they can ensure that the flood risk will not be increased, when already the surface water runs away onto businesses and properties. This will need permeable paving and drainage systems and lots of work to improve flood risks in the future. Detail the plans for flooding.</p>	<p>The preparation of the Worksop Central DPD is being supported by the development of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the area. This will detail the flooding risk and the recommendations needed to improve the situation in the future. In addition, the Council is in discussions with the Environment Agency about other flood prevention measures for the area.</p>
1670988	Resident	Consider using existing properties no longer used for their purpose to turn into housing.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF058	Sport England	Section A6 supported	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>The regeneration of previously developed vacant or underused sites within urban and rural Bassetlaw forms a key part of the vision and objectives of the Local Plan. Two 'Priority Regeneration Areas are identified in the Plan: 'Policy ST6: Worksop Central' and 'Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area'.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of landowners	<p>Policy ST1 requires about 700 homes to be provided in 'Inner' Worksop. Policy ST6 requires at least 660 homes in Worksop Central Area. Are these the same thing? Having regard to our review of the Council's Land Availability Assessment, there does not appear to be enough land in the defined Worksop Central Area to meet the identified needs. Equally, no other strategies are set out as to how this level of housing can be delivered.</p>	<p>Yes. The Local Plan requires 660 of the Worksop requirement to be delivered within Worksop Central. The Council has undertaken a call for land and a sustainability appraisal for the sites. The sites identified within the Worksop DPD are capable of accommodating enough homes to meet the Local Plan target.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF003	Canal & 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 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. We therefore welcome the reference given in the draft policy towards the need for remediation and protection of the watercourse. This will ensure compliance with the aims of paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The Trent is identified by the Trust as a Freight waterway, capable of handling waterborne freight. We therefore welcome the latest policy wording, where part B.12 highlights that consideration should be given to opportunities to utilise the River Trent for the transportation of construction and waste materials. We believe this would help to accord with the principles of paragraphs 102 and 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework and, in the case of larger loads, in the governments water preferred policy for the movement of abnormal loads.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The River Trent is identified as a major Green Corridor within the Local Plan and its waterway freight status will not be impacted.
1651001	Resident	I am puzzled why Cottam has been chosen for a new village. It is at the end of what in effect is a dead end road . It is completely isolated. It is hemmed in by the River Trent. There are no obvious work opportunities in the vicinity There is no public transport opportunities. It will encourage numerous car journeys to go anywhere. The location could not be more inappropriate	The Site has now been identified as a priority Regeneration Area due to the level of uncertainty in terms of the type of development and the delivery of such infrastructure that is needed to support the redevelopment of the site. The site is also considered a longer term site due to its scale and its likely to be redeveloped later in the plan period and beyond.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>The proposed housing development at Cottam Cottam is one of our neighbouring parishes and we, and others from our parish have attended meetings on the development; however, a large proportion of the EDF land, including that of the former power station itself falls within the Rampton & Woodbeck Parish boundary. The decision to give permission for a substantial number of houses on this site is both reckless and wrongheaded. Section 6.2.1 is concerned with the High Marnham Energy Hub and the opening sentence implies the environmental reason why that site is not being developed for housing:“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.”This description is also an accurate description of the Cottam Power Station site as conceded in 5.4.11: “The site is predominately brownfield with a legacy of contamination due to its former uses associated with a coal fired power station and associated buildings and infrastructure.”We are aware that there are no accurate site maps for Cottam of where contaminants have been buried. We are also aware that former and retired Cottam Power Station have been reemployed to try and identify where contaminants may be buried. It is obvious that if those decontaminating the site must rely on fallible human memory alone there can be no guarantee that some contaminants might be left and pose a health threat to residents of the new development. Were the Council aware of this? If so, why propose using the Cottam site for housing? If potential residents are made aware of the possible risks will anyone want to live there?The High Marnham Energy Hub is an excellent and innovative use of an otherwise problematic brownfield site. The Council deserves praise for supporting this. Councillor White, in her Forward to the Plan, describes it as unique, which can only mean it is the only one of its type. With the rapid growth of renewable but unpredictable energy sources such as wind and solar power we need more energy hubs, and the Cottam site is the obvious candidate and will show that the Council is serious about its green agenda and that the Marnham Energy Hub is not just a single token gesture. In addition to the above arguments, the same arguments against the Garden Village can levelled against the Cottam development that is there should be no new builds until the conversion of vacant builds has been exhausted and residential developments should not be encouraged in isolated rural areas, away from places of work, recreation and shopping causing more vehicle use. We are also surprised that no mention is given to the Cottam site’s principal infrastructure asset, the working railway line to the Power Station site. Once again, the thinking seems to be predominantly 20th century when planning was structured around car use. An important further consideration regarding transport is the lack of a public transport system. Nearby Rampton lost its regular travel to work bus, and this will also be a factor for those moving into the proposed Cottam development who need public transport. The roads in and through Cottam are narrow country lanes, and an increased number of cars will not only have an effect on road use but will also lead to further pollution. There is already a safety aspect with increased traffic for the delivery hub in the village, this will be worsened by the needs of extra vehicles, and families living in rural areas often find they need to have more than one car. If the development were to be a mix of social housing, residents on benefits or low incomes would be severely impacted by the lack of effective public transport access to large shops, schools, and doctors’ surgeries etc. A community shop proposed in the plan would likely to be expensive and unaffordable for lower income residents.</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site could include some renewable energy and technology and it will also have to improve local infrastructure.</p> <p>Any redevelopment of the site will need to be carefully planned through the development of a comprehensive masterplan that will have community engagement. The detail within the masterplan will be subject to the agreement of the Council.</p>
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	<p>The draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has made reference to the need to develop rural businesses. An ideal opportunity would be to preserve one of the cooling towers and other infrastructure to set up a national 'heritage' tourist attraction. It won't be many years before power generation by coal will be history - Cottam provides an ideal opportunity, and the space, to set up such a tourism/leisure offer, with one route of access via the River Trent. This will help to regenerate north-east Bassetlaw, providing opportunities for local businesses, accommodation, etc</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
REF041	Retford Civic Society	<p>The Society is pleased to see that proposals to develop a new village on the site of the former Cottam Power Station have been dropped from the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
REF057	Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	<p>More generally, we welcome the proposals for the proposed development of the sites of the former power station in the Trent Valley. We are, however, concerned that other villages in our area are not adversely affected by the development in their vicinity.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The impact on nearby communities will form part of the careful planning for the site through a comprehensive masterplan. This will be subject to public engagement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF060	Notts County Council	The transport and movements requirements (4a) are likely to extend much further than the site in order to mitigate the traffic impact on rural villages. Such impacts are are likely to fall within the scope of a Transport Assessment and to provide a means of sustainable travel. The redevelopment of this site would require provision of its own primary school given its remote location. Based on the proposed number of dwellings, the school size would need to be 1.5FE (315 places) with the ability to expand to 2FE (420 places).	Thank you for your comments. The Council has produced some initial transport flow and capacity work for the site which NCC have contributed towards.
1666840	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	I am very pleased that the plan recognises that Cottam is not at this time suitable for large scale development (I would question if without significant investment in roads and infrastructure if it ever will). I do appreciate that BDC has listened to the communities concerns in regards to this site and some of the issues stated by residents are listed in this report.	Thank you for your comments.
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	The County Council notes that these paragraphs have been included which cover the points raised by the County Council in response to the January 2020 Draft Plan in relation to the disposal of PFA material within the Northern and Southern Lagoons at Cottam Power Station. We welcome this being noted within the plan. Part 11 of the policy references that the lagoons where PFA have been deposited will be protected from inappropriate development and ensure their restoration and aftercare is in line with the relevant permissions. The County Council will continue to work with EDF on the restoration and aftercare of these sites within a wider scheme to redevelop the site.	Thank you for your comments.
REF074 map of assets is included with submission	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	<p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets. Details of the sites affecting National Grid assets are provided below. Cottam Priority Regeneration Area (ST5 and ST6) 4VK ROUTE (TWR 001 - 001B): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM - EATON SOCON - WYMONDLEY 2 4VE ROUTE TWR (021A - 047): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM – GRENDON 4VE ROUTE TWR (001A - 020A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COTTAM - KEADBY 1 ZDA ROUTE TWR (228B - 247): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM - STAYTHORPE 1 ZDA ROUTE TWR (210D - 227A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COTTAM - WEST BURTON 400Kv Underground Cable route: COTTAM 400KV NORTH CSE COMPOUND Electrical Substation: COTTAM 400KV A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid’s assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only. Please also see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets. Further Advice National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid’s assets. Guidance on development near National Grid assets National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets. Electricity assets Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance. National Grid’s ‘Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines’ promote the successful development of</p>	The existing electric infrastructure will be protected on site. Indeed, access for servicing and maintenance will also form part of the masterplan for the redevelopment of the site. The Council and others will continue to work with National Grid through the planning for the site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
		<p>sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: https://www.nationalgridet.com/document/130626/download</p> <p>The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.</p> <p>National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets', which can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p> <p>Gas assets</p> <p>High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally, written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement.</p> <p>National Grid's 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Gas assets' can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p>	
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>This site given the problems associated with contamination its remote location it is difficult to see either people or businesses willing live or set up here. It will require a disproportionate use of resources. East Markham Parish Council believes that the 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. East Markham Parish Council believes that the funds proposed for each of these two sites would be better-used improving infrastructure elsewhere within the district.</p>	<p>The redevelopment of Cottam is considered to be a long term regeneration site. There are a number of significant constraints that need to be addressed before the principle of some development types are acceptable. The Council will continue to work with the site promoters and local communities on the potential regeneration options over the plan period.</p>
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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. The Boards 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. The site lies within the Board's district, there are numerous Board maintained drains located through and adjacent to the site. The Board's consent will be required prior to any works in, under, over or within 9 metres of the bank top of the watercourse. The Board requires an easement strip along the Board maintained watercourse in order to allow for continued maintenance and future works. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This information is very helpful and will form part of the masterplanning for the site.</p>
REF122	NNLCRP (North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership)	<p>The existing railway line serving the former Cottam power station could be utilised for light rail into Retford based on a cost effective operation similar to that used between Stourbridge Junction and Stourbridge Town by flywheel energy operated trains. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_Rail_Class_139</p>	<p>The potential for light rail has been dismissed by Network Rail, but the Council will continue to work with the site promoters on sustainable transport options for the site moving forward.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF153	Natural England	<p>We note that in point 4 of the policy wording that linkages to the wider green infrastructure network is promoted, which is welcome. We suggest that opportunities to link the lowland fen priority habitat, which is present on the site, to surrounding habitats should be taken and contribute to the Nature Recovery Network. We suggest that integrated water management (as mentioned above) could be a useful approach given the history of contamination on this site. If the water on the site can be recycled it may be a way to improve the water quality in the Trent as mentioned in B point 5.</p> <p>This site may also present an opportunity for meeting Net Zero Carbon targets.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF132 - same segment is in GV ST3 table as well	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	<p>Accordingly we 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. We 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.</p> <p>We object to Policy ST2, it is not clear if the figures on page 35 are a new requirement or include existing permissions Pages 36 and 37 lists the smaller rural settlements which collectively accommodate 1,502 of the housing requirement, again it is not clear if these figures include existing commitments</p> <p>We object to ST3 and the Garden Village concept for the reasons set out above</p> <p>It is proposed that the Plan be redrafted to do the following: _</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Cottam has now been identified as a priority for regeneration. There isn't a particular land use attached to the proposed policy within the Local Plan due to the uncertainty with existing planning constraints.</p> <p>Therefore the site is identified as a broad location for growth on the Policies Map rather than a specific site allocation within this Plan.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Cottam and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	<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. We 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. We consider that resolving flood issues is a prerequisite to allocating the site. We are also aware that there is a significant amount of demolition to be undertaken and inevitably contamination to remediate. We consider that 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 site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p>
REF152	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>This submission follows previous representations submitted in February 2020 during the last round of public consultation, and also following our subsequent communications with BDC during 2020 regarding the Site's future. Since the previous round of consultation, BDC has amended draft Policy ST7 (previously known as Policy ST5). The amendment has changed the thrust of the policy's objective from that of an allocated development site to be delivered during the plan period, to a broad location that should be safeguarded for residential-led regeneration in the longer term including beyond the plan period. Through discussions with BDC during late 2020, it is understood that this approach has been taken due to the Council's concerns regarding deliverability of the Site for both technical reasons and possibly due to concerns relating to rights of access and continued use and protection of third party infrastructure on the Site. As BDC is aware through various communications during 2020, EDF is confidentially in discussions with a third-party developer which is looking at the comprehensive redevelopment of the Site. The developer has completed a comprehensive technical due diligence exercise, which EDF has receipt of, both in terms of the Site's development and legal constraints. Whilst EDF understands BDC's concerns regarding deliverability in the short term, EDF maintains that the redevelopment of the Site is achievable and commercially viable and could come forward earlier than anticipated by the current draft Policy. Notwithstanding the above, the identification of the Site as a Priority Regeneration Area is welcomed and supported, and EDF is committed to continuing to work with BDC to resolve any concerns raised. With this approach in mind, EDF considers that the Site's delivery programme could be reviewed again as part of the Council's next local plan review or new local plan, which may also be informed or supported by a developer's progress towards submitting an outline planning application for the Site's redevelopment.</p> <p>In the meantime, the sub-sections below summarise the technical due diligence work completed since the previous representations were submitted in February 2020 to provide an overview of the current stage of work as well as providing assurance that BDC's concerns can be addressed.</p> <p>Technical Due Diligence Through its communications during 2020, BDC made EDF aware that comments had been raised by several stakeholders and statutory consultees regarding deliverability, specifically matters relating to highways, utilities and the potential for incorporation of the ash lagoons within the development boundary. For information, the comprehensive programme of technical work already undertaken includes the following items: Acoustics / Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaison with third parties on site regarding possible enclosure and undertaking full acoustic sampling and reviews • Noise level monitoring around site from Cottam Development Centre (Power station and PRS), substation and road traffic • Noise Modelling and Mitigation Optioneering <p>Air Quality (AQ) • Confirmation of Construction and Operational AQ Assessment - (Cessation of Power Station).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation of AQ Assessment and assessment of NOx impact • Review of Dust data and validation • Assessment of need for Dust standoff (400m) <p>Roads and Highways</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p> <p>The proposed Policy within the Local Plan states that any proposals for the site must demonstrate how it intends to overcome the significant planning issues identified. This includes how a proposal would be considered sustainable in such a rural location.</p> <p>The development should be supported by a comprehensive masterplan that details the proposed land uses, its required infrastructure and the delivery.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Counts at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Gainsborough Road o Cottam Road/Brampton Road o A57/Laneham Road • Calculation of Traffic Generation • Preparation of Preliminary Access Junction Designs • Impact Assessment of Development on wider traffic network • Budget figures for networks improvement • Updated Cost Plan and Programme <p>Ecology & Trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of additional data from EDF • Completion of walkover survey to confirm habitat status • Review of Landscape and restoration plans • Check of Tree Preservation Orders • Check of National Biological Records Centre (NBRC) • Surveys undertaken: Winter Bird, Badger, Riparian Mammal, Bats and Breeding Birds <p>Ground and contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground Level Survey (Drone with spot levels) • Mineral's Resource Assessment • Ground Investigation focussed on confirming ground Model columns and quality, in particular the Pulverised Fly Ash (PFA) for potential re-use. • 9 cone penetration test holes, 13 cable percussive holes, ~10-15 window sample holes, 3 to 7 trial pits. • 2 rounds gas and groundwater monitoring • Factual Report, and Interpretive Report • Cut and Fill balance and volumes • Options Report (Foundations, Pulverised Fly Ash, Sands & Gravels) <p>Drainage and Flood Risk</p> <p>Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of drainage and flood solution • Model compensatory area, risk to 3rd parties & agree with Environment Agency, including a breach scenario • Cross-Sections of flood protected areas before & after development. • Drainage Assessment review • Global & phased Drainage Strategy • Liaison with Lead Local Flood Authority, Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water <p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Existing Service plans and application for missing data. • Review of existing distribution network infrastructure • Feasibility assessment of routes for gas and electricity • 3rd Party liaison (Western Power Distribution, Northern Power Grid and National Grid) • Evaluation of High-Pressure Gas Main and required standoff and end use. • Abnormal legal requirements (Easements, Wayleaves) • Production of Utilities Strategy 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF152	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>The findings from these detailed studies have provided confidence in pursuing a full regeneration strategy, albeit EDF is cognisant that there remains a significant amount of work to progress in consultation with all stakeholders and the public before an initial planning application is ready for submission. In response to comments raised regarding development on the ash lagoons, a review has been completed of the masterplan submitted on behalf of EDF during the last consultation that identifies 'Future Development Land' on part of the southern ash lagoon. The area of the power station site containing the lagoons does not form any of the land required to deliver the 1,600 homes allowed for within the draft policy and EDF remains confident that the masterplan is realistic and deliverable at the scale of development indicated within draft Policy ST7 (i.e. for 1,600 homes plus other appropriate land uses); moreover, potential may even exist to deliver more homes through, for example, using a variety of development densities. For the avoidance of doubt, the ash lagoons do not form part of the proposed core development area. Rights of Access and Site Infrastructure</p> <p>EDF has previously confirmed to BDC that third party rights of access and use of services, for which BDC has raised concerns, will remain and be protected as part of any future redevelopment of the Site. EDF has agreements in place with both Uniper (operator of the Cottam Development Centre) and National Grid, which any future developer of the Site would have to adhere to as part of any transfer in title. All the existing rights will be protected to ensure the ongoing existing operations of Uniper and National Grid.</p> <p>The summary below sets out the relevant rights and infrastructure that had been specifically noted by BDC as requiring assurances during discussions held in mid-2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas pipeline - The pipeline runs to the north of the site and will remain an operational asset. The detailed design of the development will ensure all required development distances are adhered to. Consultations have taken place with the HSE who have confirmed pre application advice regarding proximity of development to the pipeline. This does not impact on the master plan scheme. • Water abstraction and discharge permit to the River Trent - Uniper will retain a water abstraction licence and make up and purge pipelines will be re-routed by EDF along the southern and western boundaries of the site to avoid the development site. • Access to the dock and subsequent access rights - The rights of Uniper and National Grid to use the Dock area will be retained as part of the detailed design. • Discharge of surface water through the EDF site – The right to discharge surface water across the EDF site will be retained and this has been factored into the masterplan. Any future surface water drainage strategy for the site would need to take the existing infrastructure into consideration to ensure no risk to the continued operation of the CDC. • Connections to the National Grid sub-station – The sub-station will remain operational and the connections have been factored into the masterplan. A suitable no-build zone has been incorporated into the masterplan around the sub-station and its associated connections and will be refined in detailed design. • Access rights for operation and maintenance purposes – Such required rights will be retained. • Rights to lay conducting media and high voltage cabling across the EDF site – Such required rights will be retained away from the development Site. Existing agreements specifically protect existing and proposed uses of the EDF land. <p>It is important to note that all of the above items were considered during the masterplanning exercise that informed the vision document submitted during the last consultation period in February 2020. No changes to that masterplan are therefore considered necessary at this stage and, EDF is confident that the Site is capable of delivering the intended scale of development (i.e. 1,600 homes and other land uses) without hindering access to, or operation of, the various third party owned infrastructure.</p> <p>Summary</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
		EDF welcomes the inclusion of the former Cottam Power Station within BDC's Draft Local Plan as a Priority Regeneration Area for residential-led development. Whilst EDF considers the redevelopment of the Site could commence during the plan period, earlier than anticipated by draft Policy ST7, it is recognised that there is further work and consultation to be completed with a number of key stakeholders to ensure the sustainable redevelopment of the former power station site. EDF strongly believes that the masterplan that has been presented to BDC within EDF's vision document (February 2020), is deliverable and, importantly, commercially viable whilst protecting the network of third party owned infrastructure across the Site.	
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	<p>Land at the former Cottam Power Station is identified as a broad location for priority regeneration at Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area. The site is safeguarded from development that would jeopardise the comprehensive remediation, reclamation and redevelopment of the whole site in accordance with a masterplan to be agreed with the Council. Subsection B sets out a series of criteria for the development proposals at Cottam Power Station (1 – 12), and Subsection C sets out acceptable main uses for the site, subject to the requirements at Subsection B. The uses considered acceptable within Policy ST7 are; housing development of up to 1,600 dwellings, employment development for up to 14ha (use classes B2, B8 and E(g)), public transport hub and renewable energy uses. Policy ST7 is supported, initial masterplanning work indicates the site has capacity to deliver approximately 1,750 dwellings, and therefore Policy ST7 should be flexible to accommodate additional housing development over the 1,600 dwellings currently included. It is suggested that the overall quantum of development at Cottam Power Station is expressed as 'approximately' rather than as a target/maximum. The future development of the site would be supported by appropriate infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>A Sustainability Appraisal Report prepared by LUC (November 2020) accompanies the Draft Local Plan consultation. Paragraph 5.123 confirms that whilst new settlements require greater land take, they can also provide greater benefits in terms of provision of employment and new infrastructure, services and facilities. Of the five new settlement options considered by the Council, Cottam Power Station and Bassetlaw Garden Village perform particularly well in sustainability terms as both new settlement and employment site options. Paragraph 5.124 confirms that 'the potential negative effects identified as a result of redeveloping Cottam Power Station are likely to be minimised by the fact the site currently houses a power station'.</p> <p>In accordance with Subsection B of Policy ST7, any future planning application would be accompanied by an illustrative masterplan and phasing plan, that will demonstrate that the proposed quantum of development can be accommodated on site, and delivered alongside appropriate infrastructure. The future planning application will be accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES), which will present the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), the scope of which will be agreed with the local planning authority. The EIA will evaluate the likely environmental impacts of the proposed development on a variety of technical disciplines, which would likely include; heritage and archaeology, ecology and biodiversity, landscape and visual impact, flood risk and drainage, transport and access and ground conditions and land contamination. The future planning application will set out how the proposed development can meet the requirements of Subsection B. The planning application will recognise and assess the presence of natural assets within proximity of the site, including the Flatlands Plantation Scheduled Monument, the Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site and the River Trent. In relation to development the Minerals Safeguarding Areas, an approach of incidental mineral extraction would be adopted as part of the redevelopment proposals.</p> <p>Policy ST7 C. – Suggested Amendment: C. The following are considered acceptable main uses for the site, subject to meeting the requirements above: 1) Housing development approximately 1,750 dwellings 2) Employment development (comprising offices, research and development and industry in (comprising B2, B8 E(g)) for up to 14 ha 3) Public transport hub 4) Renewable energy uses</p>	Support for the policy is welcome. As a broad location there is no need at this stage to identify numbers for this site. To provide flexibility it is considered that the broad mix of uses is sufficient for a broad location. The use of an Environmental Impact Assessment in support of the application is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	To conclude, the identification of the former Cottam Power Station site under Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area is supported. Policy ST7 sets out a number of requirements for the redevelopment of the site, and any future planning application would be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment and full suite of technical documents that would address the requirements at Subsection B. Initial masterplanning work has indicated that approximately 1,750 dwellings can be delivered on site, and it is suggested that the wording of Policy ST7 at Subsection C is amended to reflect this quantum of development. The planning application would be accompanied by an Illustrative Masterplan and Phasing Plan to demonstrate how the proposed development can deliver the housing and employment development proposed, alongside appropriate supporting infrastructure.	
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent would note that the proposed redevelopment of Cottam Power Station, presents a number of issues in relation to existing infrastructure, therefore it is vital that master planning is undertaken for this development is undertaken for this site providing clear proposals for the site and an indicative Layout that can be utilised to understand the proposals in advance of the development coming forward so that a business case and associated infrastructure scheme can be developed and delivered in line with development. This will take both time to secure investment approval, and to design as the likely solution would be both expensive and time consuming to deliver.	The Council will continue to work with Severn Trent and the site promoters on the future regeneration of the site. This will include further engagement with consultees on potential land uses and schemes.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>The site comprises the 348 ha former Cottam Power Station site. The Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site (LWS 1/101) is within the eastern part of the site. 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. An Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) will be required to assess the impacts this development. We note that the wording within this current draft Point 4 has been amended and we are largely satisfied with that. Protect and enhance the biodiversity value of the Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site, its buffer zone and promotes linkages to the wider green infrastructure network, evidenced by an Ecological Impact Assessment;</p> <p>An EcIA will need to assess the whole of the site because great crested newts and other protected species may be present in the North and South Lagoons and within the open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (OMH).An appropriately sized buffer zone should be evidenced through the EcIA. Buffer zones vary depending on their focus on the landscape, habitat and/or species conservation, each of which demands a different approach for their creation. EcIA is a process of identifying, quantifying and evaluating potential effects of development-related or other proposed actions on habitats, species and ecosystems. The findings of an assessment can help competent authorities understand ecological issues when determining applications for consent. EcIA can be used for the appraisal of projects of any scale including the ecological component of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). When undertaken as part of an EIA, EcIA is subject to the relevant EIA Regulations.</p> <p>We note that Point 11 states the following: 11. Protect the Pulverised Fuel Ash North and South Lagoons, and slurry lagoon from inappropriate development, and ensure their appropriate restoration and after care in line with relevant permissions; The lagoons could form part of the blue infrastructure for the site that could have benefits for wildlife and people if restored appropriately. The restoration however, would need to be informed and evidenced by the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA). 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>	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF213	Treswell with Cottam Parish Council	<p>welcome and support the Council's wish not to be reliant on the delivery of the Cottam site to meet its housing and employment land requirements for all the necessary reasons stated 5.5.1- 5.5.8</p> <p>recognises that if, and when, all the conditions have been complied with, this plan identifies the site as a priority Regeneration Area and broad location for future growth and that regeneration of this area may/will be permitted only in compliance with Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area A/B1-B12</p> <p>however, at Policy ST7 C, the members present continue to believe that the Cottam Power Station Site remains unsuitable for housing development up to 1600 dwellings, Employment development for up to 14ha, public transport hub and renewable energy uses for the reasons previously noted and alternative uses for this valuable site should be explored.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to engage with the local community when further information about the regeneration of the site becomes available.
1669241	Resident	We have also supported the regeneration-led new settlement at Cottam provided that any delays in this secondary location in the plan period did not lead to an overall shortfall of provision across the District. We note that due to restoration and reclamation issues, BDC do not now seek to rely on any housing delivery in this plan period and this approach is supported.	Thank you for your comments.
REF214	Historic England	Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area - Section B-3 refers to the 'Flatlands' Plantation SM and this should be revised to 'Fleet' Plantation SM. Neither the policy or its supporting text refers to other nearby heritage assets, including highly graded ones, which could have their significance harmed as a result of the potential regeneration proposals. This should be revised to address the omissions. The SA and Heritage Statement make some reference to those other assets but there is little assessment of the potential for harm to those assets as a result of the various proposals. The SA concludes there is a likely significant negative effect on both heritage and archaeology. There is no apparent additional information to address these effects in the evidence base and it is recommended that further work be undertaken in this respect. At present there are concerns about the soundness of this site being taken forward in the Plan.	
1670549	Resident	Building 3,500 dwellings in this area will lead to serious road congestion unless significant investment is spent on roads in the surrounding area. The main route into Retford would not be able to take this traffic, nor the lanes around it. In order to help alleviate this the railway line to the power station should be upgraded to take passengers connecting them with local towns. Work would need to be done to strengthen the flood defences in order to give prospective owners reassurance otherwise obtaining buildings insurance may prove difficult so close to the river Trent.	The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
1670869	Resident	<p>The narrative and policy in this version of the plan is much improved for previous versions, and recognises the challenges of this site. For this the officials and others who have redrafted this should be commended and thank you. However..... There is not reference to the impact on the village of Cottam (indeed this village gets no mention at all) which would provide any reader who is not familiar with the area with an incomplete picture of potential impacts. (also see previous comments re small rural settlements). At best this is not appropriate and needs to be rectified in the next iteration of the plan. At worst this is either a lack of understanding by those representing us, or a disingenuous attempt to suggest this is a stand alone site which has no impact.... Flood risk is now identified, and although the site benefits from some defences, larlgy becvue of its current purpose; these would need ot be mainitned, and probably improved at signifanct cost (to who??) to avoid any future increase to the flood risk to the the site and the surrounding area. As noted in the plan a full and thorough flood risk assessment, including on the surrounding area must be completed, alongside EIAs and contaminated land assessments etc before any consideration of any regeneration of this site. The plan recognises this now, but the policy is still proposing option of a significant housing and/or employment hub at this site. this policy should be revisited, and focus on the identifying the challenges and alternative uses for this site, before even suggesting the creation of a new settlement on this scale. It is not clear anywhere in the plan why High Marnham, rather than Cottam site is considered more apprirate for green energy. the Cottam site already has a well established nature reserve, which could be exnpaded, and is expected to continue as a gas fired power station, so why not extend this to green (solar) energy and maximise the infrsucture already in place ie links to the national grid. The site has significant transport issues. There has been an independent assessment the transport challenges commissioned by the Authority which identifies a significant impact on all the local villages and settlements de to increased car use and concludes "Any development on the site is therefore likely to be heavily reliant on car based trips and would be contrary to national and local transport policies with regards to focussing significant development in locations that are, or can be made to be sustainable, by reducing the need to travel by car by providing a genuine choice of sustainable transport modes". I have been unable to find a similar report for the Hlgh Marnham site - there should be one and a full comparative ansysis undertaken between the two sites. There is no reason both sites could not be identified for green energy (solar) generation, resulting in Bassetlaw being at the forefront of tacking climate change and leading the way for others. surely this is a legacy we would all welcome.. But if there is a need for one or other site to provide housing or employment hubs, then further details as to the options, risks and benefits for both sites must be identified and shared with the communities affected. in the meantime policy ST07 needs to be further strengthened to reflect, and ensure any future decisions consider, the impact on the current communities of Cottam and Coates, but also Rampton, Treswell, Leverton etc and include how these will be protected and/or compensated as appropriate.</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the community and the site promotor on the future proposed uses for the site. The level of infrastructure to support a large redevelopment will be extensive and this will need to be detailed through a masterplan and its associated documents moving forward. The cost of redeveloping the site will largely be through the private sector, but some Government Grant monies could be used to help subsidise some of the upfront costs as the site is partly a brownfield site.</p>
REF044	Resident	<p>This brown field site, which has a high degree of contamination, and will be very difficult, if nor 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</p>	<p>The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. This is due to the significant level of constraints and the uncertainty about how some of these could be overcome through development. The level of constraints means there is considerable uncertainty about the delivery of the site and what types of developments are appropriate moving forward. However, the site is largely a brownfield former industrial area that has the potential to be redeveloped in the longer term.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the community and the site promotor on the future proposed uses for the site</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	The draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has made reference to the need to develop rural businesses. An ideal opportunity would be to preserve one of the cooling towers and other infrastructure to set up a national 'heritage' tourist attraction. It won't be many years before power generation by coal will be history - Cottam provides an ideal opportunity, and the space, to set up such a tourism/leisure offer, with one route of access via the River Trent. This will help to regenerate north-east Bassetlaw, providing opportunities for local businesses, accommodation, etc.	The site is being promoted for residential redevelopment but when considering the constraints and other information, the Council has now identified it as a longer term priority regeneration area. The type of uses are yet to be decided and the decision to demolish or keep the cooling towers is down to the landowners of the site.
REF104	Local Developer	<p>We wish to express our objection and concerns regarding the proposed garden villages both at Ranby, and Cottam</p> <p>There are a myriad of objections, and reasons these should not be permitted One of which is that any new garden village or villages with their vast number of new homes will mean that new homes in the existing villages will not get built, simply because of the numbers allocated to the new garden villages.</p> <p>Therefore not allowing, and or drastically reducing, and limiting the ability to correctly and for the benefit of the areas and local communities in those and surrounding those villages</p> <p>Lots of these existing villages require new development, and housing for many reasons including, and not limited to keeping the villages alive for the ongoing use, and maintenance of the village halls, shops, post offices, pubs, schools etc</p> <p>Also these garden villages by virtue of their scale will give a very unfair advantage to those developers of the garden villages over the smaller developments, companies, developers and family run house builders that ply their trade building out smaller sites, up to 15 No. in our existing villages, so competition in both numbers and finances will have a very detrimental effect on existing rural development as we know it</p>	Policy ST2 is supportive of small scale residential growth in the rural area.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>It is welcomed that some form of redevelopment of the majority of this site is to be considered once the existing coal fired plant has been fully decommissioned and demolished. However, this site is not without its problems and redevelopment in a fashion that is safe, environmentally friendly, attractive, deliverable and does not detrimentally affect local villages and areas will take considerable work. One of the major problems regarding safety is the fact that the majority of this site is within a flood zone 2 and all of the surrounding land including escape routes are in zone 3. It is difficult to understand how a sequential and an exception test could justify this location, particularly for housing when the district already has a 10.7 year housing land availability assessment. However, as a continuity of a commercial use the site is highly suitable.</p> <p>The gas fired station will continue for many years and therefore commercial/industrial design here would sit well with the current built form. Speculative built housing would not and it would be totally out of character.</p> <p>The location also has several environmental issues. Housing is classified as a very sensitive receptor when considering flooding and in the notes to this policy it suggests senior citizen accommodation could also take place, this sector is very vulnerable. Given the flood zone 2 and 3 allocation it is highly likely that homeowners will struggle to obtain home insurance and even if they do it will come at a cost. The other environmental issue has also major health implications. As we are aware, this is the site of Cottam Power Station, the old coal fired station is almost decommissioned and being prepared for demolition. There still remains the very new gas fired operation and of course all the distribution network including pylons, cables, transformers etc. These latter items in particular create noise and also produce massive electromagnetic fields around overhead cables. Studies have shown that these can have a very detrimental effect on health and wellbeing.</p> <p>To place housing in the shadow of an existing power station and generation connectivity hub would be massively detrimental with houses being overshadowed by the current power station.</p> <p>In 5.5.9 the Council state that they do not wish at this stage to be reliant on this site to meet either their housing or employment land requirements. Therefore, all reference to this site should be excluded until a more holistic and detailed approach has been produced. As it stands Cottam Regeneration Area is simply a suggestion and should not be a strategic policy yet.</p>	The purpose of a broad location is to identify where growth could go in the future subject to the provisions of the policy. All of the matters identified are referred to in policy, where additional evidence is sought to demonstrate that the development can address all necessary constraints in a satisfactory manner.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF205	Heatons on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd	<p>Policy ST7 promotes the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Cottam Power Station and aims to safeguard the area from development that would jeopardise its remediation, reclamation, and redevelopment. Tarmac broadly supports the proposed regeneration of the former power station but would like to draw the LPA's attention to the following points.</p> <p>Safeguarding of Mineral Resources</p> <p>Firstly, that the regeneration area is located within mineral safeguarding areas for oil and gas resources, as well as sand and gravel resources as per Policy SP7 of the emerging Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals Local Plan (MLP). As you will be aware, the MLP is at a late stage of examination and therefore its contents should be attributed weight when considering the draft content of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. In the determination of planning applications for non-minerals development within the District, the policies of the MLP must be considered as part of the development plan.</p> <p>The purpose of these mineral safeguarding areas, which are identified in Nottinghamshire by the County Council as minerals planning authority, is to safeguard known deposits of minerals which are desired to be kept safeguarded from unnecessary sterilisation by non-minerals development. The Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan does not show mineral safeguarding areas on the Interactive Policies Map published online. This is contrary to the guidance within national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Minerals, in which it is stated at paragraph 005 (Reference ID: 27-005-20140306) that: "District councils should show Mineral Safeguarding Areas on their policy maps". There are viable sand and gravel resources at Cottam which should not be sterilised by the development promoted through Policy ST7. The wording of Policy ST7 includes:</p> <p>"Proposals for the development of this priority regeneration area will be permitted where they:</p> <p>...</p> <p>10. Ensure the requirements for non-minerals development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas in the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan have been met"</p> <p>We submit that the mineral safeguarding areas as identified by Nottinghamshire County Council be included within the Bassetlaw District Council Policies Maps.</p> <p>Safeguarding of Minerals Infrastructure</p> <p>Tarmac supports the inclusion of Policy ST7 Point B.10 above. However, would suggest that its wording within the Draft Local Plan is expanded to include reference to the safeguarding of minerals infrastructure in addition to development affecting mineral safeguarding areas. Modifications proposed post Examination of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan emphasise the role of district authorities in safeguarding mineral associated infrastructure (MM17 of the November Modifications Document),</p> <p>'The NPPF states that planning policies should also safeguard existing, planned and potential sites for: the bulk transport, handling and processing of minerals; the manufacture of concrete and concrete products; and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material. In two-tier administrative areas such as Nottinghamshire, responsibility for safeguarding sites for the storage, handling and transport of minerals rests largely with the district or borough planning authority except where these facilities and sites are located at quarries or aggregate wharves or rail terminals'</p> <p>The former Cottam Power Station benefits from significant infrastructure that would be beneficial for certain users of the site. Importantly, the site is rail-linked. The rail-link present would enable the export of materials/products from the site during construction and beyond using a more sustainable alternative to road freight.</p> <p>The use of the railway for the movement of materials is mentioned at Policy ST7 Point B.12, however, it is mentioned in the context of importing construction materials and exporting waste materials to/from the site during its redevelopment. The potential importance of retaining the rail link as a sustainable method of transporting materials to/from the site upon its redevelopment is omitted from Policy ST7, despite the demonstrable and overwhelming economic and environmental benefits of its retention. This would be more consistent with the objectives of the NPPF (in particular Chapter 9), as well as Strategic Objective 13 of the Draft Local Plan itself, which states that the Local Plan should "make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure".</p> <p>Policy ST7 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan should be re-worded to much better reflect the requirement to safeguard important infrastructure such as the railhead at Cottam.</p>	<p>The Minerals Planning Authority confirm that making reference to the relevant minerals and waste plans in the Local plan and provide the necessary link to the minerals safeguarding areas is compliant with national policy. The County Council have confirmed that they are supportive of the policy wording relating to minerals. Re-use of the railhead would be supported but this is a detailed mater that needs to be worked up at masterplanning stage to ensure it can be delivered and is feasible. At Local plan review when the policy is reviewed this can be updated where necessary.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>The regeneration of previously developed vacant or underused sites within urban and rural Bassetlaw forms a key part of the vision and objectives of the Local Plan. Two 'Priority Regeneration Areas are identified in the Plan: 'Policy ST6: Worksop Central' and 'Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area'.</p> <p>As previously highlighted, Gladman advise that Bevercotes Colliery merits inclusion within the Plan as an additional Priority Regeneration Area, reflecting its past use and unique locational advantage to support economic investment and job growth. The redevelopment of the former Bevercotes Colliery will remediate and reclaim a significant brownfield site and its identification as a regeneration site would fully align with the strategic objectives of the Plan to spearhead the regeneration of previously developed land and of Bassetlaw. Furthermore, the site's planning history supports a development area which can deliver the redevelopment of Bevercotes Colliery alongside new and enhanced habitats for nature and wildlife including designated Local Wildlife Sites, which through continual improvement will help realise the areas' full biodiversity potential. Through the planting of deciduous and native broadleaf trees, the management of existing varieties, (some of which are covered by tree preservation orders) and the creation of new wet and dry land habitats, the site will support a number of amphibians including great crested newts as well as water voles, ground nesting birds, bats and badgers. The reintroduction of bridleways around the site will also open up the area up to occupiers of the development and the general public and encouraging breeding birds.</p> <p>4.7 Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area</p> <p>4.7.1 Policy ST7 safeguards land at the former Cottam Power Station site as a broad location for priority regeneration within the Local Plan. The policy sets out considered acceptable main uses for sites including housing development, employment development (B2, B8 E(G)), public transport hub and renewable energy uses providing that the listed criteria are met.</p> <p>4.7.2 Gladman welcome the Council's ambition to regenerate large brownfield sites with a legacy of contamination and support Policy ST7, which supports Strategic Objectives 3 and Strategic Objective 4 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>4.7.3 It is noted that Policy ST7 and the Cottam site are not relied on by the Council to meet the housing or economic requirements and in essence form an aspirational policy to safeguard brownfield land as a potential location for future growth.</p> <p>4.7.4 Gladman are of the view that a similar approach should be taken to support the regeneration of the Bevercotes Colliery site. The Council are aware through on-going engagement and previous representations, that 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. Furthermore, the site has extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for employment which demonstrates the principle of development in this location and that there is the ability to bring forward a sustainable form of development at the site.</p> <p>4.7.5 It is Gladman's view that the Bevercotes Colliery site should also be included in the Plan as a Priority Regeneration Area and an aspirational location to regenerate previously development land while allowing for relevant conditions to be complied with. It is evident that the site also offers the opportunity to provide flexibility to the Council's future needs with its ability to support employment proposals.</p> <p>4.7.6 While the Local Plan evidence base has not thoroughly assessed the site for economic and employment purposes. Bevercotes Colliery site is a long-standing, historic site of employment and now offers the opportunity to provide a range of business uses including B(8) and aligned B(2) uses which meet the requirements of the Framework to drive economic development and regeneration while recognising the differing locational requirements of different sectors9.</p> <p>4.7.7 Indeed, Gladman highlight that Bevercotes Colliery should be recognised for its ability to deliver employment uses across the footprint of the existing extant planning permission allowing for the effective use of land in meeting employment purposes on brownfield land while safeguarding and enabling the improvement of the surrounding environment10.</p> <p>4.7.8 Including Bevercotes Colliery as an aspirational Priority Regeneration Area, which does not contribute to meeting specifically defined development needs of the District, while setting conditions which recognise the site's unique set of circumstances would support the Council's objective of regenerating brownfield sites while safeguarding any potential ecology that may</p>	<p>Bevercotes Colliery has planning permission for employment use. As such, there is no need to support the site's regeneration through the Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST7 - COTTAM PRIORITY REGENERATION AREA			
		exist. Indeed, the site's location and challenging brownfield characteristics provide significant opportunities for the region to deliver a pioneering green economy at the heart of the Government's ambition to 'Build Back Greener' 11.	
REF117 (Ordsall South Rep)	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	We acknowledge that there is uncertainty regarding the former Cottam Power Station. In addition to the obvious contamination issues and unstable land, this site also suffers from flood risk and environmental constraints. There does not appear to be a strategy for its regeneration and as such, we seek clarification that the suggested 1600 homes are not counted within the sources of existing supply. That would undermine the Council's strategy elsewhere. We agree that it should be identified as a much longer-term opportunity site.	Reference to 1600 homes will be removed from the policy.
REF199	Cushman and Wakefield on behalf of UNIPER UK LTD	I am instructed by Uniper UK Ltd to submit written representations to the consultation of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020. Specifically, the representations focus on Uniper's operational power station – Cottam Development Centre (CDC) - and the adjoining strategic draft policy allocation (Policy ST7) on the former Cottam Coal Fired Power Station. Referring to ongoing discussions with your authority and the owners of the adjoining strategic site, my client broadly supports the draft policy ST7 and its supporting text, which correctly identifies the existing site constraints affecting the Cottam Priority Regeneration Area, as a result of the relationship with the CDC. Specifically, paragraphs B8 and B9 of the draft policy. My client is committed to working collaboratively with your authority and the owners of the strategic site in order that a positive policy context can help support the continued operation of CDC and future energy development projects on the site and the regeneration of the former Cottam Power Station site. In sharing this aspiration, my client proposes that the policy and supporting text be amended to reflect the potential opportunities and benefits that CDC could create and capture future energy project developments to compliment the regeneration of the Cottam Strategic site	Support noted and welcome. The Council would be happy to have further discussions with Uniper about the potential opportunities and benefits that could be realised in the area. The policy is a broad location; on that basis it will be reviewed at Local Plan review. It is considered that would be the more appropriate point to amend the policy if necessary.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
ST041	Retford Civic Society	Most of the employment land in Retford is in use or will be soon. So that there is a continuing supply of new jobs, it is essential that the one small site to be allocated for employment in the town is properly serviced and made available for businesses to build on. It took over 20 years for the last employment allocation on Randall Way to be brought forward, due to a lack of investment in infrastructure. This must not happen again. The servicing of this allocation should be facilitated by development of the nearby residential land which is in the same ownership. Although the planning permission which already exists for part of Trinity Farm has a phasing condition, this condition does not expressly require the employment land to be serviced. The Local Plan should include a specific requirement for all the employment allocation on Randall Way to be serviced and made available for individual employers to build on before there is any development on the housing allocation on North Road (Trinity Farm).	The planning permission for the Trinity Farm employment allocation is in place. This includes infrastructure matters. The Local Plan will reflect the principles of the planning permission. This includes access arrangements and that appropriate provisions are in place for utilities etc.
REF061	Resident	The larger picture of development of the Garden Village, the energy hub at the High Marnham power station site and other sites around Bassetlaw is welcome. Have concern for those local communities which may be directly affected by these developments. Hope that any potential deleterious effects will be carefully considered and all possible action taken, or insisted upon where developers are involved, to reduce these as much as possible.	The Local Plan should be read as a whole. Site allocation policies will ensure that appropriate mitigation is sought to address potential adverse impacts. For other sites, other policies in the

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
			plan such as for design, amenity, transport, flood risk will ensure that impacts on local communities are carefully assessed and mitigated appropriately.
REF092	DHA Planning	Explore Industrial Park Strongly support the formal allocation of the site for general employment development under Policy ST8(B). Previously requested such an approach, which is consistent with that taken by Bolsover District Council for the remainder of the site which, as set out above, has been formally allocated for these uses. Welcome the support of Bolsover District Council in allocating their part of the site for general employment uses, and are pleased that Bassetlaw is now taking the same approach in its emerging Local Plan. This is 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. 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."	Support noted and welcome.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	Concerned that there is no provision in the plan for Small and Medium Enterprises to locate in villages like East Markham. The plan is in danger of ensuring villages become nothing but bed and breakfast communities with residents commuting out for work. There needs to be a greater emphasis on providing opportunities for small start-up businesses with high speed internet connections and excellent connectivity to the wider area. Notes there is no mention of development on the Gamston Airport or the Bevercotes Colliery Site. Their proximity to the A1/A57 road network this is a lost employment opportunity. Would prefer to see both sites not developed for warehousing and logistic facilities rather for medium sized manufacturing and high tech companies. <i>The following section was written in reference to the January 2020 DLP</i> 6.3.6. Apleyhead does form a logical extension to the logistics of the A57 corridor but concerned about the impact of any development on existing links and also Clumber Park.	Policy ST12 supports the growth of business outside the allocations, this includes the for start up business in the rural area. Gamston Airfield Business Park is protected as an Existing Employment Site by policy ST11 to help support its long term operation. All of the site allocations are able to provide space for start-ups should there be market demand to do so. The supporting text for the garden Village makes reference to such use. Bevercotes Colliery has planning permission for employment use. The Plan would therefore be supportive of a proposal to accommodate business development on site in line with the planning permission. The potential impact of new development on Clumber park will be assessed by the Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Recreational Impact Assessment.
REF106	Water management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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 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. HARWORTH EM002 The site lies partially within the Board's district, the Board maintained White Water Main Drain is located on the northern boundary of the site. Consent will be required prior to any works in, under, over or within 9 metres of the bank top of the watercourse. Requires an easement strip along the Board maintained watercourse in order to allow for continued maintenance and future works. Consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river. EM007 The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. Consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Reference to SUDS taking into account climate change will be added to the water quality policy. Sites EM002 and EM007 both have planning permission for employment use. Detailed requirements identified by the Board should be addressed through discussions to deliver those permissions.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Its a great disappointment that once against any business or economic growth is still about Warehouses, Logistics and IT. Bassetlaw's heritage and expertise should make it a magnet for manufacturing, not "labouring". Whilst employment expansion is a necessity it does appear that at least one of these sites does not follow the Local plan policy of the use of brownfield sites. Symmetry Park and its expansion northwards is at the loss of acres of agricultural and forest land, that is wrong when there are still unused brownfield sites around the old Harworth Colliery.	The supporting text recognises the potential manufacturing can bring to the long term prosperity of the District. Policy ST8 provides for B2 employment use which would include manufacturing. Where possible the Local Plan site allocations are brownfield land. But there is not brownfield land available to meet the future needs of the District. Symmetry Park has planning permission so the principle of development has already been agreed. Harworth Colliery has planning permission, which over time will see the regeneration of this extensive brownfield site.
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	There is a mismatch with the ratios of 'dwellings required' to 'jobs created' when the figures for the whole of the District are compared to the Retford implications. Retford town is expected in the Plan to carry at least 10% of the total district's total 'New Build' through to the end of Plan, and the imbalance is particularly distinct when the 'Employment sites' figure for Retford is just around 3%. The only significant Employment growth in Retford is shown at Trinity Farm ST08 EM006. Whilst this is good, it means for instance that workers from the 800+ dwellings proposed for the opposite end of Retford will face a 2+ mile journey to the only new work in town - it may well be made in electric vehicles, but it will be in vehicles across an already congested section of the A620 unless there is fast frequent cheap and properly timed public transport provided by the developers. Background papers for the Plan assess the potential of the area for employment growth. The housing provision in the Draft Plan is based on a scale of employment growth close to the top of this range and see no measures for Retford which are likely to bring the required employment growth. This is a serious mismatch that may render the Plan too weak for immediate approval by the Inspector, and it is essential to either adjust the dwelling numbers down, or the local employment up. The only other 'fix' for this might be a rigid transport Plan that forces Developers of 10 or more dwellings to give cast iron guarantees of subsidised regular bus and train travel to the 5 or 6 key employment locations that Retford residents attend. The Council has committed resources to a study of central Worksop, has identified this area as a 'Priority Regeneration Area' and is to prepare a development plan document to guide its future. Retford does not yet have the same provisions, and the Party wishes to support the Business Community initiatives in Town and expects to see a proportionate allocation of BDC funding. The Plan risks setting Retford on a path to growing, not falling, unemployment. It certainly places Retford at high risk of falling local employment rates. Suggested changes to the plan ● If the plan cannot provide sufficient local jobs, then the standard method of assessment for new homes must be followed. ● The Draft Plan says little about Retford Town Centre where there are numerous opportunities for employment and housing. A commitment must be made for an assessment of and plan for Retford Town Centre and to ensure that the organisation doing so takes in feedback from across the town and its interest 6 of 18 groups. The Council must keep neighbourhood plan preparation under review and to consider an alternative approach if it fails to make rapid progress. ● The future is difficult to predict, but the Party believes that Leisure and Hospitality will form a significant section of future District prosperity especially in historic Towns. Unless this Plan matches its aspirational rhetoric, the Town will end up as an extensive retirement town with a regular outflow of talent and youth - we will be judged in 20 years' time, and 'it's a nice place to end your days' has limited appeal to most under 50s.	Policy ST8 covers the employment land required to meet needs for uses such as offices, general industry and storage and distribution. This is consistent with national policy. Overall Trinity Farm provides for 11.11 ha of land for employment/employment generating uses, 5 ha is for offices, general industry and storage and distribution. The rest will provide a range of additional jobs. A requirement of national policy is that employment land is identified to reflect market demands. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 identifies that, from discussions with local property agents that the demand for employment land in Retford identified by the Local Plan is broadly appropriate. On that basis, it would be difficult to demonstrate deliverability – a requirement of national policy. However, the Local Plan is supportive of town centre growth which can also support jobs growth and also protects 5 existing employment sites in Retford to help their future operation. The sustainable transport policy requires developers to use a Travel Plan which should set out how the package of measures that will be implemented to reduce the demand for travel by less sustainable modes, and how sustainable travel from their development will be made. Requirements must be proportionate to the type and scale of development to be consistent with national legislation. It is considered that use of the standard method does not support jobs growth generated by the employment land supply, would address local housing needs or help secure strategic infrastructure interventions. If these matters are not addressed the Local Plan would be contrary

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
			to national policy. Policy ST15 focuses on the management of town centres; section D2 focuses on Retford Town Centre. The Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan is progressing well. The purpose of neighbourhood plans is that they are community-led, however the Council provides officer support to facilitate its preparation. This will ensure that the correct procedures including consultation are followed. Leisure and hospitality are town centre uses. The Neighbourhood Plan would be the ideal vehicle to take this aspiration forward. The Local Plan supports town centre uses in the town centres so the approach would be complementary to that taken.
REF160	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Much is made of aspiring to create high paid jobs in the District. That is laudable, but not all jobs are going to be such. This week the Council proudly announced that Burger King are coming to town; on a site next to ASDA, which the Council also lauded, whose 200 staff are mostly paid only slightly above the National Living Wage. The Council made much of the development at Symmetry Park but two years on the current jobs and those coming are again at or slightly above the NLW. The agent marketing the large warehouse development there listed as one of the sites benefits as being in a low wage area with a large supply of people looking for work. There are existing large employers in the area paying low wages already. Presumably these will continue to do so and continue to employ hundreds of local workers.	The wages paid by employers is not a matter for the Local Plan. But to support the aspiration to attract a diverse range of employment to the District is vital that the right sites are available. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 identifies that, from discussions with local property agents that the demand for employment land, capable of attracting better paid, higher skilled jobs is along the A1/A57 corridors. Additionally the allocation of Marnham is designed to introduce a specific growth sector to the District.
REF158	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council - in agreement with Rotherham and Doncaster Councils	Paragraph 6.1.25 of the draft Plan is welcomed, which states that: “The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost at a strategic level to D2N2 or Sheffield City Region, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority.” However, the policies as currently drafted do not provide an appropriate mechanism for the impact on the economic strategies of other authorities to be taken into account. Policy ST8 Strategic Employment Site C. To develop the role of the A57/A1 growth corridor the development of a strategic employment site, SEM01: Apleyhead Junction (118.7ha) will be allocated to accommodate <u>sub-regional and/or</u> regional employment growth in accordance with Policy ST10. Development <u>should</u> will be required to: 1. provide E(g)/B2/B8 employment functions connected with <u>key sectors identified by the D2N2 LEP Local Industrial Strategy</u> the logistics sector; <u>1.</u> 2. demonstrate D2N2 LEP support for delivery; <u>2.</u> 3. be supportive of the role of key urban centres, such as Worksop; <u>3.</u> 4. have the ability to deliver significant economic development benefits in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, D2N2 and Sheffield City Region; 5. not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority; <u>4.</u> 6. not compromise the viability or deliverability of other employment allocations identified by this Plan or in Local Plans adopted by other authorities within D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region; 7. demonstrate that, 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; <u>5.</u> 8. be satisfactorily accommodated by critical infrastructure, in terms of capacity and timescales associated with investment works; <u>6.</u> 9. have good access to key strategic transport routes; <u>7.</u> 10. provide a significant number of new permanent jobs including skilled employment.	Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Barnsley and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF168	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Strategic Employment Land / Apleyhead junction The Council along with other South Yorkshire authorities previously expressed concerns regarding the proposed provision of strategic employment land and the strategic employment site SEM01: Apleyhead Junction. The responses provided in the consultation statement are acknowledged and the recognition that further work with Sheffield City Region and neighbouring authorities is needed in relation to the Apleyhead site is welcomed. Noted that no further engagement has taken place to date. Taking account of the consultation responses and the revised policy, the Council remains concerned with the plan's proposals. This is a view shared by other Councils and comments agreed by Barnsley, Doncaster, and Rotherham Councils are included below at Appendix 1 which outline the concerns and requests a number of amendments to policy.	The Council acknowledges the concerns Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and the other South Yorkshire authorities have in relation to Apleyhead. Further discussions will continue to take place with the authorities under Duty to Cooperate, this includes involvement in evidence base work being prepared to inform the Council's approach.
REF178	Councillors, East Retford South	The Bassetlaw plan identifies a need of 10,013 new build homes across Bassetlaw by 2037. Of these, 1,802 are required to be built in Retford, 18% of the District's total. The Bassetlaw plan identifies employment sites which will bring 11,000 new jobs across Bassetlaw. Of these, 5 Ha of land (Trinity Farm) are identified in Retford, with a projected uplift of 280 jobs, 2.5% of the District's employment aspirations. There is an obvious disparity between the percentage increase in homes vs the percentage increase in jobs. It appears that the ambition for Retford is limited. Namely, to 'thrive as a well-established market town providing for the changing needs of local residents, rural communities, and visitors to the town.' [BDC Spatial Strategy: Retford] The results of our local survey show that employment opportunities are a top priority for residents, with 45.76% listing it as their highest priority when considering provision of services.	Policy ST8 covers the employment land required to meet needs for uses such as offices, general industry and storage and distribution. This is consistent with national policy. Overall Trinity Farm provides for 11.11 ha of land for employment/employment generating uses, 5 ha is for offices, general industry and storage and distribution. The rest will provide a range of additional jobs. A requirement of national policy is that employment land is identified to reflect market demands. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 identifies that, from discussions with local property agents that the demand for employment land in Retford identified by the Local Plan is broadly appropriate. On that basis, it would be difficult to demonstrate deliverability – a requirement of national policy. However, the Local Plan is supportive of town centre growth which can also support jobs growth and also protects 5 existing employment sites in Retford to help their future operation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF211	National Trust	<p>Object to the proposed 118.7ha Strategic Employment Site in Part C of this policy. The 2019 Economic Development Needs Assessment showed no demonstrable need for this site. A new 2020 assessment assesses the number of jobs that the land supply could generate and how this in turn would affect population and housing growth. It should be noted that even under a growth model, the 2020 OE forecasts data suggests that only 84ha of land is needed in total (slightly higher than the 2019 figure of 63 ha) – see HEDNA 2020, paragraph 10.4. This has been boosted further by taking account of the completions trend, resulting in an aspirational need figure of 186.9ha. This figure should be viewed as an upper end target which is broadly met by the existing land supply (excluding Apleyhead) of 184.3ha. While the HEDNA states that Apleyhead exhibits the key attributes of a strategic employment site (e.g. strategic highway accessibility etc.), information in the report also reveals that in the absence of a Regional Spatial Strategy there is no other available evidence of need for such a strategic site in the region/sub-region. There is a risk that its allocation will impact on the delivery of allocated employment sites in the district and elsewhere and will inhibit regeneration of brownfield sites. Note that Sheffield City Region Authorities, in their responses to the Draft Local Plan 2019, have requested that the policy is amended to ensure that Apleyhead Junction does not accept proposals that could reasonably be accommodated on existing sites in other parts of South Yorkshire and D2N2 city regions. Bassetlaw has not responded positively to this suggestion. Bassetlaw's proposed approach to employment land has the effect of approximately doubling the housing requirement. With reference to the HEDNA, it is not clear that any of the criteria set out in Planning Practice Guidance for circumstances where higher housing growth figures should be set have been met. At a local level, both the excessive employment development and associated housing growth are likely to have ramifications for the environment including key environmental assets such as Clumber Park, as a result of air pollution, recreational pressure and cat predation – identified in Bassetlaw's Habitats Regulations Assessment. Other issues include loss of agricultural land and the closing of the undeveloped gap between settlements.</p>	<p>The Logistics Study evidences a need for logistics led sub-regional regional development along the A1/A57 corridors. The market requires larger sites; Apleyhead is considered to be an appropriate site to meet the specific demands of the logistics sector. The policy is clear that Apleyhead will be for a specific employment need, additional to that identified for the general employment sites, none of which can accommodate the scale of growth needed at sub-regional/regional level. The Local plan is promoting brownfield sites but these are not considered to be of a scale to address the specific sub-regional/regional requirements of the logistics sector. The Council has engaged positively with neighbouring authorities through Duty to Cooperate to progress this site. It is considered that the requirements of national policy and planning practice guidance have been demonstrated in the Local Plan's approach. The HRA considers that mitigation is achievable to address any potential impacts on air pollution and cat predation. A Recreational Impact Assessment is being undertaken to address potential recreational impacts – the National trust are a partner in that process. National policy does not prevent the development of agricultural land or land in the countryside.</p>
REF214	Historic England	Concerns in respect of the approach to the historic environment in relation to General Employment Site Allocation EM008 High Marnham Green Energy Hub and EM009 Bassetlaw Garden Village in addition to Strategic Employment Site SEM01 Apleyhead Junction.	Thank you for your comments.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>The location of these is very important. Large scale B8 facilities should be located either adjacent to a main arterial road or at least on a road network that leads straight to the A1 or M1. This will lessen their impact upon surrounding villages, towns and the road network. Ideal locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harworth (existing and extended). - Blyth (existing and extended) - Ranby including Apleyhead junction but some on the Retford to Worksop road would be possible (Proposed in this draft plan). - Markham Moor. (Proposed in this comments document). <p>Other B2 uses may have a lesser impact upon residential properties and the road network and these could be located closer to existing conurbations thus feeding off the existing workforce location.</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan allocates land alongside the A1/A57 where the sites have been identified as suitable, available and deliverable and are considered to be attractive to the market.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF188	Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.Pears Property Ltd.	<p>High Marnham Green Energy Hub is identified within both Policy ST8: Provision of Land for Employment Development and Policy ST9: EM008: High Marnham Green Energy Hub. Strongly support the identification of the site within the employment land policy, in recognition of the significant opportunities it offers to aid the economic prosperity of the District, and within its own allocation in order to ensure and focus its delivery.</p> <p>Support the reference at paragraph 6.1.17 (p58) to the “positive policy intervention” that Policy ST8 makes to ensure the regeneration of the former coal fired power station site at High Marnham and the acknowledgement that its closure directly affected employment in the rural area, and indirectly affected local supply chains. J G Pears are committed to facilitating the delivery of new specialised employment uses on this site and agree that this will be essential to support those local communities and the wider District, and make optimum use of this significant brownfield site in the longer term. J G Pears have already engaged with the Service Director of Investment and Growth and Nottinghamshire County Council and look forward to working together with the District and Country Councils as well as D2N2 and other stakeholders to see the comprehensive delivery of the site drawing significant inward investment to the area.</p>	Support noted and welcome.
REF224	Sheffield City Region	<p>Whilst supporting the Draft Plan’s overall approach and much of the specific policies, it is also important to repeat some of the comments made by the LEP/MCA on strategic employment sites in February 2020. In particularly, proposals for the Apleyhead site and the associated policies for this in the Draft Plan require further discussion. Whilst supporting this aspect of the Draft Plan in principle, there are some practical changes which could help to strengthen the way that the Apleyhead site is presented in Policy ST8 so that it more closely aligns with our priorities in South Yorkshire. Apleyhead has a potentially important role to play in helping to attract large scale inward investment to the benefit of South Yorkshire as well as D2N2. Implementation needs to be more carefully considered as the Plan develops. There are some important changes in emphasis to Policy ST8 between the previous and current draft of the Plan. The previous draft identified the strategic employment site at Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within any key sector identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) – presumably sectors listed in the LIS like creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing. The evidence also suggests that new jobs at Apleyhead would rely on increased levels of commuting from outside of Bassetlaw, ie residents from South Yorkshire travelling to occupy these jobs. Given this, and the broader range of uses proposed for Apleyhead, must work together to ensure this site does not have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities as well as create unsustainable patterns of commuting. There is an opportunity to undertake further collaborative work so that can address cross boundary and strategic issues between Bassetlaw and South Yorkshire. This would benefit from all four South Yorkshire local authorities being involved and could add further detail to the Statement of Common Ground agreed by the MCA and other authorities in the wider city region (approved by the MCA in June 2020). This would also be in line with Paragraph 6.1.25 of the Draft Plan which explains how the Council is working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities, which is welcomed. Elected Members and officers from Bassetlaw District Council have played an active 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. This is extremely valuable and provides a strong basis for us to continue to work together.</p>	Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Sheffield City Region and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities and SCR.
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework sets out four tests that must be met for Local Plans to be considered sound. In this regard, we submit that in order to prepare a sound plan it is fundamental that it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positively Prepared – The Plan should be prepared on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on a proportionate evidence base. • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with National Policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework. <p>Duty to Cooperate The Duty to Cooperate 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. It requires local authorities to engage constructively,</p>	Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with SCR and the South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The Council has agreed draft Statements of Common Ground with SCR and neighbouring authorities. A Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement was published alongside the November 2020 Plan. The Sustainability Appraisal is consistent with

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary strategic issues throughout the process of Plan preparation. As demonstrated through the outcome of the 2012 Coventry Core Strategy Examination and the 2013 Mid Sussex Core Strategy Examination, if a Council fails to satisfactorily discharge its Duty to Cooperate, this cannot be rectified through modifications and an Inspector must recommend non-adoption of the Plan. Whilst Gladman recognise that the Duty to Cooperate is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration, as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) it is clear that it is intended to produce effective policies on cross-boundary strategic matters. In this regard, Bassetlaw District Council must be able to demonstrate that it has engaged and worked with neighbouring authorities, alongside their existing joint working arrangements, to satisfactorily address cross-boundary strategic issues, and the requirement to meet any unmet housing needs. This is not simply an issue of consultation but a question of effective cooperation. The revised Framework (2019) has introduced a number of significant changes to how local planning authorities are expected to cooperate including the preparation of Statement(s) of Common Ground (SoCG) which are required to demonstrate that a plan is based on effective cooperation and has been based on agreements made by neighbouring authorities where cross boundary strategic issues are likely to exist. The revised Framework (2019) sets out that local planning authorities should produce, maintain, and update one or more Statement(s) of Common Ground (SoCG), throughout the plan making process¹. The SoCG(s) should provide a written record of the progress made by the strategic planning authorities during the process of planning for strategic cross-boundary matters and will need to demonstrate the measures local authorities have taken to ensure cross boundary matters have been considered and what actions are required to ensure issues are proactively dealt with e.g. unmet housing needs. Sustainability Appraisal In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to 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 reasonable alternatives. Bassetlaw District Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, Bassetlaw Local Plan's decision-making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent. On 24th July 2018, MHCLG published the Revised National Planning Policy Framework which was subsequently updated in February 2019. These publications form the first revisions of the Framework since 2012 and implement changes that have been informed through the Housing White Paper, The Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation and the draft Revised Framework consultation. The revised Framework (2019) introduces a number of major changes to national policy and provides further clarification to national planning policy as well as new measures on a range of matters. Crucially, the changes to national policy reaffirm the Government's commitment to ensuring up-to-date plans are in place which provide a positive vision for the areas which they are responsible for to address the housing, economic, social and environmental priorities to help shape future local communities for future generations. In particular, paragraph 16 of the Revised Framework (2019) states that 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; d) Contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals; e) Be accessible through the use of digital tools to assist public involvement and policy presentation; and f) Serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)." A central feature of the NPPF is the need for local plans to support the building of a strong, competitive economy. Paragraphs 81 and 82 of the NPPF indicate that planning policies should: "81. a) set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, having regard to Local Industrial Strategies and other local policies for economic development and regeneration; b) set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period; c) seek to address potential barriers to investment, such as inadequate infrastructure, services or housing, or a poor environment; and d) be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices (such as live-work accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. 82. Planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations." With regard to housing, to support the Government's continued objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that the Local Plan provides a sufficient amount and variety of land that can be brought forward, without delay, to meet housing needs. In determining the minimum number of homes needed, strategic plans should be based upon a local housing needs assessment defined using the standard method, unless there are exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative approach. Once the</p>	<p>national legislation and includes an assessment of policy options and reasonable alternatives. The Local Plan is consistent with national policy and identifies a significant housing supply, with appropriate buffer to maintain a rolling 5 year supply over the plan period. The Council is fully informed about changes to national planning legislation and planning reforms and potential impacts for the plan-making process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>minimum number of homes that are required is identified, the strategic planning authority should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. In this regard, paragraph 67 sets out specific guidance that local planning authorities should take into account when identifying and meeting their housing needs. It states: “Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of: a) specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period; and b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan.” Annex 2 of the Framework (2019) provides updated definitions for the terms “deliverable” and “developable”. These are defined as: ‘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 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.’ ‘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.’ Once a local planning authority has identified its housing needs, these needs should be met as a minimum, unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so. This includes considering the application of policies such as giving consideration as to whether or not these provide a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type and distribution of development (paragraph 11b)i.). Where it is found that full delivery of housing needs cannot be achieved (owing to conflict with specific policies of the NPPF), Local Authorities are required to engage with their neighbours to ensure that identified housing needs can be met in full (see Paragraph 35 of the NPPF 2019). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was published by the Government to provide clarity on how specific elements of the NPPF should be interpreted. The PPG has been updated to reflect the changes introduced by the revised NPPF to national planning policy. The most significant changes to the PPG relate to defining housing need, housing supply and housing delivery performance. In terms of economic development, The PPG continues to require strategic policy-making authorities to prepare a robust evidence base to understand existing business needs, which will need to be kept under review to reflect local circumstances and market conditions. Thorough consideration must also be given to the specific locational requirements of specialist or new sectors that have the ability to drive the economic prospects of the areas in which they locate. With regard to housing, The Standard Method was introduced by the Government to simplify the process of defining housing need, and avoid significant delay and debate experienced in plan preparation and at planning appeals. Revisions to the PPG, 20th February 2019 confirmed the need for local planning authorities to use the 2014-household projections as the starting point for the assessment of housing need under the standard method. The most significant of these updates was the confirmation of the need for local planning authorities to use the 2014-household projections as the starting point for the assessment of housing need under the standard method. It is vital to consider the economic impact of COVID-19 and the long-term role that housing will play in supporting the recovery of the economy, both locally and nationally. Encourage Bassetlaw to fully consider the merits of planning for a housing figure beyond the minimum requirement of 288 dwellings per annum. An increased housing figure would enable Bassetlaw to capture a larger proportion of the £7 billion yearly housebuilder contributions. With 218,000 homes predicted not to be built due to COVID-19 from now to 2024/255, it is imperative that Bassetlaw Local Plan identifies sufficient land to support the delivery of homes. In order for the housing needs for the whole plan period to be met, it will also be essential to provide sufficient headroom within the housing supply. Supports the Home Builders Federation’s recommendation that local plan should seek to identify sufficient deliverable sites to provide a 20% buffer between the housing requirement and supply. Planning for the Future – White Paper, 6th August 2020, set out proposals for how it is seeking to ‘radically reform’ the planning system. The proposals are seeking to streamline and modernise the planning process. This consultation regarding these proposals closed on the 29th October. It will be important that the Council keeps abreast with the implementation of these changes to determine any potential implications for the Local Plan. The White Paper reiterated the role of planning in supporting economic recovery following the Covid-19 outbreak and the importance of supporting local opportunities for economic growth and job creation. Timescales remain uncertain, subject to the outcomes of this process the Government has signalled its intent to make rapid progress toward this new planning system through the swift introduction of new legislation to implement the changes. Further consultation on immediate changes to the current planning system closed on 1 October 2020 - proposed revised standard method for calculating local housing need, which proposed to incorporate a percentage of existing stock as the baseline of the calculation. In December 2020 the Government published</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>their response to the 'Changes to the Current Planning System' provides an overview of the consultation responses before highlighting that it has been deemed that the most appropriate approach is to retain the Standard Method in the current form with an additional 35% uplift to the 'post-cap number' for 20 local authorities. The Government's rationale behind this approach is to increase homebuilding in existing urban areas to make the most of previously developed brownfield land over and above that in the existing standard method. The latest correspondence from Government regarding the revisions to the Standard Method for calculating local housing need will not affect the minimum local housing need which Bassetlaw should Plan for. It is vital that the Council keeps in touch with the implementation of changes deriving from the White Paper consultation to determine any potential implications for the Local Plan.</p>	
REF198	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Promoting the former Bevercotes Colliery site through the local plan making process. The emerging Plan's consideration of the site to date has been focussed on its potential development as a Garden Village, notwithstanding the judgements reached to date, the plan making process should actively consider alternative options for the future of the site, focussing on its significant economic development and regeneration potential. It will be important for the plan making process to fully consider the specific locational requirements of different sectors and the ability of this specific location to accommodate businesses with specific locational needs. The regeneration potential of the site should be supported through a positive and proactive approach within the Local Plan that fully recognises its ability to support the sustainable economic growth of the area. These provide details outlining the site's development potential for the delivery of a new, green economy enterprise zone comprising of a state of the art sugar beet processing facility, waste to energy facility, educational centre and electric service station, with supporting leisure and recreational features. Further information is set out in the appended Vision Document. Supportive of the Council's vision and objectives which provide a positive and proactive approach to future development in Bassetlaw over the plan period to 2037. Supportive of the positive approach to new growth, which sees the Council make provision for new homes above that required by the Standard Method to help achieve the District's economic objectives. Strategic Objectives 3 and 4 set out the intention of the Plan to encourage and support sustainable economic growth and support sensitive regeneration of previously developed, vacant or underused sites and spaces within urban and rural Bassetlaw. Strategic Objective 14 states that new settlements and development contribute to the provision of necessary infrastructure to deliver growth. The Bevercotes Colliery site has been identified by the Council as having the potential to accommodate a garden village community, together with Gamston Airfield and its potential allocation for this purpose has been tested through the emerging Plan's Sustainability Appraisal. The site remains an existing employment site with extant planning permission for its redevelopment for B2 and B8 uses (reference: 09/05/00002). The current iteration of the Plan is now silent on Bevercotes Colliery. It is important that the full potential of the site to support economic development and regeneration is recognised through the plan making process and as such, the sites suitability, availability and achievability for a range of employment uses should also be given pro-active consideration. The strategic objectives of the Plan, principally SO3 and SO4, highlight the need to prioritise development on previously developed land that is capable of sensitively regenerating Bassetlaw and stimulating sustainable economic growth. The land at Bevercotes Colliery can help the Council achieve its strategic objectives and the site should be identified as an additional Priority Regeneration Area. Land at Bevercotes Colliery can also be bought forward in a manner to meet the intentions of SO14. The Council are aware through on-going engagement and previous representations, that 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 site has extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for employment which demonstrates the principle of development in this location and that there is the ability to bring forward a sustainable form of development at the site. Bevercotes Colliery site should be included in the Plan as a Priority Regeneration Area and an aspirational location to regenerate previously development land while allowing for relevant conditions to be complied with. It is evident that the site offers the opportunity to provide flexibility to the Council's future needs with its ability to support employment proposals. The Local Plan evidence base has not thoroughly assessed the site for economic and employment purposes. Bevercotes Colliery site is a long-standing, historic site of employment and now offers the opportunity to provide a range of business uses including B(8) and aligned B(2) uses which meet the requirements of the Framework to drive economic development and regeneration while recognising the differing locational requirements of different sectors. Bevercotes Colliery should be recognised for its ability to deliver employment uses across the footprint of the existing extant planning permission allowing for the effective use of land in meeting employment purposes on brownfield land while safeguarding and enabling the improvement of the surrounding environment. Including Bevercotes Colliery as an aspirational Priority Regeneration Area, which does not contribute to meeting specifically defined development needs of the District, while setting conditions which recognise the site's unique set of circumstances would support the Council's objective of regenerating brownfield sites while safeguarding any potential ecology that may exist. Indeed, the site's location and challenging brownfield characteristics provide significant opportunities for the region to deliver a pioneering green economy at the heart</p>	<p>Bevercotes has planning permission for employment land. The Council supports the development of the site for the consented use. It is considered that the planning permission for the site enables the positive re-use of brownfield land and the site's regeneration. Ongoing discussions have been had with the site promoters in relation to the development of this site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		of the Government's ambition to 'Build Back Greener'. Policy ST8: seeks to deliver the Council's strategy for economic growth and investment through ensuring an attractive and flexible supply of employment land is available in the District. Reiterate that the recognition of Bevercotes Colliery in the Plan as an additional Priority Regeneration Area aligns with the overall Strategic Objectives of the Plan and the ambitions of Policy ST8. Bevercotes Colliery is a long-standing employment location and has the ability to form a comprehensive employment area including B(8) and aligned B(2) uses, as demonstrated through the extant planning permission on the 80.94 hectare site and the wider market interest in the vision document. The site has a unique set of circumstances, including boundary tree cover at 25 metres, allowing for the sensitive setting of development within the surrounding landscape and also benefits from its location less than 1km from the strategic A1 corridor. Continues to represent an excellent location for strategic employment development that requires acknowledgement within the policies of the plan.	
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	Chapter 6 of the Local Plan seeks to promote economic growth across the District and set out policies to encourage economic development over the plan period. 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. Support the Council's approach to strategic employment growth across the district and support the strategic employment allocation for EM007 to the south of Snape Lane in Harworth. Harworth is identified as an employment growth area and the EM007 allocation for 80.9ha of B2 and B8 uses 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 driving forward economic growth and employment opportunities in Harworth and the District as a whole. Land at Snape Lane, Harworth (Policy ST8 & Site EM007) has been promoted for development for c81ha of employment land since the inception of the Local Plan. Outline planning permission (15/00971/OUT) was granted on 14 th March 2017 for 235,000 sqm of employment development (Use Class B1, B2, B8 and ancillary development) to form a new strategic employment site. The permission has a lifespan of 10 years and helps underpin a step change in the fortunes of Harworth Bircotes in economic growth terms. A S.73 Planning Application (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 on 6 th November 2019. This application is subject to the completion of a S.106. This site is at a very advanced stage and the allocation in the draft Local Plan reflects the status of this land as a committed employment site.	Support noted and welcome.
REF177	Axisped on behalf of FCC Environment	Policy ST8 seeks to deliver the Council's strategy for economic prosperity and inward investment. To support job growth and upskilling of residents, sustainable economic growth will be directed to General Employment Sites and a Strategic Employment Site as identified on the Policies Map. Part B of the policy provides details of General Employment Sites which are made up of those sites with planning permission and site allocations. The total amount of available employment land is 168.6 hectares. FCC's comments to the January 2020 draft Local Plan questioned why their site was not included under Policy ST6. The Council has responded to these comments by stating: "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." It is correct that planning permission exists for part of the site, it is not clear from the Council's response why some sites with planning permission are allocated as General Employment Sites under Policy ST8, and others, such as FCC's site are not. FCC's site forms a logical extension to the existing employment site EES10 Carlton Forest and would deliver in the region of 135-300 jobs depending on the final use. FCC's site could contribute to the Council's existing supply of employment sites and should be identified within this policy. It is considered that this inconsistent approach to the allocation of sites with planning permission represents a failing of the plan as it is not justified. The approved development on the site clearly demonstrates that the site is sustainably located to deliver employment development within the Plan period. In accordance with paragraph 35 of the NPPF, the Plan must be positively prepared and should provide a strategy which as a minimum seeks to meet the area's needs. Policy ST1 confirms the provision of at least 168ha of general employment land should be delivered over the Plan period to accommodate local employment growth. This is not a maximum target and assumes that additional employment development could come forward in appropriate locations over and above the determined employment need; whilst FCC contend that the entire 8 hectare site should be allocated for employment uses, as a very minimum the parcel of land with planning permission should be included within Policy ST8.	The site is identified as an Existing Employment Site in the Local Plan where new or additional development would be supported. The general employment sites have been identified based on a range of evidence base documents and informed by evidence of market demand. The majority of the site is identified as a Local Wildlife Site which is afforded protection by the NPPF. Its allocation for employment would be contrary to national policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>The Bassetlaw draft local plan proposes to allocate more employment land than has been previously agreed at city region level, which would potentially have a negative impact on economic development in other Sheffield City Region authorities and the region as a whole. Previously objected to this approach (Bassetlaw consultation Jan/Feb 2020) as a city region and jointly with the other South Yorkshire authorities, but the latest version of the Bassetlaw Plan fails to take account of these objection. SCC commented on an earlier Regulation 18 consultation on the Bassetlaw Plan published in January 2020 as part of a Sheffield City Region (SCR) Combined Mayoral Authority response. That was endorsed by the City Region and all four South Yorkshire authorities. This response was approved at the time by the Interim Head of Planning and the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development. The main concerns we had with the previous draft related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the amount of land for employment uses proposed in the Plan and the fact that this level was too high and not justified, so represented an over-allocation of land. • concerns regarding one specific proposed strategic site allocation that we understood was included in order to meet a potential demand for a large inward investment opportunity. Did not necessarily object in principle to such an allocation, considered that there were insufficient controls on the type of development that could take place on that site to ensure it would deliver this specific type of investment. Concerned the way the allocation was presented and supported in the Plan and how it was proposed to deliver the site. Unfortunately, these concerns have not been addressed in the latest version of the Plan so we, the SCR and other South Yorkshire authorities are again making representations expressing these same objections. A potential over provision of employment land could jeopardise the aims of our and other local plans in the city region to deliver sufficient employment land to meet individual authorities' needs. Sheffield and the other SCR districts are proposing to allocate sufficient employment land to meet our own identified needs and not seek to provide additional land, unlike the Bassetlaw Plan. If one district provides for significantly more employment land than has been calculated to be needed, this will create an element of additional 'competition' between individual local authorities for new investment, with one authority having an unfair competitive advantage by nature of a wider offer, or portfolio, of land and sites than other areas. The Bassetlaw Plan could create a greater level of investment opportunities at the expense of other areas. One of the roles of city regions is to ensure that individual areas operate in a strategic, coordinated way to ensure maximum benefits for the region as a whole. This is delivered through Statements of Common Ground, and Bassetlaw will be failing to adhere to this approach with the draft Plan as proposed. The previous combined response suggested amendments to proposed policies and allocations to address these issues and ensure an approach that met both local and city region needs. Given the failure to address these concerns are again proposing an amendment to the policy wording that has been agreed with the other three South Yorkshire authorities. Have some very general and brief comments relating to housing and transport. These do not raise any strategic issues for us and our comments are therefore supportive of the approach. Given the above Sheffield City Council formally objects to elements of the draft Bassetlaw Plan as it is currently worded and suggest an alternative approach, as set out in detail below. Understand that the city region and the other 3 South Yorkshire authorities will be making responses on the draft Plan in line with our comments below and will suggest changes identical to our suggested rewording of Policy ST8. 	<p>Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Sheffield and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF225	Sheffield City Council	<p>Policy ST8 B – General Employment Sites point out again the supply of 168 hectares is 100 hectares more than the identified need of 68 hectares representing an over-supply of 100 hectares or 147%, contrary to the agreed Statement of Common Ground. C. Strategic Employment Site The need should be a regional one, assuming Sheffield City Region is classed as a region including Bassetlaw. “Sub-regional” does not appear to have been defined, so it is not an appropriate term. We suggest that the words “sub-regional and/or” are deleted and question whether “national” should be included to reflect the supporting text in 6.1.20. The wording of the policy should be strengthened to make sure the specific development requirements of the site are met, by changing “should” to “will be required to”. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 82 states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors including logistics. National Planning Practice Guidance on Housing and Economic Needs Assessments (Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 2a-031-20190722) states that where such a need for strategic facilities exist, strategic policy making authorities should collaborate with other authorities to identify the scale of need across relevant market areas. This process has not been undertaken either regionally or for the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The SCR Strategic Employment Land Appraisal Summary Report (May 2020) (submitted to the SCR Infrastructure Board on 2nd July 2020) states that collaborative work on logistics should be undertaken in the future. This work has yet to take place and it is considered that the allocation of the site and its regional importance is a duty to cooperate issue and should be addressed as one. Regional work on this issue would also address if there is justification/need for a regional site. The recent consultation on Issues and Options for a draft Sheffield Local Plan discussions on this issue took place and there was agreement with the SCR and the adjoining LPAs that a city region-wide assessment of logistics needs should be produced. The South Yorkshire authorities would welcome the opportunity for engagement on these issues at the earliest opportunity. Should the site be retained for allocation, to meet demand for logistics outside of Sheffield that could be wholly or partly accommodated on the site (although this has yet to be determined), this should also be reflected in the wording of policy ST8. The requirement in C1 should be changed from “key sectors identified by the D2N2 LEP Local Industrial Strategy” to “the logistics sector”. So that the policy does not lead to a further over-supply of employment land in the district and draw demand away from nearby areas, further clauses should be added to the policy that any development on the site should not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority and should not compromise viability or deliverability of Local Plans adopted by other authorities within D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region. Our understanding is that the original (and main) reason to allocate this site is to meet a potential major inward investment opportunity that would otherwise be lost to the region due to the lack of a suitable site, there should also be a requirement for any development to be capable of accommodation only on this site and nowhere else in the region. Should the site remain proposed for allocation then the proposed changes in red are required: C. To develop the role of the A57/A1 growth corridor the development of a strategic employment site, SEM01: Apleyhead Junction (118.7ha) will be allocated to accommodate regional employment growth in accordance with Policy ST10. Development will be required to: 1. provide E(g)/B2/B8 employment functions connected with the logistics sector; 2. demonstrate D2N2 LEP support for delivery; 3. be supportive of the role of key urban centres, such as Worksop; 4. have the ability to deliver significant economic development benefits in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, D2N2 and Sheffield City Region; 5. not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority; 6. not compromise the viability or deliverability of other employment allocations identified by this Plan or in Local Plans adopted by other authorities within D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region; 7. demonstrate that, 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; 8. be satisfactorily accommodated by critical infrastructure, in terms of capacity and timescales associated with investment works; 9. have good access to key strategic transport routes; 10. provide a significant number of new permanent jobs including skilled employment.</p>	<p>The District has a strong employment land supply, the majority of the employment allocations have planning permission. The latest evidence in the Logistics Study shows that the employment need has increased to 84ha, it is appropriate and consistent with national policy to over-allocate to provide flexibility and choice to the market. Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with SCR and the South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics led site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in the general employment FEMA or the logistics property market area. The Council has agreed draft Statements of Common Ground with SCR and neighbouring authorities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Welcome the revised local plan which combines the previous Policy ST6 and Policy ST8 into a single new Policy ST8, as this clearly explains the proposed economic growth and employment development strategy. Concerned the wording of ST8, which is fundamentally an overarching employment land policy, is overly prescriptive and includes unnecessary detail which should be amended and moved to policy ST10. Without the amendments below would object to ST8. Inconsistencies remain between Policy ST1 and Policy ST8. For example, ST1 refers to strategic employment sites as ones which can support ‘future significant indigenous employment growth and/or strategic employment needs’. Yet Policy ST8 refers to Apleyhead Junction being ‘allocated to accommodate sub-regional and/or regional employment growth in accordance with Policy ST10’. Consider that ST8 should be revised to mirror the terminology of ST1 in order to reflect the types of uses and investment which can be realised on the site. The different terminology creates potentially avoidable policy tensions. As we detailed previously, to deliver the Local Plan vision in full and particularly the 11,200 additional jobs target (i.e., a step change in growth and investment in the district) all allocations within the plan must be delivered – both strategic and non-strategic. ST8 should not inadvertently create barriers to the delivery of Apleyhead Junction as a key site. Following on from the amendments to ST1 in respect of the overall employment land target, ST8 should be amended to include Apleyhead Junction in the group of employment sites needed to deliver the stated growth ambitions. If the local authority required further detail on the relevance of Apleyhead Junction as a major employment site this detail could be included in Part C of the policy as amended below. ST8 can be further simplified to only deal with key overarching employment land matters and not include criteria based assessments (as are included in ST8 part C) which are better placed in the site specific policy (ST10). Logical to include Apleyhead Junction into the general sites list (as Site EM010: Apleyhead Junction), with the detailed policy requirements in ST10 then updated accordingly to address both key principles and detailed policies. This creates a policy (ST8) which deals with the list of employment sites and defers the criteria for each site to the site specific policies. Suggest the following wording to Policy ST8: B. Employment Sites The following Employment Sites will support the delivery of economic growth: Apleyhead Junction added to the sites list, as Site EM010. Apleyhead Junction major employment site C. To develop the role of the A57/A1 growth corridor as a strategically important location, the Apleyhead Junction site (Site EM010) will be allocated as a major employment site enable future major local employment growth and/or significant indigenous employment growth and/or strategic employment needs within and beyond Bassetlaw’s boundary in accordance with Policy ST1. (note: the criteria from ST8 are moved to ST10)</p>	<p>The policy will be re-worded to ensure consistency across the Plan and to better reflect the approach being taken to the site through the Local Plan. Apleyhead is considered as a strategic employment site, so is therefore additional to the general employment needs of the District.</p>
REF204	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning consultant on behalf of land owner	<p>Lodged objections to this policy on behalf of our Client at the previous consultation stage. The policy remains unchanged and our objection is repeated. Continue to object to the non-allocation of our Client’s land as identified and for the reasons set out in our letter of 26th February 2020 and appendices. Seek a more generous policy for the development of land for business purposes outside areas defined in the Plan where there are no overriding technical or environmental objections – also as set out in our letter. This would be consistent with the NPPF which confirms that all forms of business are acceptable in rural areas (subject to the specially protected areas identified in the Framework).</p> <p>The draft 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 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. Reviewed the draft Plan proposals for employment development and suggest that the number, size, type and distribution of employment areas is inadequate to meet the Council’s over-arching aspirations in two main 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 mentioned) and 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. Paragraph 5.1.57 notes the potential for economic growth above that provided for in the Local Plan with particular reference to strategic logistics growth (i.e. growth related to the transport and distribution sectors) and, at paragraph 5.1.58, notes the increasing prominence of the A1 corridor. The location</p>	<p>The rural policy is considered to address the points raised. The site was considered in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The site was identified as having largely negative effects with regards to a higher number of the SA objectives</p> <p>It was therefore determined that it was not a preferred option for taking forward for allocation when compared to other alternatives.</p> <p>The SA assessment considered that although the site is located close to the A1, it is isolated and poorly located in relation to the local labour supply. In addition, no significant housing growth is being proposed in the area to support a large allocation for employment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>of a proposed new settlement in the draft Plan reflects the importance of the A1 corridor and no issue is taken with the strategic approach to meeting a significant proportion of the District's housing and employment needs in a new settlement. If the new settlement is to be a truly sustainable and integrated community rather than a series of separate housing and employment sites, the lead time to deliver the concept will be considerable. Section 5.3 of the Local Plan which describes the new settlement – the Bassetlaw Garden Village – fully recognises this is a long term proposal which will involve development beyond the current Plan period: that proposals are at a very early stage. The Plan confirms the highly accessible location of the proposed new settlement (paragraph 5.3.14). In strategic locational terms, the site of the new settlement is no more accessible than the area surrounding the Markham Moor interchange. Given the long lead time the new settlement achieves the sustainability credentials required by Local Plan policy, the Local Plan needs to provide for what might be termed “opportunity sites” either by specific additional allocations or by introducing greater flexibility within Policy ST1(B)(2)(d) to bridge the gap. Within the rural areas (as the draft Plan notes, comprise the majority of Bassetlaw District), linkages between sites and settlements should be recognised where the links are supported by viable public transport or where additional development along established public transport routes could safeguard and/or enhance public transport services. The Plan as currently drafted fails to do this. Object to Policy ST1A which is over-restrictive. The policy should read: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth which in the main will follow the hierarchy set out below and be appropriate to the size of each settlement that meets the evidence need..... (or words to that effect) Policy ST6A and B should be amended to include the site which is the subject of these representations. 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. 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, 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 major highway works to improve capacity and safety on the A1 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. 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 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 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. The reason for its description as a wildlife site is entirely unclear. 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. My Client confirms her undertaking to make the blue-edged area available as described above in the event the area edged red is allocated for employment development. This would be secured by a S106 Agreement. Other land</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Site Allocations Landscape Assessment identifies that due to the site's rise in topography, development here could negatively impact the local landscape character of the area.</p> <p>Significant negative effects were also identified for biodiversity. Cliff Gate Grassland Local Wildlife Site is within the site option and Beacon Hill Grassland is adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Significant negative effects for land and soil (loss of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land.</p> <p>The majority of this site is within Source Protection Zone 3. As such, a significant negative effect is likely.</p> <p>The site is also located within the setting of several listed buildings, including Markham Moor Hotel, Markham Moor House and the Milestone (all Grade II) and development could harm the settings of these.</p> <p>The site lies close to shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>The majority of this site is within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Character Area. The site is within Landscape Policy Zone MN11 and is classified for conserve and reinforce.</p> <p>The Submission Local Plan allocates over 287 ha of employment land which the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 has assessed as the needs of the District to 2037. The Local Plan allocates a range of sites capable of meeting the need of a range of business in locations close to the Main Towns and along the A1/A57 growth corridors.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>in the same ownership is 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 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 short time, this planting will enclose views of the 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. 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.</p>	
REF184	Doncaster Council	<p>There remain 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 draft plan recognises at paragraph 5.1.17 that the Council will work with neighbouring authorities to undertake additional work to further consider the impacts of the strategic employment site, no discussions or Duty to Co-operate engagement has been undertaken on this matter following the concerns expressed in relation to the January 2020 draft. NPPF (para 82) states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors including logistics. The NPPG on Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 2a-031-20190722) states that where such a need for strategic facilities exist, strategic policy making authorities should collaborate with other authorities to identify the scale of need across relevant market areas. This process has not been undertaken either regionally or for the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The SCR Strategic Employment Land Appraisal Summary Report (May 2020) (which went to the SCR Infrastructure Board on 2nd July 2020) states that collaborative work on logistics should be undertaken in the future. This work has yet to take place and it is considered that the allocation of the site and its regional importance is a duty to cooperate issue and should be addressed as one. Regional work on this issue would also address if there is justification/need for a regional site. The South Yorkshire authorities would welcome the opportunity for engagement on these issues at the earliest opportunity. The authorities continue to have concerns that the amount of strategic employment land proposed does not appear to be sufficiently justified by the evidence base. There are concerns at the significant difference in the job requirements identified between the demand and supply led approaches. Based on the supply side approach, the economic evidence highlights that the provision of the additional strategic employment site at Apleyhead could almost double the number of jobs accommodated within employment sites in the draft plan (the site potentially providing 3,857 - 5,358 jobs compared to 5,878 jobs for all other employment sites). The draft plan is based on a housing requirement of 589 dwellings per annum and meeting the full extent of jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) Update 2020. This assumes the higher of the jobs range for the Apleyhead site would be met. The HEDNA demonstrates that the Apleyhead site will generate a significant level of commuting into the District from neighbouring areas. The HEDNA concludes at paragraph 5.21: The higher jobs at Apleyhead Junction, which are ambitious, should only really be countenanced with changes to commuting. This alternative commuting pattern results in housing need of 562 dwellings per annum. If this approach is taken forward there would still be a need to agree, through the Duty to Cooperate, with neighbouring authorities for them to take a greater share of the housing need associated with the higher jobs growth. Given the likely draw of employment from outside of Bassetlaw to Apleyhead, then this further supports the concerns previously identified that this site could have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities, and the stance previously requested by South Yorkshire authorities that policy ensures that delivery of economic development on employment allocations within other boroughs is taken into account. This is compounded by the change in emphasis between the previous and current draft Policy ST8. The previous draft identified Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within key sectors identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). It is unclear from the policy which sectors this includes, however footnote 13 of the LIS identifies priority sectors as creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing. The authorities remain concerned that there is insufficient justification to support the significant allocation of a strategic employment site and that outstanding cross boundary and strategic issues have not been appropriately addressed through the Duty to Co-operate. It is acknowledged that previous suggested policy changes were not supported and that in response the Council had concerns that requiring consideration of other sites within D2N2 or Sheffield City Region prior to development on the strategic allocation would amount to a sequential approach which is not evidence based or justified. The South Yorkshire authorities remain of the view that given the significant potential cross boundary impact of the site, and that it is proposed as a strategic site accommodating development which would</p>	<p>Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Doncaster and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		<p>not normally be accommodated within general employment allocations, then the policy should provide significantly more certainty than in its current format.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.25 of the draft Plan is welcomed, which states that: “The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost at a strategic level to D2N2 or Sheffield City Region, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority.” The policies as currently drafted do not provide an appropriate mechanism for the impact on the economic strategies of other authorities to be taken into account. Should the site remain proposed for allocation then the following changes are requested: Policy ST8 C. To develop the role of the A57/A1 growth corridor the development of a strategic employment site, SEM01: Apleyhead Junction (118.7ha) will be allocated to accommodate <u>sub-regional and/or</u> regional employment growth in accordance with Policy ST10. Development <u>should will be required to</u>: 1. provide E(g)/B2/B8 employment functions connected with <u>key sectors identified by the D2N2 LEP Local Industrial Strategy</u>¹² the logistics sector; <u>1. 2. demonstrate D2N2 LEP support for delivery; 2. 3. be supportive of the role of key urban centres, such as Worksop; 3. 4. have the ability to deliver significant economic development benefits in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, D2N2 and Sheffield City Region; 5. not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority; 4. 6. not compromise the viability or deliverability of other employment allocations identified by this Plan or in Local Plans adopted by other authorities within D2N2 or the Sheffield City Region; 7. demonstrate that, 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; 5. 8. be satisfactorily accommodated by critical infrastructure, in terms of capacity and timescales associated with investment works; 6. 9. have good access to key strategic transport routes; 7. 10. provide a significant number of new permanent jobs including skilled employment..</u></p>	
REF158	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council - in agreement with Rotherham and Doncaster Councils	<p>Remain 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. Whilst the draft plan recognises at paragraph 5.1.17 that the Council will work with neighbouring authorities to undertake additional work to further consider the impacts of the strategic employment site, it is noted that no discussions or Duty to Co-operate engagement has been undertaken on this matter following the concerns expressed in relation to the January 2020 draft. NPPF (para 82) states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors including logistics. However the NPPG on Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 2a-031-20190722) states that where such a need for strategic facilities exist, strategic policy making authorities should collaborate with other authorities to identify the scale of need across relevant market areas. This process has not been undertaken either regionally or for the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The SCR Strategic Employment Land Appraisal Summary Report (May 2020) (which went to the SCR Infrastructure Board on 2nd July 2020) states that collaborative work on logistics should be undertaken in the future. This work has yet to take place and it is considered that the allocation of the site and its regional importance is a duty to cooperate issue and should be addressed as one. Regional work on this issue would also address if there is justification/need for a regional site. The opportunity for engagement on these issues at the earliest opportunity would be welcomed. There remain concerns that the amount of strategic employment land proposed does not appear to be sufficiently justified by the evidence base, as well as concerns at the significant difference in the job requirements identified between the demand and supply led approaches. Based on the supply side approach, the economic evidence highlights that the provision of the additional strategic employment site at Apleyhead could almost double the number of jobs accommodated within employment sites in the draft plan (the site potentially providing 3,857 - 5,358 jobs compared to 5,878 jobs for all other employment sites). The draft plan is based on a housing requirement of 589 dwellings per annum and meeting the full extent of jobs growth (11,236 jobs) identified by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update 2020. This assumes the higher of the jobs range for the Apleyhead site would be met. The HEDNA demonstrates that the Apleyhead site will generate a significant level of commuting into the District from neighbouring areas. The HEDNA concludes at paragraph 5.21: The higher jobs at Apleyhead Junction, which are ambitious, should only really be countenanced with changes to commuting. This alternative commuting pattern results in housing need of 562 dwellings per annum. If this approach is taken forward there would still be a need to agree, through the Duty to Cooperate, with neighbouring authorities for them to take a greater share of the housing need associated with the higher jobs growth. Given the likely draw of employment from outside of Bassetlaw to Apleyhead, then this further supports the concerns previously identified that this site could have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities, and the stance previously requested by South Yorkshire authorities that policy ensures that delivery of economic development on employment allocations within other boroughs is taken into account. This is compounded by the change between the previous and current draft Policy ST8. The previous draft identified Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within key sectors identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). It is unclear from the policy which sectors this includes, footnote 13 of the LIS</p>	Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with Barnsley and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST8 - PROVISION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT			
		identifies priority sectors as creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing. The authorities remain concerned that there is insufficient justification to support the significant allocation of a strategic employment site and that outstanding cross boundary and strategic issues have not been appropriately addressed through the Duty to Co-operate. Previous suggested policy changes were not supported and that in response the Council had concerns that requiring consideration of other sites within D2N2 or Sheffield City Region prior to development on the strategic allocation would amount to a sequential approach which is not evidence based or justified. The authorities remain of the view that given the significant potential cross boundary impact of the site, and that it is proposed as a strategic site accommodating development which would not normally be accommodated within general employment allocations, then the policy should provide significantly more certainty than in its current format. Paragraph 6.1.25 of the draft Plan is welcomed, which states that: "The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to ensure any benefits associated with this policy are not lost at a strategic level to D2N2 or Sheffield City Region, and at a local level do not adversely impact upon the economic growth strategies of the District or any other authority." The policies as currently drafted do not provide an appropriate mechanism for the impact on the economic strategies of other authorities to be taken into account.	
REF230	Chesterfield Borough Council	Can see that the supply of employment land needs to be dealt with in the plan, and recent delivery of housing indicates potential to exceed the Gov standard. It would be useful ... about whether re-allocating some employment land to housing was investigated. Not increasing housing to match employment supply could increase in-commuting from areas such as Chesterfield which is not desirable, so another reason to support. Evidence of historic delivery rates should be considered. Have any assumptions have been made about any level of job displacement from other parts of the HMA to Bassetlaw? It may be covered somewhere in the supporting evidence that not spotted.	The option of de-allocating employment land and re-using for housing has been considered and several of the proposed site allocation in the Worksop Central DPD are on such sites. The general employment sites are identified to meet the Districts needs. The jobs growth identified for Apleyhead has been reached to ensure a greater share of jobs for local residents, thereby minimising the level of in-commuting. Job displacement has been covered by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF188	Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.Pears Property Ltd.	We note typographical errors with the referencing of the High Marnham Green Energy Hub allocation on pages 182 and 212 where the site reference is given as 'EM007'. At page 190 the site reference is given as 'EM006', each of these errors should be corrected to read 'EM008'. These drafting errors are also reflected in other evidence base documents such as the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment.	These have been addressed within the revised version of the Local Plan, The SA and the HRA.
REF003	Canal & River Trust	We appreciate that it is intended for the redevelopment to be managed by means of a Local Development Order, and that matters raised in our previous response may be considered within a future consultation on a LDO.	Thank you for your comments.
REF060	Notts County Council	NCC would request that reference is made to the protection and enhancement of the Local Wildlife Site along the western extent of the northern boundary of the allocation.	This has been included within the supporting text and Policy
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	Allocation EM008 (High Marnham) lies with 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.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
1658674	D2N2	D2N2 is keen to promote the use of existing sites such as High Marnham to bring higher value jobs to the area. We encourage the adoption of innovation that can help tackle climate change across all sectors, but in particular in construction and manufacturing. Both of these ambitions require a significant investment in skills infrastructure to ensure that we have the right people in the right places to lead that innovation and to implement those new ways of working. We would therefore be delighted to work with Bassetlaw DC to support the development of the proposed employment and skills strategy.	Thank you for your comments.
REF074 map of assets is included with submission	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	<p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets. Details of the sites affecting National Grid assets are provided below. High Marnham Energy Hub (ST6 and ST7) XE ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: High Marnham – Thurcroft – West Melton 4ZV ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: CHESTERFIELD - HIGH MARNHAM 1 ZDF ROUTE TWR (002 - 057): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM - STAYTHORPE 1 ZDA ROUTE TWR (254 - 311): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: COTTAM – GRENDON ZDA ROUTE TWR (248B - 248F): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: DISC HIGH MARNHAM ROUTE ZDA ROUTE TWR (247-248A-251A-252B-252A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: HIGH MARNHAM - WEST BURTON ZDA ROUTE TWR (252C - 253A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line. Route: HIGH MARNHAM 400/275KV SGT2 Electrical Substation: HIGH MARNHAM 400KV Electrical Substation: HIGH MARNHAM 275KV A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid’s assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only. Please also see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets. Further Advice National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid’s assets. Guidance on development near National Grid assets National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets.</p> <p>Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance. National Grid’s ‘Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines’ promote the successful development of sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: https://www.nationalgridet.com/document/130626/download The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid’s statutory safety clearances are detailed in their ‘Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets’, which can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p> <p>High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid’s approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites</p>	The existing electrical infrastructure and access will be safeguarded as part of the Local Development Order. The National Grid will form part of the development group as it is a stakeholder or has land assets on the affected site. The production of the LDO will be undertaken in partnership with relevant stakeholders like yourselves.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
		<p>affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally, written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement.</p>	
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Travel infrastructure from Retford and Tuxford could support green modes of travel to the planned 'High Marnham Green Energy Hub', with very little effort. The last thing we want to encourage is commuting to a 'Green Energy Hub' via motorised transport, especially given that it is 5-10 miles from the large residential areas of Tuxford and Retford.</p>	<p>Although this site will see some job generating employment, it is not expected to of a high level. The majority of development on this site is for renewable energy or low carbon which is often supported by a smaller number of employee than your more traditional employment uses such as storage, warehouse or distribution. A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be require as part of any planning application.</p>
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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. The Boards 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. The site lies within the Board's district, the Board maintained Marnham Drain is located through the eastern side of the site. The Board's consent will be required prior to any works in, under, over or within 9 metres of the bank top of the watercourse. The Board requires an easement strip along the Board maintained watercourse in order to allow for continued maintenance and future works. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments. These issues are noted and can be addressed through the development of the Local Development Order.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the flood risk to the site and includes the impact of climate change. The assessment provides recommendations for how the redevelopment of the site can be undertaken to provide a safe and sustainable development that minimises the risk from flooding.</p>
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>High Marnham is a former coal power station with a historically significant contribution to climate change. It is also a former source of employment and income to the District. A Green Jobs Hub can be part of a range of measures for the District in addressing Climate Change and to provide new employment for areas like Retford. However, the Plan does not seem to go far enough in stating its ambition for the site - particularly in terms of jobs. As a result, we would strongly question any job creation opportunities which may be used to justify housing growth in the District. The Branch feel that a major manufacturing or high skilled employment centre needs to be at least mentioned in the plan to help justify the homes being built in Retford.</p> <p>For this reason and we wish for the Plan to be explicit in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Setting the principles for any LDO 2. Stating that Bassetlaw needs to take a leading role at a National level in creating Green jobs for the decarbonisation and rebalancing of 	<p>The Plan cannot be too specific in the principles for the LDO due to these being explored further in terms of the suitability and their capability. An area like this needs flexibility due to the constant changes to national guidance and policy on green and low carbon technologies.</p> <p>Although there was a rail link to the Power Station, there is no longer this capability.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
		<p>our economy</p> <p>3. Putting an ambitious vision forward for the Green Jobs Hub.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 6.2.1 is reworded as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land at the former High Marnham Power Station provides a long-term opportunity to positively re-use a longstanding significant brownfield site and facilitate its redevelopment. With the capability of connecting directly into national grid infrastructure, as well as strong rail/water links, the site offers a unique opportunity to support significant employment uses within the renewable energy and low carbon technology sectors and their supply chain, making a significant contribution to this D2N2 growth sector. This includes manufacturing facilities in sectors such as solar, wind, batteries and EVs. ● 6.2.3 is reworded as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Due to its rural location in eastern Bassetlaw, any development on the site will need careful consideration of its impacts, particularly upon local communities, the environment, rail network, water, and the highways network. ● Add a new clause 6.2.2 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Council has not identified a plan for local renewable energy generation to meet all of the demands of the District. To meet net zero goals the District needs to find ways of offsetting emissions, such as manufacturing, developing, or consulting on low carbon technology. ● Add a new clause 6.2.3 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The creation of a large employment centre at the site would help to address job shortages in Bassetlaw. Manufacturing at the site would be able to leverage the highly skilled manufacturing workforce in the District. ● It may also be worth the Council including a case study outlining the size of manufacturing facilities relative to the size of the site. A good case study would be a Tesla “Gigafactory” which is 139ha. This is important to inform what may be built at the Green Jobs Hub. ● We also request that the Plan identifies how local experts may be consulted on the Green Jobs Hub. Bassetlaw has significant skills on how to maximise the potential for Green Jobs, but the Plan as written does not explicitly state how these might be accessed in any consultation, development or LDO. 	<p>In addition, there is no current water access to the site.</p> <p>We have included further detail about the sites potential impact on nearby communities, heritage, landscape, flooding and transport.</p> <p>Further work is needed between the Council, site promoters, community and the green and low carbon industry.</p> <p>The Local Plan will not identify a specific energy target as this will be difficult to implement due to viability.</p> <p>There is still uncertainty about what level and type of jobs will be located at the site. This will depend on the employment uses. Green energy jobs tend to have a fewer number of employees than your more typical employment uses.</p> <p>The LDO can be amended (separately) if Government regulations change during the Plan period.</p>
REF153	Natural England	We welcome the opportunity that this proposal presents in meeting Net Zero Carbon targets.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF165	Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Darlton and Fledborough Parish Council	<p>Although this site is not within our Parish Council, development of this site will have significant implications for our four villages. Firstly we are delighted that the District Council is not using the long disestablished Power Station as a benchmark for development and that the site in its current 'state' i.e. flat, and now considerably naturalised, is the benchmark. As the Power Station has been gone for approximately 20 years we agree that this is the appropriate approach to take to the site. The revised plan makes reference to a Masterplan that will be produced in partnership with the developers. From the recent Bassetlaw Council presentation our understanding was that the site would be developed under a Local Development Order (LDO) and would the developed would be shaped by the developers and the local community. This is not reflected in the current iteration and we feel that it would remove ambiguity if the wording could be updated. The Local Plan mentions the close proximity of High Marnham village but does not reference Fledborough village to the north of the development site which is as near, and at some points nearer than High Marnham village. This is very important when considering the site development in terms of visuals/height of potential buildings, noise factor of proposed businesses, light factor of proposed businesses and traffic movement. Light pollution is a particular issue since JG Pears Ltd has been granted 24hr access and use of the site, the attached photos show the impact of lighting at the JG Pears site which is at Low Marnham, i.e. further away. Shielding against any new development at the High Marnham Energy Hub is paramount to the residents of Fledborough and High Marnham parishes. Can Bassetlaw please incorporate Fledborough village in any future plans presented including expanding the maps included in those plan to include the village in the same way that High Marnham village is included. This needs to be considered in the LDO.</p> <p>On the site itself there needs to be consideration given to the changing environment whereby a natural wildlife corridor has been established along the new cycle track. Any development on the site adjacent to the track, needs to take into account the established existing wildlife. We mention this because the Bassetlaw Plan had industrial type buildings next to the track. Clearly this is at odds with the wildlife corridor although we understand from the consultation that this is something which will be revised in the LDO and we welcome this as a necessary change. We welcome the positivity of the site owner/developers to consider a car park at the site supporting the use of the cycle track as both a cycling route but also as a car park for walkers which is enjoyed by many. If this has the future potential to be expanded to include a picnic area/cafe, it could also be a resource for the businesses on the site and their staff. We are pleased that Bassetlaw District Council are potentially working with Nottingham University who are developing green energy sector activities and possibly using some of the site for green houses. However the concerns of our parishes, particularly Ragnall, is of potentially significant increases in road traffic movements. We are currently attempting to get a speed reduction through the village because of existing concerns about traffic speed, any increase of traffic numbers will only exacerbate the situation. Our community is small and as a consequence our voice may not seem very loud, but we are deeply worried about the increase in traffic. A suggested figure of 500 new jobs on the site, is wonderful for the local economy, but would be disastrous for Ragnall Village.</p> <p>At the presentation it was made clear that Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) would undertake a full traffic assessment regarding traffic movements etc. Our worry is that NCC undertook a traffic assessment when JG Pears submitted their Plans for the development of their site and Highways saw no problem with heavy goods vehicles travelling/passing on bends at Grassthorpe and through Ragnall. The road infrastructure cannot support developments that require regular heavy goods vehicles constantly travelling through our villages. To increase job opportunity on one hand and destroy quality of life for others, is not progress. It is a judgement that has to be made and our homes and communities have existed over hundreds of years, this has to take precedence when considering sustainable development. The other concern is the quality and safety of Ragnall crossroads. Again we are currently seeking speed traffic reductions along the A57 to increase the safety of this junction. It is noted that the BDC Plan acknowledges improvements are needed at the crossroads if there is to be an increase in traffic. And it isn't only Ragnall and Fledborough that would be impacted: additional traffic heading north will pass Dunham Primary School, travelling east would impact on Dunham village where we already have regular road accidents and travelling west will go through Darlton, another small village divided by the A57 making movement across the village very difficult. So when Highways do their impact assessment they need to consider Ragnall, Fledborough, Dunham and Darlton. Traffic travelling due south will impact on villages within Newark and Sherwood District Council's (N&S DC) administration. We are pleased that it is Bassetlaw's intention to include N&S DC in the consultation regarding this site development. We are also pleased to hear that it is Bassetlaw DC's intention to reinstate the community consultation group established at the beginning of this process.</p> <p>In Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the reduced Housing Allocation • We welcome the fact that the planning for this site will now include clear guidelines and criteria under the LDO • We welcome the fact that the Power Station will no longer be used as a benchmark 	<p>Due to its scale, the redevelopment of this site will need to be carefully planned. The site has a number of constraints such as flooding, the environment, heritage, landscape, private amenity, existing electrical infrastructure and poor accessibility to the nearby major road network and these issues will need to assessed through the production of the LDO and through future planning applications. The uses on the site will need to be appropriate to their location in rural Bassetlaw. The Site is not suitable for your more typical employment uses such as warehouses, storage and distribution.</p> <p>References to all five nearby villages; Ragnall, Fledborough, High and Low Marnham and Normanton on Trent has been added to the supporting text. We have also included more text in relation to the potential impact on other issues such as heritage, transport and the environment.</p> <p>This includes the protection of the Local Wildlife Sites that runs along part of the northern and eastern boundary of the site. This will help maintain a green buffer between the site and the surrounding countryside, including the former railway track.</p> <p>The Highway Authority have stated that a full transport Assessment and Travel Plan is needed to identify any issues and what, if any, mitigation is needed to appropriately manage the impact of traffic on the local road network.</p> <p>These can only be undertaken when there is a good understanding of the type of uses and likely level of employment generating traffic.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the inclusion of a carpark at the site for recreational purposes • We remain supportive of the focus on green and renewable energy but concerned about the scale of this development • We are encouraged by the emphasis on buffer zones, the wildlife corridor and the broader environmental considerations at the site. • We are concerned about the potential noise and light pollution • We are very concerned about the number of traffic movements, particularly heavy goods vehicles to the site and in the wider domain including Ragnall, Fledborough, Dunham and Darlton. • Finally we are pleased about the reinstatement of the Community Consultation Group. <p>As a community and as a Parish Council we recognise the need to develop and to move forward and as such we recognise the opportunity presented by the High Marnham site, but it is also important to recognise heritage, rurality and our indigenous agricultural life style.</p>	
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>POLICY ST9: Site EM008: High Marnham Green Energy Hub (page 62) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Anglian Water is the water undertaker for High Marnham and has no objection to the principle of employment development on this site and would wish to be consulted on the Local Development Order for this site.</p>	Thank you for your comments and AW will be consulted and involved within the development of the Local Development Order.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	<p>Policy ST9 - Site EM008: High Marnham Energy Hub This is a significant employment site covering some 60 hectares. Policy EM008 with regard to High Markham Energy Hub sets out some criteria that must be met. However, the full list of development requirements is not set out and are to be contained within a Local Development Order which is not yet available for consideration. This should form part of the Regulation 19 consultation and should be fully costed so viability can be assessed.</p> <p>The previous policy set out a requirement relating to the need for contributions to the A57/Durham on Trent/Ragnall crossing. Delivering this very large site will require significant front-loaded infrastructure investment. The Council will need to be satisfied that the site is capable of being delivered and is viable. The previous Draft Plan consultation highlighted that delivery of High Marnham was 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>The policy, and presumably the LDO, will set 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 ST8. It is not generally available.</p>	<p>The Local Development order, although linked to the Local Plan, is a separate planning policy document and will need to go through its own process.</p> <p>Reference to the former high marnham power station and the site is now included within Policy ST53 Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Energy Generation.</p> <p>Strategic issues such as Transport and Flooding have been addressed within the Bassetlaw Transport Assessment and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where recommendations have been provided.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent understand the benefits of utilising the existing energy infrastructure at High Marnham to develop a green Energy Hub, We would note that we do not have any Sewerage infrastructure located within the existing power station area, and anticipate that there would be a significant need for additional capacity	Thank you for your comments. These issues are noted and can be addressed through the development of the Local Development Order.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>A green energy hub at High Marnham indicates innovative thinking of which we are supportive. An Ecological Impact Assessment (EiCA) will be required however, to assess the ecological impacts of the proposal.</p> <p>We note that in this current draft no specific mention is made to the Fledborough to Harby Local Wildlife Site and Old Trent Local Wildlife Site. 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. An appropriately sized buffer zone should be evidenced through the EiCA. Buffer zones vary depending on their focus on the landscape, habitat and/or species conservation, each of which demands a different approach for their creation.</p> <p>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 following text has been added to the supporting text:</p> <p>'The Local Wildlife Sites; Marnham Railway Yard and Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway are within 100m of the site and run along the northern and eastern boundary towards the lagoons and River Trent – a Main Green Corridor. These areas will be protected from development and an appropriate 'green buffer' between the development on site and the Local Wildlife Sites and River Trent will need to be incorporated into the design of the site'.</p> <p>It is likely that due to its size, an EIA will need to be undertaken as part of the planning for the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF211	National Trust	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. We are concerned that the Council has hollowed out the policy in favour of a Local Development Order. While an LDO may be a useful mechanism for granting consent for a site, it does not prevent a developer from coming forward with their own alternative proposal (i.e. if it does not precisely meet the requirements of the LDO). It would therefore be helpful if the Council set out its policy position in relation to key constraints of the site and its surroundings. For example, it may require flood betterment bearing in mind the proximity to Flood Zone 3 and a landscape buffer to protect the Local Wildlife Site nearby.	<p>The Council believe the Local Development Order process is most appropriate mechanism for such a unique site. The type of use and the viability of uses are important, especially within the green energy sectors. An LDO provides flexibility in the sense that they can be revised if required over the plan period. This can be done outside the local Plan process.</p> <p>Permission will only be granted if developments comply with the contents of the Local Development Order.</p>
REF214	Historic England	Policy ST9: EM008: High Marnham Green Energy Hub - There are inconsistencies in the SA text relating to heritage, and the negative impacts on heritage are not addressed in the justification text and this will need addressing ahead of the next round of consultation on the Plan.	These heritage assets have been included within the supporting text of the Policy and are recognised within the Sustainability Appraisal.
1670549	Resident	The road network around High Marnham is very poor. Thought should be given to promoting wind turbines on this site which would help provide low carbon energy without traffic disruption.	<p>A Transport Assessment will be undertaken to inform the development and where appropriate mitigation is needed. This will include assessing the impact of proposed traffic movements on the existing road network and through existing villages.</p> <p>Wind Turbines are not appropriate for the site due to the proximity of the overhead electricity pylons.</p>
1670869	Resident	<p>Why is High Marhnam, and not Cottam PS site considered for green energy surely the same considerations apply to both sites. the use of the word 'unique' in para 6.2.1 is misleading!</p> <p>Para 6.2.4 refers to using the LDO mechanism - this process can circumnavigate the statutory need for full local consultation, and allows for the Authority, and developers, to avoid due process, so why is it deemed the most appropriate mechanism for this site? the plan should be clear on the cons as well as the pros of utilising this option for this or any other site identified in the plan.</p>	<p>The land owners and interested parties are promoting the former High Manrham Power Station for renewable energy uses. The site has direct connectivity into the national grid and therefore any excess energy produced can go directly back into the grid without a significant level of new connective infrastructure needed.</p> <p>The landowners at Cottam are promoting this site as a new settlement.</p>
REF093	Resident	My main concern regarding the High Marnham development is that the present road system is not adequate for any further heavy traffic, especially around Grassthorne which is in need of a bypass. It will probably also increase the traffic through Ragnall and Fledborough if vehicles approach from the north. This community has already the nuisance of many heavy lorries heading for Pears factory day and night. I hope this will be taken into consideration when any new development takes place.	A Transport Assessment will be undertaken to inform the development and where appropriate mitigation is needed. This will include assessing the impact of proposed traffic movements on the existing road network and through existing villages.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF174	Resident	<p>Despite these issues being highlighted in past by residents we are very concerned by the effects of further building and heavy goods vehicles on the hamlet of Ragnall. Classed as countryside and unsustainable it's fragile infrastructure is unsuitable to cope with increases, which seem to be ongoing. The Drainage system is already overloaded resulting in repeated flooding of some properties and there have been numerous accidents on the windy country roads, yet traffic flow will only get heavier with future plans. Whilst the sustainable energy hub is very worthy in itself we hope the council will look to create a more suitable route for the shear amounts of traffic from both industrail sites, bypassing the unsafe and unsuitable residential roads. Preserving the open spaces and wildlife corridors, enhancing the well used bike path, river walks etc would be greatly appreciated. As well as retainining the character and distinctiveness of the area it helps offset the noise, disruption and loss of amenity that have a cumulative effect on health and wellbeing of residents.</p>	<p>The redevelopment of this site will need careful consideration in terms of its impact on the highway network and the environment. A detailed Transport Assessment will be produced once further information is provided in terms of the type of development uses on the site. The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment has made assumptions based on the information we have at this stage. The Transport Assessment will provide information on any mitigation that is required in terms of minimising the developments impact.</p> <p>The existing Local Wildlife Sites to the north and east of the site will be protected to preserve biodiversity. Any impact to the River Trent will be minimised.</p> <p>In addition, further enhancements to local biodiversity will be undertake though extensive tree planting and landscaping, particularly around the lagoons and the edge of the site.</p>
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>This site has stood vacant for a considerable time now which would indicate that it is not attractive in terms of location and cost or ownership for it to be brought forward. The suggestion that it could in some way add to the green economy is a good idea but an idea is all it is. Its location means that vehicular traffic to and from the site has to pass through very sensitive receptor areas and for this fact alone its use as general B2 and B8 is not to be supported. However, the use of the site with the green economy is to be welcomed. According to government guidelines, we are now trying to provide electricity storage facilities (big batteries!) whereby spare generation can be stored for reuse later on, a good idea and this site with its current links to the national grid would be ideal. It could also provide a site particularly on the old railway sidings area for a large scale solar farm, again both of these would provide benefits without the requirement for vast numbers of vehicular movements. If Policy ST9 is to be retained it should only be on such a basis.</p>	<p>The Council are looking at options for the site in terms of appropriate uses for the area. These will be detailed within the Local Development Order.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST9 - SITE EM008: HIGH MARNHAM GREEN ENERGY HUB			
REF188	Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.Pears Property Ltd.	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). 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 Marnham, which currently inputs surplus energy into the grid, but could be harnessed directly by future development on this site. The allocation also serves to meet a priority of the D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan and emerging Local Industrial Strategy. We endorse D2N2's recognition of the 'significant potential' the site can make to the green economy, whilst contributing to national and local objectives to reduce carbon emissions, reduce energy demand through on-site efficiencies, and reduce excess energy waste through the site's circular energy potential. We acknowledge the need for careful consideration of the impacts arising from the redevelopment of the site, particularly upon local communities, the environment and the highways network and our clients have already commissioned extensive technical work in order to ensure any potential impacts are minimised and where necessary mitigated. J G Pears are committed to working with the LPA and other stakeholders to see the successful delivery of this site. The proactive approach to the development of the site now taken by the LPA in their commitment to delivering the site rapidly through a Local Development Order (LDO) is strongly supported. An LDO will provide an appropriate mechanism for the management of such a specialist employment site enabling growth by positively and proactively shaping sustainable development. We welcome the fact an LDO will serve to incentivise development by simplifying the planning process and making investment more attractive to businesses in the green energy sector. The landowner will work proactively with the LPA to complete the draft LDO by the end of 2021 and facilitate delivery of the site from early in the plan period.	Thank you for your comments.
REF224	Sheffield City Region	Proposals for a new Garden Village in the Draft Plan as well as the Renewable Energy Hub are also supported. These are exactly the type of innovation needed to help close the divide between north and south and level up our areas.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF087	Highways England	A minimum of 168 ha of land has been allocated for employment along with at least 118 ha of employment land to accommodate future sub-regional/regional employment land growth at Apleyhead junction.	Comments noted.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	'Given its location, the Apleyhead site could prove attractive for logistics and distribution'. There will be an obvious increase to traffic; this is referenced in the Local Plan but no mention is made of the potential to move goods by rail – is this something that can be encouraged as it will pass the site. Cycle access should also link to garden village and beyond to Elkesley – supporting 9.1 Healthy & Active lifestyle	It is not possible to have rail access to the site. The policy requires cycle access to the site and allows for discussions to take place in the future relating to connectivity to the Garden Village.
REF153	Natural England	Welcomes the inclusion of point (1d) which outlines the requirement for an Air Quality Management Strategy and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment to protect the special characteristics of Clumber Park SSSI and the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Welcome the requirements set out within the section on Green Infrastructure & Biodiversity including a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (note this would be a "shadow" HRA) and winter bird surveys to ensure there are no adverse impacts upon Clumber Park SSSI and Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Note that in the same section (2b) that there should be green infrastructure connectivity to neighbouring sites and suggest that this could include the green infrastructure planned for the adjacent Garden Village. Integrated water management could also potentially be feasible across both sites for greater climate resilience.	Support for the policy approach is welcome. Green infrastructure connectivity will be added to the policy, integrated water management to the supporting text.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	‘Given its location, the Apleyhead site could prove attractive for logistics and distribution’. There will be an obvious increase to traffic; this is referenced in the Local Plan but no mention is made of the potential to move goods by rail – we would like to see the use of rail encouraged, within the plan as it will pass the site. Cycle access should also link to garden village and beyond to Elkesley and further afield – supporting 9.1 Healthy & Active lifestyle	It is not possible to have rail access to the site. The policy requires cycle access to the site and allows for discussions to take place in the future relating to connectivity to the Garden Village.
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Apleyhead Junction sets out a long list of criteria to be satisfied if planning permission is to be forthcoming. Part 3 of the policy sets out Transport & Movement requirements and in addition to the creation of a safe access onto the A57 also requires financial contributions to the A57/B6040 roundabout, the A614/A57/A1 junction and unspecified capacity Improvements on the A57. Delivering this very large site requires significant front-loaded infrastructure investment. The Council will need to be satisfied that the site is capable of being delivered and is viable. The Council needs to be very cautious on deliver rates from this site. Set out our concerns about the delivery of employment land at a number of the allocations: 1. The Strategic nature of some sites will need a significant amount of front loading to deliver the infrastructure. The Viability Assessment does not give confidence that delivery will be attainable. 2. The impact of Brexit and Covid 19 on the public funds. It would appear that a number of sites will require public support. Are all of the sites viable? Covid will have long lasting impacts on the economy which will potentially extend beyond the Plan Period. 3. High Marnham is for a niche operation in an emerging sector. 4. Cottam Regeneration Area is not a Sustainable location. Consider that land for additional smaller employment sites need to be identified in Policy ST6 with regard to land East of Markham Moor (LAA263).	The Logistics Study confirms a demand for a site of the scale of Apleyhead. The timing of infrastructure provision will need to be agreed with the Local Highways Authority, there is no evidence to suggest it all needs to be front loaded. The Council is confident the site can be delivered through a viable scheme. A number of employment allocations have planning permission and are being actively moved through the decision making process indicating there is market demand for the sites. Evidence indicates that for logistics the market is stronger than previously as a result of Covid. High Marnham will have an LDO to facilitate its delivery. Cottam is a broad location identified for growth after this plan period should the policy criteria be met. The policy identifies a range of smaller sites to support a range of business opportunities across the District.
REF201	Severn Trent	Generally supportive of the principles outlined within Policy ST10 in particular the approach for development to meet BREEAM for water efficiency, and the approach to incorporate Green infrastructure and Biodiversity within the employment landscape. Encourage that these area incorporate SuDS such that surface water can be safely manage and conveyed through the development in mitigate the impacts of climate change and flood risk on and off site as a result of the development.	The flood risk and water quality policies cover SUDS. These are strategic policies so would cover development at Apleyhead. His position has been agreed with Severn Trent.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	6.3.3 This 71ha semi-natural broadleaved woodland is designated as Top Wood/Great Whin Local Wildlife Site. Development of the site will be sensitive to its nature conservation interests which must be preserved and enhanced during and post-construction site. A full arboriculture survey and ecological survey will be required to ensure the qualities of are adequately considered, mitigated and compensated for, and so that future maintenance and management is agreed. Elsewhere on site, mature hedgerows and hedgerow trees that exist along field boundaries should be incorporated sensitively into the design. Biodiversity net gain will be required. Welcome the amendment within the current draft ‘Biodiversity net gain will be required’. This is in line with Paragraph 174 NPPF (2019) which states ‘identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity’. Advocate the removal of the wording ‘ecological survey will be required to ensure the qualities of the are adequately considered, mitigated and compensated for’ and replaced with ‘an Ecological Impact Assessment will be required. EcIA is a process of identifying, quantifying and evaluating potential effects of development-related or other proposed actions on habitats, species and ecosystems. The findings of an assessment can help competent authorities understand ecological issues when determining applications for consent. EcIA can be used for the appraisal of projects of any scale including the ecological component of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). When undertaken as part of an EIA, EcIA is subject to the relevant EIA Regulations. Unlike EIA, EcIA on its own is not a statutory requirement. It is an evaluation process undertaken to support a range of assessments’. Would like to see the inclusion of ‘the future maintenance and management is agreed’ within the policy text. 2. Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity a) Be supported by an ecological survey and arboriculture plan which protects and enhances the qualities of Top Wood/Great Whin Covert Local Wildlife Site; future maintenance and management should be secured through the planning system.	The policy has been amended to make reference ecological impact assessment and reference to future management and maintenance.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF211	National Trust	For reasons set out in our response to Policy ST8 Employment Land, National Trust objects to the unjustified allocation of 118.7ha of greenfield land at Apleyhead junction.	Comments noted.
REF214	Historic England	The SA indicates that there would be a significant negative effect in respect of archaeology and that a DBA would be required for the site. If the HER has not been consulted as part of the evidence base for the Plan it is not clear at this stage whether the Plan would be able to achieve its aspirations for the site. The Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) does not assist further with any analysis of potential impacts on harm. It is not clear how the impacts on the nearby registered Park and Garden have been considered either. There are concerns about the soundness of this site being taken forward in the Plan. If it can be demonstrated through further work as part of the Plan process that the anticipated development could be achieved at the site it may be necessary to revise the policy text of Section 1 of Policy ST10.	A Heritage Paper has been prepared and agreed with Historic England evidencing the approach taken to site selection and how the historic environment has been considered. HER have been consulted on the sites. The emerging Heritage Paper update has made sure to include consideration of potential impacts on setting of Clumber Park and Garden (Grade I Listed).
1658674	D2N2	Clearly it's a site of sub-regional importance and could support a number of our growth sectors and our ambitions on skills and low carbon, so it's another site we'd be delighted to work with you on to help bring it forward.	Support noted and welcome.
1670549	Resident	Opposed to the policy of developing green fields when there is a brownfield alternative at Bevercotes Colliery.	Bevercotes has planning permission for employment development so should come forward for development outside the Local Plan process.
REF110	Resident	Would the Business development Zone at Aplyhead be started prior to the Garden Village, Peaks Hill Farm or Ordsall South or after?	The timing of Apleyhead will be determined by the Local Plan's adoption and the site gaining planning permission. The submission of a planning application is dependent on the site promoter's timescales.
REF129	Resident	Read these proposed developments with genuine disappointment that projects such as these, requiring large areas of countryside space, are deemed acceptable in modern times given the environmental pressures to maintain what is left of our open space. The area is largely surrounded by open country and forestry and indeed, one of the few spaces that retains its rural feel. Any development in this area will have a heavy visual impact. Have excellent historical assets close by including Sherwood, Clumber and the Dukeries which are internationally respected and require special preservation and enhancement rather than projects that could impact negatively and move to a more urban feel in the area. It is a great pity rely on international hotel and leisure companies to promote these great assets and should be doing more in my view to develop this in environmentally sustainable ways which would go hand in hand with natural development. Compare Sherwood forest with the New forest in the South which retains much of its historical and natural character. Given that Sherwood is arguably the most famous forest in the world, it is rather pitiful what remains and how little has been done to restore and enhance this amazing legacy. The Bassetlaw area is changing and developing, increasingly losing its rural character. Housing and commercial development should only be permitted within (or be part of) existing settlements. Remaining open country should be preserved and ecologically enhanced at all costs, without presuming that undeveloped land is a useable commodity. There should be no removal of mature trees and extra space made available for forestry and biodiversity to offset any negative impact. This is more important than ever, given the dire state of our natural world and rapid loss of natural species, not least through loss of habitat. This is especially important for this area which could be of greatly increased benefit and a valuable asset as we move to an increasingly developed and urban environment. We can and must do better than this to preserve our precious and unique resources.	The site is heavily screened by woodland from the A57 and the policy will require an appropriate buffer to screen the site from the A1 appropriately. There is not enough land available to meet the District's growth needs in existing settlements. Inevitably some trees may be lost to development but the Plan requires these to be replaced on site to ensure no overall loss. Biodiversity net gain will be required.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This employment allocation could be reduced considerably if the residential aspect of the "Garden Village" on the opposite side of the A1 was to be removed. This particular site forms an incursion into a large previously wooded area and its development would have a strong negative influence upon wildlife and ecology. Its location is good, if combined with the site on the opposite side of the A1, the amount of land take-up could be reduced.	Inevitably some trees may be lost to development but the Plan requires these to be replaced on site to ensure no overall loss. Biodiversity net gain will be required. The two sites will support different markets and will address different needs therefore it is not possible to combine the sites.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF224	Sheffield City Region	<p>Whilst supporting the Draft Plan’s overall approach and much of the specific policies, it is also important to repeat some of the comments made by the LEP/MCA on strategic employment sites in February 2020. Proposals for the Apleyhead site and the associated policies for this in the Draft Plan require further discussion. Whilst supporting this aspect of the Draft Plan in principle, there are some practical changes which could help to strengthen the way that the Apleyhead site is presented in Policy ST8 so that it more closely aligns with our priorities in South Yorkshire. Apleyhead has a potentially important role to play in helping to attract large scale inward investment to the benefit of South Yorkshire as well as D2N2. Implementation needs to be more carefully considered as the Plan develops. There are some important changes in emphasis to Policy ST8 between the previous draft and current draft of the Plan. The previous draft identified the strategic employment site at Apleyhead for logistics uses; whereas the current draft widens this to allow employment uses within any key sector identified in the D2N2 Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) – presumably sectors listed in the LIS like creative and digital, transport equipment manufacturing, visitor economy, transport and logistics, professional and scientific services, construction, and food and drink manufacturing. The evidence presented for the Plan also suggests that new jobs at Apleyhead Head would rely on increased levels of commuting from outside of Bassetlaw, ie residents from South Yorkshire travelling to occupy these jobs. Given this, and the broader range of uses proposed for Apleyhead, must work together to ensure this site does not have a detrimental impact on economic development within other authorities as well as create unsustainable patterns of commuting. There is an opportunity for us to undertake further collaborative work so that we can address cross boundary and strategic issues between Bassetlaw and South Yorkshire. This would benefit from all four South Yorkshire local authorities being involved and could add further detail to the Statement of Common Ground agreed by the MCA and other authorities in the wider city region (approved by the MCA in June 2020). This would also be in line with Paragraph 6.1.25 of the Draft Plan which explains how the Council is working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities, which I also welcome.</p>	Through Duty to Cooperate the Council have worked with SCR and the other South Yorkshire authorities to agree an evidence led approach to the progressing Apleyhead. The policy will be re-worded to be identified as a logistics site, that should not adversely impact upon the growth strategies of authorities in logistics property market area. This should address the concerns of the authorities. A draft Statement of Common Ground will be prepared with neighbouring authorities.
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick Developments	<p>These representations demonstrate the Apleyhead Junction site continues to be suitable and appropriate for major employment led development and has no insurmountable constraints. The site is owned by a willing and established developer with a track record of delivering major employment schemes. The site was previously assessed by the Council and then proposed for allocation in the previous draft local plan (2020). It is now controlled by a willing and able developer, with a strong track-record of delivery, who can now bring the site forward. Require continued confirmation, through a Local Plan allocation, that the Council maintains their support of this key opportunity. Demonstrate the site is suitable, deliverable, and viable for allocation within the emerging plan. The site is in line with the growth strategy of the area and will deliver a range of key benefits to Worksop, Bassetlaw District, and the wider Sheffield City Region. The Apleyhead Junction site. The site is capable of delivering up to approximately 4.75m sqft of flexible market leading and market facing employment space. This can be delivered in a range of configurations, from smaller units through to Gigafactory-type space of upwards of 4m sqft in a single unit. The site is regionally unique in this context, in being able to meet the widest range of occupier needs including the largest floorspace and site requirements in the market. Previous local plan representation (February 2020) provided a detailed description of the site and its surrounding context including relevant planning and environmental designations. These representations do not repeat the details already provided, it is relevant to note the following key points which are pertinent when considering the suitability and deliverability of this site. This site is a strategically important opportunity that is: 1. Within the strategic A1 and A57 corridor identified in the draft plan 2. Close to existing major employment locations, including proven locations for major logistics, warehousing, distribution, and other employment facilities- including occupiers such as DHL, B&Q, and Wilko; 3. Immediately adjacent to a main junction on the strategic road network; 4. Flat and therefore capable of accommodating the largest units; 5. Relatively unconstrained in the main developable area; 6. Deliverable from an infrastructure perspective, in terms of access, utilities, etc; 7. Close to suitable residential populations and local labour; and 8. Capable of providing sustainable transport links, including pedestrian and cycle access and infrastructure to support public transport provision; A Site Location Plan is enclosed. This means the site is attractive to occupiers from a national and regional catchment, whilst also enabling the major expansion of local businesses whose needs cannot be met by the currently available opportunities. The potential importance of this site has been accepted at a Sheffield City Region and local evidence base level, which reinforced the entirely correct allocation of the site in the draft local plan. The evidence presented in section 3 shows the demand for sites such as this is only likely to increase. This places a clear requirement to find suitable sites at the earliest possible opportunity, which can then be brought forward at pace. Previous representations also identified a range of significant benefits, which are reflected in the plan that can be achieved through the delivery of this site. An outline planning application, can assist in early delivery of these significant benefits which include: • Delivering major investment in the strategically important A1 and A57 corridor; • Providing major new</p>	Comments noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
		<p>opportunities for larger footprint units that cannot be accommodated elsewhere in the Plan area; • Approximately £435m direct and indirect GVA per annum from the fully operational development; • Between 4,400 and 7,700 new full time equivalent job roles, depending on the mix and scale of units and uses; • Upwards of £35m direct and indirect GVA per annum during the construction phases (approximately £280m for an eight year build out) alone; • Construction value of upwards of £275m; and • Upwards of 500 jobs created in the construction phases and associated construction supply chain. Ongoing work, and the current development programme. To provide confidence to interested occupiers and to bring forward the significant benefits of development, the planning programme envisages an outline planning application for submission at the earliest opportunity in Q1 of 2021. Caddick has commissioned a range of logistics and employment use research pieces to assess and evidence the significant local and regional benefits which could be realised from development at Apleyhead Junction. These reports consider a range of issues including; the market demand for the type of units proposed, the locational benefits of development at the site, the economic benefits which can be realised, the effect of macroeconomic changes on the sector, and the regional role of this major scale development. The initial findings show there is significant demand for the types of units proposed in this location, and that the site (and indeed Bassetlaw) has the potential to meet a wide spectrum of demand on a sectoral and geographic basis. For example, it is expected that the site can satisfy occupier demand in both the East Midlands and Yorkshire & North East as two of the three most in demand regions for employment space. Further detail on economic and market related matters is provided in Section 3. It is expected that Caddick's ongoing work will be made available to the council at the appropriate time, in order to inform any further local planning authority led site assessment work. A significant level of detailed technical work has been undertaken to understand how the site could be delivered. This work has included: Early local consultation (with wider public consultation planned in early 2021); Highways and transport assessments; Ecology surveys including but not limited to: Site walkovers and initial appraisals; Nesting, breeding and seasonal bird surveys (including wintering birds); Nightjar and woodlark; Bats; Badgers; Amphibians and eDNA; Specific assessment of Sherwood Forest ppSPA; Habitats Regulations considerations; Biodiversity Net Gain; Drainage and flood risk appraisals; Landscape masterplanning; Ground conditions assessment; Agricultural land classification reports; Initial air quality assessments; Baseline noise assessment; Heritage appraisals; Initial archaeological trial trenching strategy(s); and Landscape and visual impact. This technical work will continue to be refined and updated. EIA Scoping The Scoping Response issued by the local planning authority on 8th December 2021 confirmed the scope of the Environmental Statement to be submitted with a future planning application. Further information on technical matters such as ecology, arboriculture and highways are set out in Section 3 of this report. A formal pre-application submission is currently with the local planning authority for consideration and a written response is anticipated in January 2021. Wider consultee engagement is ongoing and has sought to agree key technical items prior to the submission of a planning application. This has included agreement of the transport assessment principles with Highways England, initial discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council, and engagement with Natural England regarding key ecological and habitat matters including the adjacent Sherwood Forest ppSPA. This is in addition to any local plan led engagement by the local planning authority. It is anticipated that, as things stand, an outline planning application could be readied for submission at the earliest opportunity in Q1 of 2021. There will be ongoing dialogue with the council and consultees, including detailed community engagement, in advance of submission of a planning application.</p>	
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Given the importance of major logistics and employment opportunities in the Sheffield City Region, the SCR Combined Authority commissioned a Joint Sheffield City Region Strategic Employment Land Appraisal ('SELA'). The SELA seeks to provide a more coherent understanding of current strategic-level employment land across all nine districts in the SCR, specifically Barnsley, Bassetlaw, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, Doncaster, North East Derbyshire, Rotherham, and Sheffield. The study identified a 'strategic-FEMA' for the wider region different to that of the Local Plan defined FEMA's; one which would enable the SCR to offer the optimum supply of land to address large scale or strategic inward investment requirements that would otherwise be above the indigenous needs of one district. When applied to the Apleyhead Junction site, the needs of the strategic FEMA are important in addition to the local indigenous need; as the site represents a large-scale B-Class development with the potential to provide vital economic benefits for the region. The SELA identified Bassetlaw as a district which could meet these needs, due to the availability of suitable land, access to suitable local employment, and proximity to the strategic road network. By providing space for such uses in Bassetlaw, SCR could then protect existing high value manufacturing areas and maximise the use of such land to meet advanced manufacturing ambitions in other districts. The study concluded that local indigenous need for employment land should not be the sole driver when planning for large-scale strategic developments that have the potential to support the wider region. The footloose nature of the logistics uses that would be accommodated on the site at Apleyhead Junction and the uniqueness of the locational characteristics at the site, means that a regional perspective should be used when considering its allocation. Apleyhead Junction, and land south of Worksop, is then identified as a strategic logistics node in the SCR SELA. Risk of missed opportunities for Bassetlaw If the local plan did not allocate Apleyhead Junction there is potential the District (and indeed</p>	Apleyhead is being promoted by the Local Plan as a strategic site for logistics employment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
		<p>the region) would miss major investment opportunities that could deliver significant economic benefits. In the last 18 months there have been live interest for sites of this nature however the investment has gone elsewhere due to the lack of suitable allocated or consented sites. These missed opportunities show the types of economic benefits a large-scale development can have on the wider region. Aware that Tesla were presented with a range of UK site options (including Apleyhead Junction) for their European Gigafactory for the advanced production of electric cars. Tesla instead opted for a similar site in Berlin, Germany, where a 300ha (gross) facility is under construction. In terms of jobs created, Tesla predict the Berlin factory will employ up to 12,000 persons from both the local area and across Europe in order to secure persons with the necessary skills and expertise. Aware the Apleyhead site was presented to Britishvolt, for their leading Gigafactory, yet a site in Blyth (Northumberland) was selected instead. Britishvolt aims to establish the UK as the leading force in battery technology, with the green automotive industry of paramount importance. The proposed factory could create up to 3,500 jobs across over 2m sqft of floorspace. The economic benefits of a development on the scale of the Tesla Berlin and Britishvolt Gigafactory can be put into context when observing the economic impact of Tesla's first Gigafactory in Nevada, USA. Research by the Nevada Governor's office (2018) indicated Tesla brought \$6 billion in capital investment to the state of Nevada and created upwards of 7,000 jobs. This generated very significant regional economic growth and created an annual economic impact of \$3.56 billion across the region. This indicates that the economic benefits of a site such as that which can be accommodated at Apleyhead Junction are likely to have a major impact on the wider region. The knock-on effects of developing a site of this scale were also highlighted, as other major technology companies were attracted to the region. The economic impact of these additional companies has resulted in higher employment rates, higher personal income, and greater economic diversification in the region; with employment in the region growing by 34,500 jobs since 2014. The improvements associated with the Apleyhead Junction site could greatly enhance the competitiveness of the surrounding region for manufacturing, data centres and other types of economic development projects. This means sites such as this can be major catalysts for other major regional scale growth. Without a site such as Apleyhead Junction being allocated, there is a risk of major logistics requirements being lost not only from Bassetlaw, but also from SCR and D2N2 areas. The average size of logistics and distribution requirements is rising and deals in the 500,000sqft to 1m sqft size range are increasingly common (there were 9 such deals in the East Midlands alone in 2020). It is necessary for the occupier market to have some choice of locations, and if the right site cannot be provided to meet their needs, those requirements may be lost to regions that can supply the right sites. Opportunities further south in the East Midlands are currently being created to attract some of these market requirements, although it understood that the current supply could only accommodate 3 such units ibid. The Plan needs to ensure that the residents of Bassetlaw, SCR and D2N2 areas are able to benefit from the job creation, investment and GVA these market opportunities can bring. The Plan can only do so by having locally allocated sites that could meet this need, in addition to some choice in locations provided by other authorities in the wider sub-regions. The area has already lost major inward investment opportunities because of lack of suitable land supply. The Plan needs to address this fundamental requirement to avoid this happening further during the remaining Plan Period, hence the importance of allocating land at Apleyhead Junction.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Apleyhead Junction can meet occupier needs in multiple geographic markets whilst also satisfying key locational requirements such as access to labour and proximity to the strategic road network. This is further reinforced by the SCR Strategic Economic Plan recognition of the A57 Corridor as a key growth area. The growth in and increasing prominence of the A57 corridor is exemplified in the scale and range of development which has been delivered to the south of Worksop. This is none more so evident than in the ongoing development of almost 1m sqft of logistics space for DHL at Manton Wood, and previous major regional and national distribution and head office facilities for B&Q and Wilko. The importance of this area of the district was identified in the previous Draft Local Plan evidence base as a part of the District which is in high demand due to its strategic position and locational advantages. The previous draft local plan evidence also identified the importance of A57 and A1 corridor, something which is carried forward into the draft local plan. The importance of the A57 Corridor, and Apleyhead Junction, in meeting this demand for major employment sites is recognised in the evidence base which concludes Apleyhead Junction is the only site in the area which can meet a strategic need as it is: • Is in close proximity to key transport corridors, namely the A1/A57 which provide connectivity to urban areas, ports, and air freight opportunities; • Can provide B2/B8 employment functions connected with key sectors identified by the D2N2 LEP; • Can benefit from LEP support for delivery; • Supports the role of the key urban centre of Worksop, by providing locally accessible employment and opportunities; • Is of a large scale offering occupier flexibility and large-scale investment potential for locally grown businesses or for inward investors if appropriate; • Can deliver significant regeneration or economic development benefits; and • Can benefit from specific on-site infrastructure which has the ability to attract a specific type of occupier. Sites such as Apleyhead Junction can attract major leading investment which can act as a catalyst for growth within the locality and wider region. The correct type and scale of investment in the appropriate site (and location) there can be significant benefits to the wider UK economy through, for example economic growth, attraction of associated companies and sectors, and the creation of new markets. The Draft Local Plan is correct to allocate Apleyhead Junction as a major employment site. If this site were not allocated, it would create a major issue for land supply locally and mean that the Plan area is forgoing the potential for major investment and job creation, which is necessary given the likely local impacts of the current recession on an already deprived local population.</p>	Comments noted and welcome.
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>The allocation of Apleyhead Junction is supported in principle. Without an intervention of this nature it would not be possible to achieve the step change regeneration which is clearly sought by the draft plan, nor would it be possible to deliver the jobs target set in draft Policy ST1. Concerned the wording of ST10 is overly prescriptive and includes unnecessary detail which is better placed in the development management process (for example the list of highway interventions). Whilst the principle of an allocation is supported and Caddick will continue to work with the local authority, without the amendments as below would object to ST10. Continue to welcome that the draft plan and evidence base recognise the success of Worksop, and importance of the A57 corridor, in delivering significant employment growth, job opportunities and major investment. The plan and the evidence base note the potential for a corridor or cluster of similar uses, and this is welcomed. 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 Apleyhead Junction site is a unique opportunity for a market leading development that meets the specific requirements of a range of occupiers including large scale occupiers who often seek sites on a regional, rather than local, basis. There are no other locations in Bassetlaw, nor in the sub-region, that can deliver the scale or quality of flexible employment land in such an accessible location. Sub-regionally, this scale of development could only likely be achieved with sizeable additional Green Belt releases. This is relevant when considering the strategic need and demand for sites such as Apleyhead Junction and its relationship with other employment sites and aspirations in the local plan. The benefits of allocating this site can only be realised with a flexible and responsive policy approach that reflects the market appetite to invest and which does not frustrate the objective by putting in unnecessary barriers. Notwithstanding the general in principle support for allocating the site, concerned the policy detail could create onerous requirements which inhibit the ability to properly deliver the site. Instead, the policy should set a flexible and supportive framework for development. For example, Part A of the policy refers to the development including 'natural greenspace uses' yet no detail is provided on this matter. Green space will be incorporated into the development but the term 'natural greenspace uses' suggests a more formal designation within the site which is not shown in the allocation and does not form part of the anticipated development proposals. Consider green space issues should be dealt with under specific green space policies, or within the development management criteria in ST10 Part B (as amended). Part 3(iv) of the policy requires 'A financial contribution towards the new Bassetlaw Garden Village rail station for use by occupiers of the site'. A requirement would be addressed through a planning application where the requirements for such a contribution can be properly assessed. Would be premature for the draft local plan to place financial contributions on an emerging allocation (Apleyhead Junction) when there is no evidence the contribution would meet the necessary legislative tests. Part 3 also includes references to requirement agreement, or at least incorporating advice, from the local highway authority (LHA). Continue to seek engagement with the LHA as part of the ongoing pre-application advice, the Transport Assessment should not be forcibly</p>	<p>It is important that the site allocation policy clearly identifies the Council's planning objectives for the site and also identifies the infrastructure needed to mitigate potential impacts in the locality. This provides future developers with clarity over likely costs associate with development and the community and stakeholders that potential impacts will be appropriately addressed. It is also necessary to evidence infrastructure requires for the Council to identify that the site can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme. However, the policy will be re-visited to ensure there is a clear link between the infrastructure requirements and the proposal. The requirement to address impacts on the ppSPA are necessary to address the individual potential impacts from this development upon Clumber Park as a result of its proximity. The biodiversity policy is a strategic policy to provide the policy framework for applications District-wide. Links to the Garden Village will be re-visited appropriately.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
		<p>bound by emerging policy to take on the LHA advice in full, particularly if the advice were to place unrealistic expectations on the scope and content of a Transport Assessment. Part 3 then identifies a range of highways improvements which should be undertaken (or contributed to) as part of the development. Consider that any such requests should be considered through a planning application where detailed trip generation and associated analysis can be used to set an appropriate scope of works or contributions. Further changes are also required to ensure ST10 is aligned with other development management policies. For example, ST10 places a more onerous requirement on the need to avoid adverse effects on the nearby ppSPA than is required in Policy ST42: Biodiversity and Geodiversity. Other policy amendments are suggested in a similar context, in order to ensure the policy avoids onerous requirements which could delay or prevent development. Generally speaking, content the policy supporting text sets an appropriate framework of, and explanation for, the policy. Minor changes are required to the wording to ensure consistency with other policies. Should avoid inferred linkages between the proposed new settlement (policy ST3) and Apleyhead Junction, it should also avoid placing onerous requirements to agree certain infrastructure items with other landowners and developers. For example, draft local plan paragraph 6.3.8 states: The site is also expected to benefit from the provision of a new railway station at the nearby Bassetlaw Garden Village. Its proximity will prove attractive to future occupiers and employees, Therefore, developers should work with the promoters of the nearby Garden Village to ensure that the sustainable and public transport provision is complementary and that appropriate links are made. This includes access via the land adjoining the railway line for pedestrians and cyclists.’ Neither ST10 (Part 3(iv)) nor the supporting text identify how this could be delivered. There is no identification of costs for such infrastructure nor any indication of the programme for delivery although it is assumed the new settlement station would be provided towards the back end of the plan period at the earliest. Such a timeline does not fit with the development aspirations for Apleyhead Junction where development could be completed in the plan period. Can consider appropriate, proportionate, and reasonable requests where they relate to new settlement delivery provided it does not unnecessarily affect the delivery of Apleyhead Junction. The plan must be realistic when setting policy expectations and aspirations. Suggest the following amended wording to Policy ST10, and it should be noted that the amended part A of ST10 includes the various economic criteria previously listed in draft policy ST8.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST10 - EM001: APLEYHEAD JUNCTION, WORKSOP			
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Policy ST10: Site EM010: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop Land at Apleyhead Junction, Worksop (118.7ha) as identified on the Policies Map will be developed for major employment (Class E(g), B2 and B8) and will deliver a safe, sustainable, quality working environment. Development should as appropriate: A. Key economic considerations 1. Provide E(g)/B2/B8 employment functions identified by the D2N2 LEP Local Industrial Strategy; 2. Be supportive of the role of key urban centres, such as Worksop; 3. Deliver significant economic development benefits in terms of development value and gross value added for the District, D2N2 and Sheffield City Region; 6. Have suitable access to key strategic transport routes; 7. Provide a significant number of new permanent jobs including a mix of appropriately skilled employment. B. Development Management considerations 1. Good Quality Design and Local Character a) Incorporate sensitive design and location of buildings that supports the positive development of the site; b) Be supported by a detailed lighting strategy that minimises light pollution on the natural environment; c) Achieve BREEAM very good standards (or any successor scheme) for energy, water efficiency and sustainable construction; d) Be supported by an Air Quality Management Strategy and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment which consider and outline appropriate measures to protect the special characteristics of Clumber Park SSSI and the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. 2. Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity a) Be supported by an ecological survey and arboriculture plan which appropriately manages the qualities of Top Wood/Great Whin Covert Local Wildlife Site; b) Provide an appropriate level of green infrastructure connectivity within the site and to neighbouring green infrastructure assets to support climate resilience; c) Provide an appropriate landscape buffer between the site and the A1 to the east and to the railway line to the north; d) Be supported by a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment, including winter bird surveys to ensure there are no significant adverse impacts upon Clumber Park SSSI and Sherwood Forest ppSPA. 3. Transport and Accessibility a) Be supported by a proportionate Transport Assessment and Travel Plan which considers the potential effect of development on surrounding highways and outlines potential mitigation measures as necessary, b), Consider proportionate transport and highways measures such as: i. Enabling safe access to the site from the A57 for vehicles, public transport, cyclists, and pedestrians; ii. Relevant and proportionate mitigation measures including financial contributions to the local highway network as agreed through any future relevant planning application for the site: iii. Quality, safe, and direct pedestrian and cycle links: a) Along the A57 to connect with existing development; b) Which allow for possible future connections to the location of the new settlement; iv. A proportionate financial contribution to support an appropriate frequency bus service connecting the site to Worksop town centre, supported by appropriate public transport infrastructure within the site; v. Appropriate servicing and parking provision for each development parcel. (no changes proposed).</p>	The policy will be revisited to reflect all comments made and to achieve a sound basis from which to proceed. The policy requirements will be those that are considered necessary to facilitate a sustainable development on site.
REF209 Apleyhead	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick	<p>Comment on the suitability of the allocation of the Apleyhead Junction site Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (November 2020) and related key draft policies. Continue to support and welcome the allocation of land at Apleyhead Junction for major employment development to help achieve the local plan vision. The site is suitable for development and is controlled by Caddick as a willing and established developer with a proven track record of delivering major employment sites. The local plan and its evidence base, along with regional studies and documents such as LEP Strategic Economic Plans, all show a clear upward trajectory for logistics sector growth. Reinforced by research which identifies 2020 as a record year for major employment space demand and take-up, and this trend will continue. Is ideally located to meet employment space demand in two of the post sought after market areas (East Midlands and Yorkshire & North East), and its position on flat non Green Belt land close to the strategic road network and near to suitable residential populations is highly attractive for occupiers. The local plan recognises the need to boost employment land supply and focus growth primarily within Worksop, and particularly to sites close to the urban area (such as Apleyhead Junction). The Council must ensure suitable employment sites remain allocated to help meet the need identified within Bassetlaw, and the allocation policies must not place unrealistic burdens on developers. No technical constraints which cannot be appropriately mitigated, it is still suitable for employment uses, has a willing developer attached and is in line with the growth strategy for Bassetlaw, wider Sheffield City Region and D2N2 areas. Welcome the approach to identifying a new settlement as a means of delivering major sustainable co-located growth. This would be best achieved through a 'broad location' rather than a specific 'Garden Village' allocation.</p>	Comments noted and welcome. The Garden Village is expected to be taken forward as an allocation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST11 – Existing Employment			
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	This Policy seeks to protect existing employment sites and several of the listed sites contain permitted waste management facilities. The County Council welcomes this policy which relates to Policy WCS10 of the Waste Core Strategy which seeks to safeguard permitted waste management facilities and potential future sites from sterilisation from other development uses.	Support noted
REF092	DHA Planning	<p>"Explore Industrial Park - Policy ST11: Existing Employment Sites and Buildings</p> <p>Firstly we support the removal of the EIP site from this policy and its transfer to the more appropriate Policy ST8, as discussed above. However, we note that our previous concerns over the current drafting of part C of the policy have not been addressed. Whilst we continue to have no objection to the main principle here, 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-E(g), B2 or B8 employment use would only be permitted where certain criteria are met. It is not currently clear whether all the criteria must be met in order to accord with the policy.</p> <p>As an example of why this matters, 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. We request that the policy is amended in this way."</p>	<p>Policy ST8 Identifies Explore Industrial Park as a general employment site and shows that there is land available for development on the site. This is reflected in the latest evidence the 2020 HEDNA. See Appendix A – site supply.</p> <p>Support the allocation of the site for general employment development under Policy ST8 (B) is noted.</p> <p>"and/or" has been added to the end of each criterion to clarify that not all of the criteria would necessarily need to be satisfied.</p>
REF035	Resident	Policy ST10 – Existing Employment Sites should therefore include Gamston Airport as a fully functioning aviation facility, justified and in accord with the NPPF Section 9, paragraph 104(f).	<p>Gamston Airfield Business Park is safeguarded an an existing employment site under Policy ST11.</p> <p>The remainder of the airfield functions as an operational as a general aviation airfield and is not considered to sit within any of the employment uses classes. The airfield is protected as such by national planning policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST11 – Existing Employment			
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owner	<p>Policy ST11: Existing Employment Sites</p> <p>As part of our February 2020 submission, we had welcomed draft Policy ST10's support for new and extended employment development, subject to various criteria being met. This has not been carried forward as part of the new Policy ST11 however and, thus, the draft Local Plan is now silent in terms of providing any guidance for new employment development on unallocated sites in non-rural locations or within existing employment areas. To ensure that the policy is effective, the original text from Policy ST10 should be reinstated so as to ensure flexibility in the employment land supply and avoid it being over-reliant on the delivery of proposed allocated sites.</p>	Amendments to Policy ST12 Policy -- Rural Economic Growth And Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas - has now been revised to clarify the position in relation to new employment development on unallocated sites in non-rural locations or within existing employment areas.
REF177	Axisped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>"1.5 ST11 – Existing Employment Sites</p> <p>1.5.1 Policy ST11 has been revised and no longer includes for the provision for new employment development outside of allocated employment sites subject to the development satisfying a number of criteria. The revised supporting text confirms that Policy ST11 enables sustainable economic growth where appropriate outside of the existing employment sites and in the rural area in association with Policy ST12.</p> <p>1.5.2 For the reasons we set out below in our response to Policy ST12, this change is not supported as it no longer provides a policy framework for any employment development within the rural area unless it is for the growth of an existing business. This is not consistent with the NPPF which promotes making effective use of land and supporting a prosperous rural economy."</p>	<p>Policy -- Rural Economic Growth And Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas - has now been amended to refer to the delivery of any local employment opportunities that support the diversification of the rural economy, and not just to existing businesses.</p> <p>Proposals for the growth of businesses in the countryside and outside established employment areas/allocations, that deliver local employment opportunities, including support the diversification of the rural economy, will be permitted.</p>
REF205	Heatons on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd	<p>Tarmac benefit from freehold ownership of land at Chainbridge Lane, east of Lound, approximately 4km north of Retford. Tarmac would like to submit 17.5 hectares of land at Lound for employment uses over the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan period. The land itself consists of a Charcon precast concrete facility and associated adjoining land, as shown on the accompanying Plan (Drawing No. L023-00288-1). The employment uses a Chainbridge Lane are long-established and have expanded in recent years. The land is located adjacent to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve, with Local Wildlife Sites (Draft Local Plan Policy ST36) located to the north and east. The Charcon precast concrete facility benefits from a permanent planning permission. Furthermore, permission ref. 13/00874/COU for the change of use of land adjoining the precast facility to land for the storage of HGV trailers and precast concrete products in connection with the precast facility was issued in September 2013. This permission was without any 'end date' and represents a permanent planning permission. Submit that Tarmac's freehold landholding a Chainbridge Lane currently contributes to the portfolio of employment sites within the District and should be recognised within Policy ST11 'Existing Employment Sites' within the Local Plan. Given the presence of a wider Tarmac landholding, the site retains the potential for expansion/diversification of its uses to support economic growth for the area in accordance with the objectives of NPPF and Policy ST12 'Rural Economic Growth and Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas' of the Draft Local Plan.</p>	<p>The site has permission for extension of sand and gravel extraction and retention of existing processing plant and ancillary facilities at Lound Quarry, Chainbridge Lane, Lound, Retford.</p> <p>It is a minerals extraction site making pre-cast concrete and should be restored following completion of operations. It is therefore a countryside location with the operation being in the interest of minerals and quarrying extraction. It is therefore not considered appropriate to allocate as a general employment site under Policy ST11.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST12 - RURAL ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ECONOMIC GROWTH OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AREAS			
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	Concerned that there is no provision in the plan for Small and Medium Enterprises to locate in villages like East Markham. The plan is in danger of ensuring villages become nothing but bed and breakfast communities with residents commuting out for work. There needs to be a greater emphasis on providing opportunities for small start-up businesses with high speed internet connections and excellent connectivity to the wider area.	The plan is supportive of the the diversification of the rural economy, and the establishment of rural enterprises and housing development in suitable locations. Employment policies provide opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Policy ST59 requires developers to engage with broadband providers to ensure that full fibre, or the fastest, most up to date technology, is installed in premises/homes.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 67, Para 6.5.4 – Supporting employment opportunities (albeit on a much smaller scale) is welcomed and supported. This can only ensure the longevity of the small rural settlements as long as it is in keeping with that area.	Support noted
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	This policy states: A. Proposals for the growth of business in the countryside and outside established employment areas/allocations, including the development of education facilities that provide training for role and heritage professions, will be supported where all of the following are met: 1. There is a proven need for the development in terms of business opportunity or operational requirements; 2. The proposed development cannot physically and reasonably be accommodated within the curtilage of the existing site; 3. The scale of development is appropriate in the proposed location; 4. The development has no adverse impact on the character of the location, the surrounding townscape or landscape, the forming character of the settlement or biodiversity and heritage; 5. There is no unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network and that safe access can be achieved by vehicles, sustainable and public transport; 6. The development generates no adverse impact on residential amenity Generally support the thrust of this policy. However we suggest the Council reviews criteria 2 which refers to the ‘existing site’. Suggest that there is a recognition that there may not be an ‘existing site’. As the policy is constructed, with all criteria to be satisfied, the policy would exclude other sustainable sites that are not ‘existing’.	Noted - criteria 2 has been amended to refer to existing sites
REF171	Lichfields on behalf of land owner	Support Policy ST12, the wording of criterion 4 and 6 should be amended to reflect the NPPF’s recognition that potentially adverse impacts associated with new development can often be addressed through appropriate mitigation. Our proposed revised wording is as follows: 4. Subject to appropriate mitigation, the development has no adverse impact on the character of the location, the surrounding townscape or landscape, the form and character of the settlement or biodiversity and heritage. 6. Subject to appropriate mitigation, the development generates no adverse impact on residential amenity. The draft policy should also be revised to make clear that criterion 2 is only applicable to existing employment sites. These amendments will ensure the effectiveness of the policy, in line with the tests of soundness set out in paragraph 35 of the NPPF.	It is not considered necessary to amend the Policy as it already provides sufficient safeguards, and there are other specific policies in the Plan relating to design which will also be taken into account. Satisfactory mitigation which enables development to proceed will be supported. Criteria 2 has been amended to refer to existing sites
1669241	Resident	Objected to the previous draft policy (ST11) version sought to restrict economic growth in rural areas by imposing a criterion which required that - It is directly related to agricultural, horticultural or forestry operations, or other activities, which by their nature would require a rural location; which would have stifled wider rural business expansion counter to paragraph 83 of the NPPF. Note that this criterion has now been dropped and can support the revised policy.	Support welcome and noted
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This should have a more positive spin and include a section on new rural based industries which can be limited by size rather than use.	All proposals are assessed in terms of their suitability, balanced against benefits and environmental impacts.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST12 - RURAL ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ECONOMIC GROWTH OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AREAS			
REF099	Consultant on behalf of land owner	<p><i>These comments were made in reference to Policy ST11 "Rural Economic Growth" in the January 2020 Draft Local Plan</i></p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 of the Draft Local Plan sets out a fundamental concept:- "3.2 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 A1 corridors" But given the extent to which Bassetlaw is an Authority with a substantial rural area it is surprising that Draft Policy ST11 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 A1 would normally be more associated with rural Bassetlaw than urban Bassetlaw. But there 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.</p>	Policy ST12 and the plan in general strike an appropriate balance between encouraging a thriving rural economy, maintaining, or improving the sustainability of smaller rural settlements, and conserving the character of the District's much valued countryside.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	<p>As explained at the previous stage of the Local Plan consultation do not believe that the draft policy highlights the importance of the diversification and business growth which occurs on this Estate specifically. Welcome the references to support growth where it supports a country estate. In this draft Plan, the description of Policy ST12 briefly mentions the Estates' rural businesses, including those linked to food production and agriculture. The wording of the policy itself is restrictive to economic growth of the Estate and does not provide the Estate with the tools to continue its role as a place of enterprise for business as a whole that may locate themselves there. The Estate's lack of a specific mention within Economic Growth Policy is not surprising given that in this draft of the Local Plan, Policy ST1 does not distinguish Welbeck village as a district settlement in Bassetlaw. P&DG must highlight the made Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan, which does designate Welbeck as a settlement.</p> <p>P&DG suggests there needs to be alignment to the Neighbourhood Plan in this regard, as the Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Plan suggests it should do as far as possible, by distinguishing Welbeck as a settlement for growth opportunities on account of its potential for tourism, leisure, limited rural housing and rural enterprise.</p> <p>To address the potential limitations, recommend the inclusion of a site-specific policy for rural economic growth across the Welbeck Estate. A policy drafted in this way would allow the Estate to diversify more businesses across the site, employing more local people and contributing towards Bassetlaw's objective of promoting the visitor economy. Notwithstanding this, the current employment offer within the Estate is already significant, with over 300 employees and tens of external businesses located in premises on site. On those numbers alone, this is profound and easily equivalent to a conventional business park that would ordinarily be considered for allocation. Given the Estate's contribution to the rural and visitor economy within Bassetlaw, a Policy directly relating to Estate and its diversification and reuse of heritage assets on it would be warranted and beneficial. This policy suggestion would be subject to ensuring development meets the expectations of other policies to be adopted Local Plan and other material considerations. The suggested wording for the proposed policy could be as follows: The District Council will work with the Welbeck Estate and other partners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the diversification of land uses across the site encompassing opportunities for tourism, economic development, leisure and accommodation, limited housing where permitted by the other policies of the Local Plan and community uses; • Support the diversification of land uses on the site that deliver the objectives of the Local Plan for both the rural and visitor economies; • Encourage the development of businesses and companies locally which harness the education potential of the Welbeck Estate or local community, and secures the • long-term future and positive redevelopment of heritage assets; • Ensure that new development, where permitted by this policy, does not prejudice other policies of the Local Plan. 	<p>The Council will work with all stakeholders, partners landowners and developers to realise the objectives of the Policy. It is not considered that a site-specific policy is required for the Welbeck Estate. The Policy as well as other policies and LP objectives provide for economic prosperity and inward investment, support the positive re-use of heritage assets and the appropriate provision of housing in the countryside as well as supporting job growth and upskilling of residents. This is considered sufficient.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a separate development plan and has been created by the local community. The existing plan is currently being reviewed alongside the Local Plan and is due for its Regulation 16 consultation later this year.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST12 - RURAL ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ECONOMIC GROWTH OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AREAS			
REF177	Axisped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>The NPPF states that the Government is committed to securing sustainable economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity. It also reinforces the position that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. FCC's site lies outside of the defined settlement boundary of Worksop and therefore whilst it is most closely related to the urban area of Worksop, from a policy perspective it is located within the rural area. Despite its rural location, the site has the potential to support economic development in the District and contribute to the economic aims of the District and the wider area. Policy ST12 supports proposals for the growth of businesses in the countryside and outside established employment areas / allocations subject to the development meeting a number of criteria. The previous wording within the January 2020 draft Local Plan provided support for 'development that will generate employment opportunities, proportionate to the rural location'. The revised policy wording goes on to provide support for the development of educational facilities that provide training for rural and heritage professions. The Policy and supporting text appear to only provide support for the growth of existing businesses within the countryside or outside established employment areas / allocations. Given that this version of the Local Plan has removed the wording within Policy ST11 in relation to employment development outside of the existing allocated sites and Policy ST12 only provides support for the growth of existing businesses in the countryside, there is no policy framework for the development of 'B' use classes within locations in the countryside or outside of the established employment areas / allocations. This is a significant failing of the Plan which makes it unsound. Clearly it should not be the case that any economic development within the countryside or outside employment areas would need to support the growth of an existing business. Whilst it is acknowledged that the acceptability of a proposal will be viewed against other relevant policies of the Plan, it is essential that there should be a provision within the economic policies of the Plan to allow sustainable, acceptable employment development proportionate to its location within the countryside or outside of employment areas. Sites that are located within sustainable rural locations have the ability to contribute to the Council's employment land supply and could perform a strategic function in contributing to rural economic growth. Planning policy should seek to secure economic growth to create jobs and prosperity which would bring forward significant, inward investment opportunities to the District. It is considered that the current wording of the policy would not facilitate this in line with national policy. The wording of the policy should be revised to recognise that there are instances when economic development in the countryside or outside established employment areas is acceptable and should not be limited to existing business growth. The NPPF promotes the effective use of land, including providing support for the development of under-utilised land and buildings. In line with the NPPF, the policy criteria should be amended to provide support for economic development on under-utilised / previously developed sites in sustainable locations. FCC's site is previously disturbed land and part previously developed, the entire site is of low environmental value and currently underutilised. Paragraphs A1-A6 provide a number of criteria which development proposals under Policy ST12 are expected to meet. This includes demonstrating a need for the development in terms of business opportunity or operational requirements and demonstrating that the development cannot be accommodated within the curtilage of the existing site. It is considered that these two requirements would not necessarily be applicable to all new development in the countryside, such as for B2/B8 uses at FCC's site. The site is under-utilised and could contribute to the Council's employment supply without any significant impacts on the surrounding environment. However, at present, with the exception of the limited wording within Policy ST1 which promotes the efficient and effective use of land, there is no clear policy framework within Chapter 6 (Delivering Economic Prosperity) of the Local Plan which supports the re-use of land for economic development within the rural area unless it relates to an existing business.</p>	The Policy has been modified to make reference to the re-use of existing buildings in the countryside, and to sustainable growth outside of existing sites and established employment areas.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST13 - VISITOR ECONOMY			
1666840	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Welcome the recognition that Bassetlaw has the potential to expand its tourism sector. Aware from personal business dealings that visitors are surprised by the attractions within the area. Hope that going ahead there is a SPOC in relation to planning/development issues around tourism to ensure that opportunities for growth are not missed.	Welcome and support is noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST13 - VISITOR ECONOMY			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Pages 68_69, and Para E – Visitors to rural Bassetlaw are always welcomed particularly in respect of the huge historical impact certain parts of Bassetlaw have and have had (e.g. Scrooby and the Pilgrim Fathers of America). However, there is a big alarm ringing in Para D when it talks about conversion of touring to static lodges or pods or caravans. Recent events have shown that this is viewed by certain businesses as a way of providing permanent homes and it is up to the local citizens to police that is not happening. This policy MUST be reinforced to state this conversion must NOT be used as a means of creating permanent dwelling without the requisite building planning approvals.	The policy only supports conversion to static caravans or pods where it helps the expansion of an existing business. Conversion to permanent homes will be resisted. This is given further support in the policy text which states that planning conditions will be used to restrict the use of buildings to holiday accommodation only.
REF153	Natural England	Welcome the additional safeguards set out at point 3 to ensure the scale of tourism development does not adversely impact on landscape and biodiversity. Note that this policy has been considered within the Appropriate Assessment regarding its potential to impact on the Sherwood ppSPA.	Welcome - noted
REF211	National Trust	Supports Policy ST13 which supports the visitor economy of the district, particularly Part F which supports developments that will enhance the environment or bring neglected or underused heritage assets back into appropriate economic use.	Support is noted
1669638	Norton Cuckney Parish Council	This policy does not take into consideration that visitors to rural areas of the District will require local car parking and public toilets. Both are lacking in rural areas, and funding for these facilities is non existent, at district and county level. There is already pressure on rural settlements for parking, and whilst we are keen to encourage visitors, there should be support from district in the local plan.	The Local Plan supports the improvements to visitor facilities and infrastructure. Infrastructure provision will be sought where appropriate through on site delivery, developer contributions and CIL.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Tourism in Bassetlaw should be encouraged and highlighted. This local plan will be read by developers looking to locate or develop in this area. This section of Visitor Economy should also be a “shop window” with greater emphasis on support and encouragement for new facilities rather than this brief section. The formation of Springvale Fishing Lakes was a torturous long winded route with opposition all of the way. It is now one of the premier angling venues within the UK and regularly attracts 60+ anglers on a daily basis. The year 2020 saw a closure of the premises due to Covid for a period of 9-10 weeks yet still attracted 18,500 visitors to the facility which equates to 62 per day. There are 2 further ponds to finish so the venue will not realise its full capacity for another 12 months. However, on good days throughout spring, summer and autumn 140-160 anglers on the lakes is common. All of this has been achieved with no assistance whatsoever from the Council. Think what could be achieved if there was serious consideration and support from a vibrant Tourism section within the authority.	The Plan provides support for the visitor economy. Through support for development and regeneration; partnership working; and the use of CIL and developer contribution the Council will seek to enhance infrastructure, and attractions to increase visitor numbers for the benefit of the District’s economy.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	Support the role of the above policy to include visitor accommodation as it is acknowledged there is great potential for additional amenities in the Dukeries and great untapped potential to enhance the visitor economy here. The individual characteristics that support such proposals in rural Bassetlaw is supported including the recognition in favour of development where it is forming a functional link with a specific local attraction, bringing heritage assets back into use or is necessary to diversify a country estate, farm enterprise or tourism offer in the District.	Support for the Policy is noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST14 - TOWN CENTRES, LOCAL CENTRES, LOCAL SHOPS AND SERVICES			
1652721	Resident	There is no mention of car parking facilities being increased in Retford. Where are all the probable extra cars going to park? There is already a major parking problem at the weekends, and one new resident of the flats at Beardsalls Way is already complaining of nowhere to park.	No issue in terms of town centre capacity with existing car parks has been raised. However, the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan has

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST14 - TOWN CENTRES, LOCAL CENTRES, LOCAL SHOPS AND SERVICES			
			been recently designated to look at the town centre in more detail and the issues it faces.
1656935	Resident	The clustering of non-F2a uses, such as banks, cafes and takeaways, can reduce the attractiveness of a Primary Shopping Area and can create 'dead frontages'. Unfortunately the Harworth and Bircotes town centre is primarily made up of these non-F2a uses, with every other shop a takeaway or hairdressers. More needs to be done to develop footfall in the town and attract more shopping and leisure opportunities as the population of the town continues to grow. Without this we will see any money from the town be spent in shops within Doncaster, or leisure opportunities in Bawtry.	A Masterplan for Harworth Bircotes centre is being prepared. This will look at local issues affecting the area including opportunities for improving public realm, shop frontages and other regeneration.
REF041	Retford Society	Civic It is disappointing to see that the Draft Plan says very little about Retford town centre. The problems, opportunities and potential of this area are barely mentioned. The Council has committed resources to a study of central Worksop, has identified this area as a 'Priority Regeneration Area' and is to prepare a development plan document to guide its future. The Draft Plan proposes that a neighbourhood plan be produced for Retford town centre, led by the Business Forum. Retford Civic Society will do all it can to assist in, and contribute to, this work. The neighbourhood plan process is complicated particularly in a town centre and is very lengthy. The production by the Council of a development plan document, as in Worksop, could well be quicker and more effective involving just as much community input. The Society urges the Council to keep the neighbourhood plan preparation under review and to consider an alternative approach if it fails to make rapid progress.	There is a difference between Retford and Worksop Town Centres in the fact that Worksop has a substantial amount of vacant or underused brownfield land. The regeneration of these sites is a Council priority and as it is linked to infrastructure social and physical regeneration, it needs to be comprehensively planned alongside other developments. Retford Town Centre has less of a physical or social regeneration need as the issues it faces is similar to other town centres such as a declining retail core. The Retford Neighbourhood Plan could focus on these issues at a more local level without the need for an additional development plan document.
REF047	Resident	The Plan fails to address the problems, opportunities and potential of Retford town centre. This is in contrast to Worksop where the Council is developing a 'town centre masterplan'. The proposal for a Neighbourhood Plan passes responsibility for Retford town centre to others. It is much more difficult in a town centre to produce a Neighbourhood Plan than in a village. The process is likely to take a long time, and in the absence of central involvement by Council planners will probably require the involvement of consultants with little local knowledge or loyalty. The Council could deal with Retford town centre in the same way as it is dealing with Worksop town centre; this could involve at least as extensive community involvement as is likely with a Neighbourhood Plan; a Plan produced this way would carry just as much weight as a Neighbourhood Plan. This option should be pursued if there is any delay with the Neighbourhood Plan.	There is a difference between Retford and Worksop Town Centres in the fact that Worksop has a substantial amount of vacant or underused brownfield land. The regeneration of these sites is a Council priority and as it is linked to infrastructure social and physical regeneration, it needs to be comprehensively planned alongside other developments. Retford Town Centre has less of a physical or social regeneration need as the issues it faces is similar to other town centres such as a declining retail core. The Retford Neighbourhood Plan could focus on these issues at a more local level without the need for an additional development plan document

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST14 - TOWN CENTRES, LOCAL CENTRES, LOCAL SHOPS AND SERVICES			
REF190	Babworth Parish Council	The Parish's main service centre is Retford which the Parish is reliant upon for the provision of most of it's day to day needs. The vision for Retford within the Local Plan is that "Retford will have retained and enhanced it's character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening it's 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.	Noted. Thank for your comment.
REF214	Historic England	Proposals for a local centre within the Bassetlaw Garden Village will need to take into account comments made in relation to Policies ST3 and ST4 and the historic environment.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1670549	Resident	Town centres in Bassetlaw are dying, not helped by parking charges and never ending roadworks which drive shoppers away. The pandemic has opened the door to online grocery shopping and it is likely going forward visits into the town centre will get less. A wide diversity of shops is what is required to tempt shoppers back and applications for further supermarkets should be refused.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1670589	Resident	6.7.10 It is asked that more development in Small Rural Settlements is allowed, reflecting the need to sustain and create local 'corner' and village shops, many of which have ceased trading a number of years ago.	Development in rural areas is dealt with through Policy ST2 Rural Bassetlaw.
REF054	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Of course the need for a master plan for Retford town post COVID. Interested to know how the year of the pandemic will shift some of the priorities for the plan to enable development of town centres?	The Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan could focus on the town centre post-covid. The Neighbourhood Plan is being developed by a group of businesses and local people. More information can be found at: Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan Bassetlaw District Council

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 - MANAGEMENT OF TOWN CENTRES			
1652721	Resident	Increased residential facilities in the Retford town centre will obviously require spaces to park the occupants cars. There does not appear to be any consideration to the requirement for additional car parking within Retford. This would also need to be massively increased if Retford is to attract more visitors and greater footfall to boost the town's economy.	There is no evidence to suggest there is a deficiency in car parking provision within Retford Town Centre.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	Contains several references to Class F2a, notably in Policy ST15. It is unclear what this means. This Use Class relates to what could be described as village shops. Town centre uses generally now fall into either Class E or Class F. Because of this, it is impossible to know what the Council is proposing in relation to uses within town centres. This is an important area of policy and clarification is required.	The Council will clarify this within the updated version of the Bassetlaw Local Plan.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 74, Para C, Upper Floor Areas – Whilst the use of Upper floor areas of shop buildings is supported in a city / town environment it must not be allowed to "creep" into rural areas.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	Retford Primary Shopping Area Boundaries mentions shops and businesses in a designated area of the town. The development of dwellings over business premises is supported, but there will be locations within that area that will support ground floor dwellings - will that be part of the Plan?	This is largely covered by changes to National Planning Policy and permitted development rights for change of use. However, more detail on local planning issues may be developed as part of the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST15 - MANAGEMENT OF TOWN CENTRES			
REF169	Resident	page 74, para D.2b Welcome projects to improve pedestrian and cycle links in Retford.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF197	Resident	(6.8.10) Do you mean “Retford Business Forum” or the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group...or both? Upper floor uses – what guidance will be issued to prevent town centres being populated with overly dense, small flats which have the danger of creating problems within the town?	Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan is a recently designated Neighbourhood Plan Area where a group of local businesses and residents have come together to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for the town centre. The Neighbourhood Plan will likely provide more detail on local planning issues for the town centre such as public realm, retail and residential development.
REF214	Historic England	This policy is welcomed and would assist with retaining character and vibrancy of high streets within the District.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF014	Resident	Whatever the number of houses required in the district, I strongly believe that before greenfield sites are considered there should be maximum re-use of both brownfield sites in town and village centres, and creation of dwellings over shops in town centres or in redundant bank premises. For example, Retford has great scope for both of these types of development, and could be aligned with consolidation of retail onto the market square and Carolgate. This would release adjacent streets such as Bridge Street for more dwellings. I also suggest that the latest government initiative on tree planting should result in mass tree planting on the edges of towns and villages, for example on the fields at the end of Bigsby and Palmer Roads in Retford.	The Council has assessed all available sites – see Bassetlaw Land Availability Assessment. Brownfield sites have been taken forward as allocations where they are suitable and deliverable. Worksop Central DPD is proposing to allocate land for up to 700 new homes on brownfield sites. There are currently not enough brownfield sites available to meet the housing need in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate suitable greenfield sites. Bassetlaw Local Plan is proposing to deliver/plant new trees at a rate of 5 trees per new dwelling. Policy ST52 Reducing Carbon Emissions, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption requires development to deliver 5 trees per dwelling or per 1000 square metres of non-residential floorspace i.e. employment development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	Will the right sort of dwellings be provided? At a national level it can be argued that we do not have a housing crisis in terms of the number of individuals and families that require accommodation and the number houses and apartments that currently exist in the country as they are roughly in balance. The problem is the type of housing. These problems include second home ownership which often inflates local property prices driving out local people and high-end properties bought by investors left unoccupied and mothballed in the hope of future profits. Neither of these problems are a significant issue in Bassetlaw though they are in the major cities and popular holiday areas. They are also beyond the remit of a District Council to address and are a matter for national government to address, assuming there is the political will to do so. The problem that should be addressed locally is whether the right sort of houses are being created, for example affordable entry level homes for first time buyers rather than expensive “executive” houses. Once again, conversion of redundant existing buildings rather than new builds would be cheaper and more affordable for first time buyers or renters.	Bassetlaw Local Plan contains policies that are aimed at delivering a range of different housing in the District. There are a number of smaller brownfield sites proposed for residential development in Worksop and Retford. Also, there is strong support for conversion of buildings. However, there are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed. The Council is proposing a range of mechanisms to deliver affordable housing, both through the Local Plan and via other Council projects.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	Retford Housing The scale of house building proposed in the Draft Plan is over ambitious. If it was closer to that produced using the ‘standard method’ recommended by the government for assessing housing need, perhaps there would be no need for the large allocation now proposed at the south of Ordsall. The Society has some reservations about this proposed allocation. Ordsall was once a relatively small village. It has seen a massive amount of house building in recent years which has put strain on its infrastructure and facilities. Traffic into and out of the area is largely confined to three routes. The narrow river bridge restricts traffic flow on Goosemoor Lane. West Carr Road is restricted by a railway bridge wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. Ordsall Road has a narrow carriageway, particularly at its northern end. Although it may be possible to improve the capacity of the junction at the end of Ordsall Road, we are not at all sure there is scope to significantly improve the roads themselves. A further 800 houses to the south of Ordsall would put the road system under stress, probably leading to congestion. It would also harm the living conditions of people living along the main roads. The proposed cycle lane markings along the roads would bring little if any benefit unless kerbside parking is removed but this would adversely affect the many residents with nowhere else to park. Brecks Road would be particularly affected. It is very narrow and any additional traffic from the new houses and/or measures to prioritise cycling would adversely affect residents there. If, notwithstanding the Society’s concern about lack of need and inadequate roads, the Council decides to proceed with the proposed Ordsall development, the Local Plan should make it clear that the development must not start unless and until there are arrangements in place to secure the funding and provision of all the additional retail and community facilities, including a school, referred to in the Draft Plan and supporting documents. The facilities in Ordsall at present are very limited and there must be no risk that the additions to them promised in the Draft Plan fail to materialise.	Government guidance indicates that the Standard Method should be used as a starting point to determine the number of homes needed. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment Planning Practice Guidance advises that other factors should also be considered, such as economic growth, affordable housing need and past housing delivery rates. The method used for determining the Housing Requirement (see Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (November 2020)) accords with the PPG. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact of proposed development on the District. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have agreed the assessment, which indicates that the proposed development at Ordsall is suitable subject to highway improvements. The Council has also worked with other infrastructure providers, including Notts County Council Education, to determine the necessary infrastructure improvements associated with proposed site allocations. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides details of infrastructure requirements, including trigger points for contributions to/investment in infrastructure. The Policy for Ordsall South indicates that development is required to provide financial contributions towards infrastructure improvements, including highways. The policy also has a requirement for community consultation on future proposals.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF060 - implies to all housing allocation sites	Notts County Council	Workshop Allocations - It is noted that all Workshop allocations include a requirement to make provision for primary and secondary school education infrastructure through an appropriate financial contribution. It is agreed that this is necessary and should be included. Retford Allocations - It is noted that none of the Retford allocations include a requirement for financial contributions towards education provision. Whilst current pupil projections show that the proposed number of dwellings could be accommodated within existing provision, it should be noted that this is subject to change in the future, especially as the local plan period is longer than the projection periods. It is therefore requested that a caveat is included within the policy to state that financial contributions towards education provision may be required if there is a demonstrable need at the time of a planning application being made.	Bassetlaw District Council will continue working with Nottinghamshire County Council Education to agree an appropriate approach to education provision in relation to development proposals in Bassetlaw Local Plan. This will be set out in relevant policies in the Local Plan and agreed through the Statement of Common Ground.
1666018	Resident	(7.1.3 page 77 refers to Harworth) Growth should be supported by infrastructure that address the needs and the impact on the community when development is allowed to run out of control in Harworth and Bircotes. False due to our town councils failure to provide an up to date neighborhood plan Harworth and bircotes this has been exploited on the highest level councilors planning officers all allowed this to happen instead of offering support. In a recent zoom meeting the person representing the council confirmed no infrastructure will be implemented because the local plan is not proposing growth in the town. I think 20500 housed and 3000 people is growth. Proactive intervention would save this disaster instead of reactive.	The Local Plan can only require infrastructure needed to deliver the site allocations in the Local Plan. The development earmarked for Harworth all has planning permission. The infrastructure has been agreed through those planning permissions. Outside of the Local Plan process, the Council has worked closely with Nottinghamshire County Council and other partners to identify the necessary infrastructure required to deliver development in Harworth. As the Education and Highway Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council has responsibility for delivering said infrastructure. Bassetlaw will continue to work closely with the County Council to ensure all necessary infrastructure is delivered.
REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	In response to Policy ST1, generally supportive of the spatial strategy for development both in terms of the quantity of new housing proposed and the quantum that is to be directed to Retford. However, have concerns about how the new houses that are planned are to be delivered, which focuses on the Council's choice of its draft allocations. In our response to Policy ST3 outlined concerns about the inclusion of 500 dwellings coming forward on the Garden Village site in this Plan Period, noting that it would be in our view be more robust to delay these until the next Plan Period. In doing so, there would be a need to identify an alternative site or sites to deliver in the region of 500 dwellings. In addition, Policy ST16 identifies sites HS7 – HS13 as draft housing allocations in and around Retford to deliver 1,181 dwellings. Policy ST1 identifies a requirement for 1,800 dwellings to be delivered in Retford over the Plan Period. Whilst there are likely to be some outstanding commitments that are yet to have been started, consider that there are potentially over 600 dwellings that will need to come forward as windfalls within the town to meet the Town's needs in the period up to 2037. Rather than relying on windfalls to meet this need, should identify other draft allocations to meet this identified need. North of Bigsby Road is one such that is considered suitable to meet these needs. Has been the subject of two planning applications, with the latest application (19/01360/OUT) submitted in outline and proposing up to 170 dwellings. The application was a resubmission of an earlier application that had been refused by the Council on landscape and heritage grounds. Worked with Officers to resolve the reasons for refusal, and following the submission of updated evidence on landscape and visual impact, which was independently reviewed for the Council, the application was recommended for approval by Officers. The Committee Report (copy attached) confirmed that there were no technical, physical or environmental reasons that would prevent the delivery of the site and that on balance the benefits of granting planning permission would outweigh the harm of doing so. The site has therefore, been through the application process and demonstrated that it is capable of accommodating development without any adverse impacts. The site has been deemed suitable for development by Officers and could contribute to the delivery of new housing to meet the Borough's needs. Whilst Officer's were satisfied that the site was capable of accommodating development, Members refused the grant of	The site at Bigsby Road has not been taken forward as a site allocation as it was considered unsuitable. This site has subsequently been the subject of a Public Inquiry in May 2021 (Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/20/3265803 Land to the North of Bigsby Road, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 6SG). The application was dismissed at appeal in June 2021. With regard to the landscape the Inspector found: "having had regard to the above and all other related landscape matters, I conclude that the appeal scheme would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape and area. It would not protect or enhance the natural and local environment and would fail to recognise the intrinsic character of the countryside. As a result, the scheme would not comply with Paragraph 170 of the Framework".

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
		planning permission. An appeal has been submitted and is due to be heard later this year. Contend that the site subject to planning application 19/01360/OUT is suitable for development and should be allocated as such in the Local Plan.	
REF159	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Whilst it is accepted that the plan outlines no further development of housing within the life of the plan there remains question in terms of the number of houses required by Bassetlaw. If the number required across the borough is to change in any way will this have a significant impact on the embargo on further allocations within H&B who have subsequent number of developments with both outline and reserved matters outstanding and indeed have taken the largest per capita increase within the area. Whilst there is an outline proposal to initiate a Master Plan for H&B there is a degree of skepticism in regards to this providing the required infrastructure that the piecemeal development to this point has brought forward. There is a requirement for an overall review of ALL existing roads, drainage, education and all other fundamental facilities which support the sustainability of this community. Indeed, albeit not related to the local plan there is currently further erosion of existing facilities in terms of public transport and education. This does not allow local residents to have a voice and it does not empower them to feel their voices either matter or are heard; this plan only progresses part way to alleviating residents fears for the future. The Masterplan should be issues alongside the Local Plan; without this happening we once again address half of the outstanding issues. Our residents fear the erosion of public space and facilities for young and old to access green spaces, exercise and in turn improve their mental health. There is no ease of access to walking, cycling and the previously floated green wheel is a partially conceived facility which requires more spokes. There is little in the way of readying our community for the ageing population and providing ease of living for disabled people. We do not have a plan for employing our increasing population. Commend the plan in terms of understanding at this time the need for improved in structure should be precedence and that this Town is currently at development saturation point.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is not proposing to allocate land in Harworth and Bircotes within the current plan period which runs to 2037. National policy (NPPF) requires Local Planning Authorities to review Local Plans at least every 5 years to ensure that they are still meeting the requirements of the District. The Council will need to review the Plan by 2025. The results of the review will determine if any changes are required to the policies in the Local Plan. The Masterplan for Harworth & Bircotes Town Centre is being prepared and a consultation is imminent. This will complement relevant policies in the Local Plan. Officers will work with the Town Council to ensure that where appropriate and deliverable the Local Plan policy approach reinforces the priorities of the Masterplan.</p>
REF132	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estate	<p>The Plan period goes from 2020 to 2037 and seeks to make provision for 10,013 new homes. This is derived from the demographic calculation of 288 dwellings per annum, with an economic uplift to 589 dwellings per annum. The Plan does not set out where in the calculation the affordable housing need has been included, as this is a need of 2,814 new homes, which is a significant amount of the proposed total. The Plan should set out the calculation in a simple table which identifies the required elements and how much they have added over the base calculation. At the moment it is not clear how the figures have been arrived at and if they are adequate to meet the need identified. The calculations should be in the plan so that it is clear and not in an accompanying document.</p>	<p>The supporting text will be amended to include details of the evidence documents underpinning the affordable housing requirement (HEDNA and Whole Plan Viability Assessment). The affordable housing calculation is a complex process which needs a full and thorough explanation. It is not considered necessary to include this level of detail in the Local Plan. Instead it will be set out in the HEDNA and relevant background papers.</p>
REF166	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>As shown by the Housing Allocations table within this policy, there are no proposed housing allocations outlined for Harworth & Bircotes. For the reasons set out in response to Policy ST1, it is considered that additional housing should be directed to Harworth & Bircotes in the emerging Local Plan and site allocations for the town be included within Policy ST16. The land south of Common Lane is a suitable site for housing development and would be a deliverable allocation.</p>	<p>The Council considers that the housing commitments can sufficiently address housing need in Harworth and Bircotes without the need to allocate more land.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF167	Marrons Planning on behalf of Vistry Homes Limited.	<p>It is crucial that a robust assessment is undertaken of the capacity of the proposed allocations, deliverability and developability as this will inform whether the housing requirement of 589 dwellings per annum in the Plan can be met. It is common for housing trajectories for individual sites to be reduced under close scrutiny during an Examination in Public. Therefore, it would be reasonable to employ a well evidenced but cautious approach, informed by discussions with landowners and developers of their intentions and applying a degree of independent judgement. This should also take into account realistic lead-in times and infrastructure requirements. It would be helpful at the Regulation 19 stage for an updated trajectory to accompany the Plan that sets out expected completion rates by year for each allocation. Taking into account the above points, it is noted that the Local Plan proposes to make housing allocations at Retford as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · HS7 – Trinity Road (10.7ha, 244 dwellings) · HS8 – Milnercroft (0.45ha, 5 dwellings) · HS9 – Former Elizabeth School, W Furlong (1.3ha, 46 dwellings) · HS10 – St Michael’s view, Hallcroft Road (0.37ha, 20 dwellings) · HS11 – Fairy Grove, Grove Road (2.7ha, 61 dwellings) · HS12 – Station Road (0.1ha, 5 dwellings) · HS13 – Ordsall South (103.4ha, 800 dwellings) <p>There is a significant reliance on the draft HS7 and HS13 allocations to meet the housing needs of Retford, and the housing trajectory shows that development at site HS13 (Ordsall South) is not expected to start until at least 2027 and is dependent on off-site junction improvements. Any delay in that site coming forward would have an impact on housing delivery late in the plan period. Allocating additional land for development at Retford would provide an appropriate buffer and certainty that housing needs will be met.</p>	The Council has undertaken a robust assessment of housing delivery. This includes working with land owners and developers to determine the timescale for delivery. This has also been backed up by evidence of current delivery in Bassetlaw (See: Bassetlaw Five Year Housing Land Supply position statement). Over the past five years the district has experienced a significant increase in housing delivery. There is no evidence to suggest that this will not continue as the housing market continues to be buoyant even through the lockdown period. Housing delivery will continue to be monitored and the Local Plan will be reviewed within five years, in accordance with the NPPF.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>The majority of the sites are the same as were detailed in the previous draft of the local plan we have not re-reviewed these sites, Please refer response (Bassetlaw 19 for details). RAG Status • High Risk – High likelihood that Capacity improvements will be required, this does not prevent development but additional time may be required to implement improvements further consultation with Severn Trent is recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium Risk – Capacity improvements may be required, further consultation with Severn Trent recommended. • Low Risk – Capacity improvements are not likely to be required <p>In terms of the new sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS3 Radford Street – there are no known downstream constraints therefore we would assess this site a Low Risk • HS8 Milnercroft – there are no known downstream constraints therefore we would assess this site a Low Risk • HS9 Former Elizabethan School – there are no known downstream constraints therefore we would assess this site a Low Risk • HS10 St. Michael’s View – there are no known downstream constraints therefore we would assess this site a Low Risk • HS11 Fairy Grove – There are several known downstream constraints that are likely to be impacted by the proposed development therefore this site would be categorised as High Risk. • HS12 Station Road - brownfield development no significant risks anticipated, potential for betterment through good Surface water management. • HS13 Ordsall South Road – There are known Downstream constraints, development categorised as High Risk, therefore we would recommend early consultation with Severn Trent by developers and the LPA where this site is proposed to be brought forward. 	Thank you for your detailed response. The Council will continue to work with STW through the Local Plan and Development Management processes to ensure any constraints are appropriately addressed.
REF214	Historic England	Historic England has concerns in respect of the approach to the historic environment in relation to Policies 17 and 22.	Thank you for your detailed response. The Council has closely liaised with Historic England throughout the development of the Local Plan, and will continue to do so to ensure any concerns are appropriately addressed. The Heritage Assessment has been revised following discussion with Historic England to clarify that all sites have been robustly assessed, with input from the Historic Environment Records, Bassetlaw Conservation and Lincs Archaeology. Further, none have objections to the

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
			proposed site allocations subject to appropriate mitigation.
REF109	Resident	HS7 Trinity Farm, Retford 10.7 HA, 244 houses The first phase is now showing as 196 houses, rising to 440 when the second phase is completed	Comments noted.
REF195 PHF	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management	Supported in conjunction with Policy ST1 in its proposals to provide a minimum of 3,080 new homes to 2037 and particularly, the allocation of 1,000 dwellings to site HS1 Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop. Noting these figures are a minimum, so flexibility is provided such that if delivery at Peaks Hill Farm is stronger than projected, then the total delivery of dwellings on the site may be more than 1,000, noting the reference to the allocation in total being 1,120 houses and 10.6 hectares of employment land at Peaks Hill Farm some of which the plan anticipates will be delivered beyond 2037.	Comments noted.
REF073	Grace Machin on behalf of land owners	<p>The local plan identifies (paragraph 3.14) that those aged 65 and over is projected to increase by 47% during the plan period (to 2037) and of these, the population over 85 will double. The plan states that ensuring there is appropriate housing, care and social infrastructure for this age group is a priority for the Council.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.16 identifies that in 2018, 67% of the population were living in the three largest towns of Worksop, Retford, and Harworth & Bircotes. Paragraph 3.23 identifies that the as the economic base has changed, Worksop has expanded, with the population growing alongside. The delivery of new homes has spearheaded the regeneration of the many parts of the District – acting as a catalyst for physical change and often well-needed investment in social and environmental infrastructure. The first objective of the Council (Paragraph 4.15) is to locate new development in sustainable locations that respect the environmental capacity of the District. Furthermore, to provide a choice of land to ensure that the Districts housing stock better meets local housing needs. Paragraph 5.1.36 identifies to meet the housing shortfall, the most sustainable solution in Worksop is the allocation of one edge of urban site: The LAA concludes that the site in Worksop is that which will cause least harm to the environment, is suitable for development and would create a defensible urban edge – the site is Peaks Hill Farm (REF: HS1 – a site of 54Ha and a minimum number of dwellings – 1,000). BDC consider the site along with a site in Retford to be the most appropriate and suitable locations for the future expansion of the existing towns in the District along with a new ‘Garden Village’. Paragraphs 5.1.39 & 40 identify that Worksop is the principal town in the District and the most sustainable location for significant growth. Paragraph 7.2.5 identifies the complex nature of delivering Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop. Aware that a ‘concept plan’ is being consulted on as part of this pre-Reg 19 Consultation. Land within the ownership of my clients should not be discounted on the basis that the basis of promoting the Peaks Hill Farm Site is still focused upon the need to provide “a high quality, landscape led design influenced by its wider rural fringe location, prominent natural assets and heritage associations” (Paragraph 7.2.8) It is not considered a robust planning strategy to only seek one greenfield allocation on the edge of Worksop to 2037 and re-examination of the previous development areas submitted in Gateford is now needed. It is a comparable area with a woodland setting and new woodland could be delivered as part of new scheme at Gateford. Peaks Hill also requires more historical and archaeological assessment which has not yet been ‘benchmarked’ against my clients proposed development areas on the edge of Gateford / Worksop.</p>	The submitted site at Gateford Hall Farm has been reviewed, as requested. The three parcels of land have been considered and assessed (LAA491a, LAA491b, LAA491c) through the Bassetlaw LAA review process. The LAA assessments conclude that all three sites are unsuitable for residential development due to heritage, highways, and landscape constraints.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
REF117 Ordsall Rep	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	Chapter 7 of the Local Plan begins by dealing with housing distribution across the District and identifies site allocations for housing development. Paragraph 7.1.1 explains that additional housing is required to meet the changing housing needs across the District, however we believe the number of housing to meet this need is understated. In addition, reiterate that maintaining the housing requirement of 87.4dpa for Retford as set out in the adopted Core Strategy is insufficient to meet these growing housing demands. Policy ST16 should be renamed as it is not about housing distribution, it sets out the required yield from the 'new' allocations. Welcome the table as a useful summary, but it should not be conflated with the distribution model set out under Policy ST1. Support the reference in the final column that the stated number of dwellings is a 'minimum'. Set out our comments regarding the uncertainty of delivery at the Garden Village above and consider that 500 dwellings from that site is not achievable in the plan period.	The housing requirement and supply for Retford was sufficiently increased to meet the requirements of the community following the January 2020 consultation (included in the November 2020 Draft Local Plan consultation document). No amendments are considered necessary to the housing requirement up to 2037. Housing supply has been increased to cover the period beyond 2037. It is proposed to amend the title of the Housing Distribution policy to 'Provision of land for Housing'.
REF180 Trinity Farm	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	The identification of land at Trinity Farm, Retford for residential development is supported. As detailed in response to Policy 23: Site HS7, the site is sustainably located and can deliver a comprehensive development responding to its gateway location to Retford. The site is however capable of delivering a higher number of units than currently proposed. Whilst we accept the Policy uses 'minimum' to express the number of dwellings deliverable, it is considered that the policy should be amended to reflect the true capacity of the site more closely. The removal of former site HS7: Leafields Retford is supported. The allotments at Leafields are a much-valued community facility, and to remove established allotments from the site, to Trinity Farm as previously proposed, would have been unsound and damaging to the local community.	As this is a minimum figure, it is not considered necessary to increase the site capacity from 244 to 297 dwellings. This can be dealt with at the Development Management stage if necessary.
1671323	William Davis	While there are no objections to the proposed housing allocations it is considered that 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. 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 site has been assessed in the LAA and is considered to be unsuitable for development/allocation due to heritage impact. Planning application 17/01356/OUT was refused on heritage grounds, detailed as follows: The proposed development would result in the loss of the open agricultural landscape, that currently forms the historic setting of the Grade I listed Manor Lodge and the Grade II listed Lodge Farm. The encroachment of further residential development into the setting would distract from the isolation and openness the Grade I listed building, resulting in harm to the historic significance of Manor Lodge. The harm is deemed to be less than substantial. Policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD states that proposals that fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a heritage asset will not be supported. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings, while paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework expects that the more important the heritage asset the greater the weight should be to its

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST16 - HOUSING DISTRIBUTION			
			conservation. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits. The minimal wider public benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused. The development, if permitted would be contrary to section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD and paragraphs 193, 196 and 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
REF170	A&D Architecture	4) Policy ST16 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.	It is not considered necessary to specifically allocate land for Park Homes. All sites are allocated for housing and will include a mix of homes in accordance with the Housing Mix Policy. Should one of these sites be proposed for Park Homes that proposal will be considered on its merits. This approach is consistent with other site allocations – the housing mix is not identified for any of the other allocations providing flexibility to the market.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1638201	Resident	Too many houses too far away from the centre of Worksop; despite all the policies discussing sustainable transport, etc, most people living here would use their cars to complete most of their journeys. There are no secondary or primary schools within any reasonable walking or cycling distance, which will further increase traffic; nor are there any shops within easy reach, again leading to increased car use, traffic and pollution. I don't see any benefit to be gained from the new link road, which will merely transfer traffic from one single carriageway road to another.	A package of measures is required to deliver sustainable development at Peaks Hill Farm. The Local Plan policy for Peaks Hill Farm (Policy 17) requires development to deliver a new distributor road which can accommodate a bus service. A new school, local centre and community facilities are to be provided on site and improvements to walking and cycling routes are required. There are not enough suitable, available and deliverable sites within Worksop's development boundary to accommodate the required amount of new housing. The Council considers that this site offers the best opportunity to deliver a sustainable development and provide strategic infrastructure contributing to meeting local needs up to 2037.
REF004	Resident	Strongly oppose this plan, my reasons are: Environmental impact, there will be more countryside wiped out. Where will all the wild life go for their habitat, the deers that roam & all the wild birds will have nowhere to go. Air pollution from the construction of the infrastructure. All the houses with at least 1,2 or 3 cars, atmospheric pollutants from these vehicles. All the surfaced areas will increase surface run off, so risk of flooding increases straight away on to the existing homes on Colsterdale & surrounding areas. Traffic flow from these houses, noise and congestion. Local services will be overrun, Bassetlaw is a small hospital as it is & not enough GP'S now, to get a doctors appointment is shocking. Small town centre, no investments other than bus station & pictures in the last 15 years, not enough employment for current population.	A number of assessments have been undertaken to assess the suitability of the site for residential and other uses. An initial ecology assessment has been undertaken and further ecology assessments will be required. No significant constraints have been identified in relation to ecology. 10% biodiversity net gain will be sought to add value to the local ecology. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken by the Council which shows that the site is in the lowest flood risk area, as such, there are no significant constraints in this respect. A flood risk assessment will be required as part of the planning application to show how surface water will be managed. The Council's Environmental Health state that there are no air quality issues in Worksop and none are expected to be generated by the development. The health service (Bassetlaw Clinical Commissioning Group) support the provision of a financial contribution to address potential impacts on the doctors and the hospital from the development. The Worksop Town centre DPD seeks to regenerate the town centre and deliver a mix of uses, including housing, commercial uses, recreational uses etc. Investment is underway at Middletons and the WASH for example.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1643802	Resident	<p>Reading the comments regarding the proposed development at Peaks Hill Farm, I can see that there is plenty of opposition to it from local residents. Focus only on the following: That there have been a number of deaths on Carlton Road in recent years. It sends a chill down my spine that when a man and his fiancée are buried on the day that they should have been married, another man is decapitated on his motorbike, that someone should then propose to build hundreds of homes nearby. Carlton Road is a dangerous road due to it's intrinsic dips and bends, even at the current speed limit. Even if new speed restrictions were introduced, the sad fact is that not everyone will stick to this limit. Common sense needs to be born in mind when considering the increase in population density and also the possibility of a new road and junction. Carlton Road approaching Owday Lane does flood. Will the loss of adjacent countryside associated with this development increase surface water from rainfall? It obviously will and this needs to be considered. Travel from Gateford to Carlton twice a day so have seen it in all weathers and conditions. During the floods early in 2020 one of my colleagues could not pass Carlton Road to return home to Worksop. The woods adjacent to the new development in Gateford have become a swamp, despite the best intentions of the developers with a pond to attempt to manage excess rain water. It seems obvious that any development at Peaks Hill will come with the same problems despite the promises of the developers. The rest of the Bassetlaw Plan seems very sensible. Conclude with my own views on a Worksop Guardian article dated the 6th Feb 2020, where it was implied that the government would force building on areas that hadn't reached certain construction targets.</p> <p>If central government has intentions of forcing development onto the council against the wishes of residents, then it is the council's duty to take legal advice. The idea that government planners would dump houses onto an area is somewhat spurious, given that we could have had four different governments by 2037. And finally the question on everyone's lips is when does the building on the green belt stop?</p>	<p>The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road.</p> <p>The site is located within the lowest risk flood zone (Floodzone 1). A flood risk assessment will be required for the site. This will set out measures to manage surface water run off to ensure there are no adverse impacts on or off site. The Environment Agency, Nottinghamshire County Council, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water identify that the proposal is capable of addressing flooding issues.</p> <p>The Local Plan is required to align with national policy and guidance. When the Local Plan is submitted for examination, the independent Planning Inspector will need to ensure that the Plan complies with national policy. When a plan is not consistent with national policy it is likely to be found unsound. There is no Green Belt land in Bassetlaw.</p>
REF008	Resident	<p>Our opinion of the development hasn't changed. As we're both key workers, myself being a bereavement support officer I don't have time to attend any further meetings. Have to say after reviewing the plans I'm a little disappointed. 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. 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. Can see that there are plans to build on many of Worksop's Greenland but no consideration for expansion of bereavement and cemeteries. As my job as a bereavement support officer the above are part of my day to day, I'd like this to be reviewed and considered because this affects 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 ... and specially asked our solicitor regarding the belt of land behind our home and 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. Wish along with these plans you could 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 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 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. 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 than 30 minutes but I highly doubt with affected road closures whilst disruptions occur for the next 15 years this would happen. Worry about the infrastructure of Worksop, in recent months there has been mass flooding. This flooding also affected Theievesdale. Don't believe anyone's home were flooded the drains simply were overflowing 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 than 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</p>	<p>The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the development can be accommodated by the road network with mitigation, including a new link road. The site is located within the lowest risk flood zone (Floodzone 1). A flood risk assessment will be required for the site. This will set out measures to manage surface water run off to ensure there are no adverse impacts on or off site. The Environment Agency, Nottinghamshire County Council, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water identify that the proposal is capable of addressing flooding issues. The County Council state that there are sufficient school places in Worksop for primary school children. The development will provide land for secondary school facilities. There is not enough brownfield land available to meet the needs for new homes so greenfield land needs to be used. Biodiversity net gain will ensure a 10% increase in biodiversity on site. At least 20% of the homes will be affordable. A quarter will be for first time buyers.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>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 disappointed that the green spaces which form part of Worksop's charm will be taken away for more breeze blocked homes. Wouldn't class Worksop as a desirable place to live but 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 fail to see the benefits to the town centre which needs attention and funding, as its beginning to look like a ghost town. Also like to mention the wildlife. Although this will be the last of your concerns the last summer was beautiful, 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) 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 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. - like compensation for the disruption the new development will have on our lives. Already getting extremely frustrated with the existing development happening at the bottom of our road near Blyth road despite being 500 yards away from it. - like 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. - like minimal lighting near our properties. Many of us have built summerhomes/glorified sheds overlooking onto the field and have conservatories which to us are our relaxation rooms and don't want blinding lights disturbing our routines. Highlight that the new plans are going to affect all of the residents in our day to day lives. 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 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.</p>	<p>The site promoters concept plan identifies a green buffer between new and existing properties and this is a requirement of the policy. Detailed matters like location of communal areas and lighting are a matter for the planning application.</p>
1653383	Resident	<p>Strongly object to the proposed road as this will result in noise pollution, light pollution, air pollution and ruin the view we have from my property. Strongly object to the proposed school being planned to be built as this will be directly behind my property which will mean noise pollution and ruin the view currently enjoy and will de-value my home. Strongly object to building houses in this area as currently enjoy a view overlooking fields and woodland, this will be removed and devalue our house. Strongly object to building houses in this area as this will adversely affect the local wildlife, we have encountered many different species such as deer, owl, buzzard including bats which are a protected species. You should find somewhere else to build.</p>	<p>The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the distributor road is necessary to enable a bus route through the site and to improve connections and reduce traffic impact on existing junctions. The Council's Environmental Health state that there will be no pollution impacts generated by the road. Loss of view and house prices are not a planning matter. The location of the new school is designed to ensure that existing and future residents are easily able to access the site. An ecology assessment has been undertaken and identified no significant constraints. Further assessments will be required at the planning application stage. 10% biodiversity net gain will be secured on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF025	Resident	<p>Live at Westerdale and would like to raise some concerns and suggestions regarding the new 1000 house development at Peak Hills Farm. For reference my house is located here, right on the tip of the new development: (picture included in representation). Like to log some suggestions regarding the dwellings and school proposed to be built on the site. Attended the council zoom meeting on 8 December 2020. Understand this building site has to happen due to government numbers ask if a few things could be considered. For instance: - The location of the Primary School. Whilst I am aware that this is part of the building site when needed (a few years after the houses are completed maybe) I wondered if it could be built at any other point on the site? Perhaps on the boundary of the red lines on the other side of the new road road? Nearer Peak Hill Farm boundary. I am worried of the noise created by parents dropping off children, children playing and screaming at break and lunch times, the bell going 8 times a day. There will also need to be a car park too for staff. Concerned by the view from the back of my house (bedroom 2, 4 and 5) as these will directly overlook the school and I'm sure will de-value my house due to its proximity. Understand will probably be the one most affected by the school there will be other houses (and the new houses) affected by the noise and car pollution and traffic. Wondered if it could be re-considered where the school is built before site construction begins? Concerned for the wildlife that live in the woods behind (deer, buzzards, birds) which would be again affected by the noise and cars in the current location mapped for the school. And from the map (whilst I understand it is a guide and not very detailed) it looks like the primary school will stretch from the woodland to the long plantation. Which would be a very very big primary school. - The boundary hedge. At the meeting it was discussed there would be some type of border between existing housing and new housing to give some privacy. From the photos you can see the view from my second (top) floor and the existing hedge which is about 6 foot high. Is there any thought as to what kind of border? Trees would give the best privacy. Concerned how much my garden will be overlooked so a border which will be x wide would give the feeling of more privacy. (I am unsure at the moment how far you intend to build new houses but I suppose there will be houses at the side of me, if not a school.) Think a hedge would be good for keeping new lighting (street lights/house lights) farther away from us so that our house remains dark at night time. - Was told the sports centre would be near the Gateford Hill and a new, small road to be built. Therefore, the playing field behind my house would be used for whatever is required. Concerned if this is a football/rugby pitch with goalposts and floodlighting. - The Long plantation. Concerned as was told the trees will stay but I don't understand how roads (from the new houses to the new road) will be able to go around the tree's perimeter, particularly if the Primary school is as big as made out to be.</p>	<p>Design comments welcome and will be fed into the masterplanning process. The location of the new school is designed to ensure that existing and future residents are easily able to access the site. An ecology assessment has been undertaken and identified no significant constraints. Further assessments will be required at the planning application stage. 10% biodiversity net gain will be secured on site. No decision has yet been made about the depth of the buffer or other detailed matters like lighting and boundary treatments. These will all be matters to discuss through the masterplan framework consultation and the planning application process which residents will have an opportunity to engage with.</p>
REF060	Notts County Council	<p>Requirement 4A, to make provision for primary education infrastructure though a financial contribution, is agreed. However, it is requested that this contribution should be expressed as "to extend local primary schools", rather than Gateford Park Primary School specifically to provide appropriate flexibility as it is not yet confirmed which school would be expanded. Requirement 4B, to safeguard serviced land to accommodate a one form entry primary school post 2037, and 4C, to make provision for secondary education through a financial contribution, are both agreed to be necessary.</p>	<p>The policy will be changed to refer: "to extend local primary schools" and remove the reference to Gateford Park Primary School.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1662603	Resident	<p>Totally oppose the building of houses been built on prime farming land off Thievesdale Lane (Peaks Hill Farm propped development). This land is used consistently throughout the year and is invaluable to the economy and welfare of the local population. Building houses on this land is criminal , loosing good sustainable farmland which is going to be a priority going forward in the UK nad locally in coming years where houses are not a major requirement . Houses do not provide jobs or sustainability to the local people. Farmland is at a premium and your prepared to forgo this for greed and money for houses which long term are going to be a drain on the area, we currently don't have enough doctors, dentists, schools to cater for the area as it stands plus all the building of houses which is already happening. Its no good saying this will follow and it will be to late as the area is too congested already.....you cant get a dental or doctors appointment inside a month in this area, that can only get worse. You are destroying good farming land and green space for immediate profit but long term you are dealing the area a death toll.... there will be no farming. no sustainable living . The whole area will only be a commuter belt so Worksop will die a death. To destroy green land that offers sustainable living , wildlife habitats that will be destroyed forever as once you start building that can never be replicated is reprehensible. The current building that has taken place has destroyed wildlife massively and has already created a massive ecological destruction with the removal of a huge willow tree illegally and now the road is closed and causing considerable issues as the junction of Farmers Branch . This is the start of your process and you are destroying nature and habitat and creating pollution, danger, and upheaval at every level . An access road linking A60 to Blyth road is dangerous and will not ease any pressure on the local roads , it will actually cause more accidents on the junctions as Blyth Road currently cant cope with the transport from Peppers as well as the large amount of traffic that travels to Blyth to access the A1, this has increased massively with the housing that has already been built in the area and by adding even more houses you are going to make this road a death trap. It can take 5-10 minutes to even get onto Blyth road from either Thievesdale Lane or Farmers Branch and you want to add to this without adding any infrastructure as a road linking to A60 will not help as traffic backing up from Cannon Crossroads area will then try Blyth Road and vice versa and these roads will just become gridlocked. The farming land was designated green belt land yet you can claim this no longer exists when it comes to been paid money this is wrong on every level. Bought our property safe in the knowledge that we were protected with the land been greenbelt, if i wanted to look at other houses then i would have bought a house that did that , you are devaluing my home and don't care about the people you are supposed to look after. Its all about the money not the area , the wildlife, the sustainability or the future development of farming and green cultureyou need to reconsider this complete idea . There are so many unused areas of land that are suitable and don't invade current properties and businesses ... you should look at these and develop them not destroy and devalue my home and the land around me.</p>	<p>National planning policy requires Local Planning Authorities to Plan for development over at least a fifteen year period. This Local Plan runs to 2037. National policy requires Councils to assess the need for housing and deliver the full objectively assessed housing requirement. There is not enough suitable, available and deliverable land available to deliver the housing requirement. Some greenfield land has to be used. The Land Availability Assessment identifies this site as being the most suitable site to deliver sustainable development to meet the development needs of Bassetlaw. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. A financial contribution will be sought to improve health care facilities in the area, including doctors and the hospital – that is set out in the policy. 10% biodiversity net gain will be required and the majority of the woodland will be protected. An ecology assessment has been undertaken. Further ecology work will be undertaken as part of the planning application process. Mitigation will be identified where necessary. House prices are not a planning matter. There is no green belt in the district.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1662608	Resident	<p>parag 7.2.1 and map. Remain concerned about the number of homes to be built at Peaks Hill Farm(PHF). The map shows the existing construction site at Thievesdale Lane, which is small in comparison to the proposed PHF site. The number of houses, the impact on the open country outlook, the disruption of the road closure and the extent to which the boundary of the residential area of Worksop is being extended by the Thievesdale Lane construction site are significant. This is only a fraction of the impact which the PHF will cause but gives an indication of what would be caused. Many of the responses to the initial plan point out that there will be a relatively small number of affordable starter homes, social housing and homes for older residents - the types of housing that are needed locally. This does not address the national or local housing shortage for these types of home. Most of the PHF homes will be bought by people from Sheffield and other large conurbations, looking for cheaper housing. PHF is unlikely to address local housing need. 1120 new homes is excessive and unjustified. The council's responses to these comments in the first consultation are inadequate and do not address the concerns. parag 7.2.14. welcome the decision to retain the open field next to the A60 at PHF as publicly accessible green space and to protect this from any building. Would like to see this used as a wildflower meadow, similar to that adjoining the North side of Eddison Park Road , rather than just being open managed grassland. A meadow field would retain a rural aspect whereas managed grassland would look like the start of the housing estate - as is evident at Gateford with the large expanses of grass with no flowers and minimal benefit to wildlife. 7.2.16. It is obvious that there will be huge increases in traffic from 1120 new houses. The link road would be a response to this but is most unlikely to improve the flow of traffic around Worksop and certainly not in the town centre - the link road is a response to the problem of additional traffic not something which will address existing traffic levels and congestion. Thought governments and councils had learnt by now that building new roads rarely alleviates traffic congestion, rather it attracts more traffic. Understand that the precise line of the link road is not yet fixed. Would be concerned if the road was other than adjacent to the southern boundary of the PHF site, close to the woodland near G4S. The road would otherwise cut through the field adjacent to the A60 and would affect the views due to street lights. Concerned by the prospect of a roundabout on the A60 where the link road joins. This could be hazardous for cyclists travelling into Worksop particularly if it is at the brow of the hill which means a cyclist setting off from stationary would initially be moving slowly. There would need to be separate cycle lanes with toucan crossings to navigate the roundabout safely. Pleased that the development will include children's play areas and allotments and assume these requirements will be insisted upon by the planning dept. and not overridden by developers claiming they cannot afford this. Pleased that there is a commitment to provide safe cycle and pedestrian travel routes and to link to existing rights of way. Pleased to see the requirement for a tree lined active travel corridor with species rich verges. Hope the council will follow "no mow" guidance for the spring and summer to protect and promote these species. The cycling routes need to be extended into Worksop and towards Carlton in Lindrick, rather than just ending when they reach the A60 or other main roads. This is an opportunity to look at safe sustainable travel between Worksop and Carlton. Traffic leaving PHF and travelling towards Sheffield or the A57 bypass, will either go through Gateford on Eddison Park Road or on Owday Lane. Both are problematic. The Gateford route ends with traffic lights to join Gateford Road. Already there are hold ups at peak times for the Gateford traffic and this would become worse with increased traffic. Owday Lane can be a dangerous road with the Z bends and ice near the wooded areas. Cars end up in the ditch every year. It is unsafe to overtake on this road other than on the straight stretch just before Owday lakes junction. It would not be safe to overtake there if traffic levels increased. There is nothing in the original or amended plan to indicate that this has been thought through.</p>	<p>A Landscape Assessment has been undertaken to inform the site selection process. This identified that the site could be accommodated sensitively in the landscape subject to mitigation which is identified by the policy. National policy requires Councils to assess the need for housing and deliver the full objectively assessed housing requirement. There is not enough suitable, available and deliverable land available to deliver the housing requirement. Some greenfield land has to be used. The Land Availability Assessment identifies this site as being the most suitable site to deliver sustainable development to meet the development needs of Bassetlaw. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. Requiring the developer to fund a cycle lane into Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick would be unreasonable. Infrastructure requirements such as children's play, retaining the open field next to the A60 are identified by policy. On adoption, these policy requirements will be expected to be delivered as part of the planning permission. This is the advantage of having an up to date local plan in place. Speculative development does not provide the opportunity to plan ahead and identify the infrastructure required.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1662636	Resident	<p>In response to the first Draft Local Plan, in January 2020, raised objections to the inclusion of the field adjacent to the A60, at the western end of the proposed Peaks Hill site. Objected (as did many others) to the loss of amenity from loss of beautiful countryside and open views. The wooded ridge, running NE from G4S on the A60 at south of this site to N of Peaks Hill Farm itself, was I felt, a natural topographical boundary between Worksop and the open countryside which slopes downhill towards Carlton in Lindrick. Very pleased that planners and developers have listened to reasoned arguments and have now designated the triangular field, adjacent to the A60, a piece of ‘green infrastructure’ (hope this will be managed as a flower meadow?) within the development site. Therefore the wooded ridge, referred to above, becomes the effective boundary of the residential development. It is vital, as the plan develops, to ensure that this field and the open views, are protected. Consideration should be given to designating the woods within the site as a community woodland, developing access paths, while at the same time enhancing the management of the woods for the benefit of wildlife. Covid lockdowns have shown how much access to nature, and woodland especially, is valued by people for exercise and mental health. Still have concerns and wish to make a number of points that hope will be incorporated into the design of the site – First, the new access road will still run through the field to join the A60. It remains to be seen what Highways engineers will say on the siting of this road but have concerns on a number of issues – - This is a dangerous stretch of the A60, particularly on the hill/bend nr Peaks Hill farm with a history of fatal accidents. - There will also be considerable visual impact of the road on the landscape. - In addition, the road will create a new link to the A57, by traffic using the new road to bypass the north of Worksop, travel along the A60 towards Carlton, turning into Owday Lane, then Woodsetts rd to travel to the A57 roundabout. Both the A60 and the minor road of Owday lane (with two lots of Z bends) are very busy with frequent accidents. To minimise the impact of the above – the new road should take a line towards the south of the site, nearer to Worksop, so a new roundabout could be built at the new rd/A60 junction just south of Freshfields. Traffic will therefore be more likely to travel on the Eddison Park/Ashes Park road through Gateford estate to join Gateford Rd and then on to the A57. The road through Gateford, with its roundabouts and traffic lights at Gateford Rd junction, is a much safer route for any increased traffic than Owday lane. - To minimise the visual impact, the new road will need to be screened by planting large numbers of grown trees along its length, matching the species in the surrounding woods. In the plan, the northern boundary of the site is to be screened by a planted belt of trees, want to emphasise how important that is, in terms of visually screening the houses from Red lane to the north and creating that ‘green buffer’ between Worksop and Carlton – and also to act as a corridor for wildlife. Welcome aspect of the plan is to provide cycling and walking routes within the site. However, to realise the full potential for greener/active travel by residents, these cycle/walking routes will have to connect to the wider Worksop and Carlton communities. There should be a wide shared use cycle/pedestrian path alongside the new road and joining the A60. From there, safe cycle/walk crossing of the A60 and safe routes into Worksop/Carlton should be provided in both N/S directions. How that should be achieved is not relevant to this site but is relevant to the plans of both Bassetlaw District and Notts County Councils, so set out below in an appendix, some suggestions, but of course, it would need consultation with experts and landowners to achieve the connecting routes. Still have concerns about the large scale of this development in open countryside and the limited provision of affordable housing. Recognise that Worksop will need to grow to prosper and welcome the consideration that has been given to sustainable and landscape issues in this latest version of the plan. If my suggestions above are implemented then they will mitigate some of negative impacts and create positive opportunities in terms of creating a more sustainable and healthier community e.g. connecting cycle routes. Appendix – Cycle/walking routes connecting the site to Worksop and Carlton. The cycle route to Carlton would be simplest to achieve by widening the existing pavement alongside the A60 and re-designating it as shared use. An alternative, which would need the landowner’s agreement, would be to establish a safe and durable surfaced route from the northern boundary of the site to Red lane, and then on to Carlton (it needs to be considered by experts on how practical it is to make this connection). A cycle route into Worksop could be achieved by a shared use path from the new roundabout on the A60, south alongside the A60 and along the wide pavements on Eddison Park Ave (re-designated shared use) to join the existing cycle route that goes through the Gateford estate, south to the Toucan crossing on Raymouth Lane and then the ‘cycle lane’ along Valley Rd to Valley School. The route would then have to be extended to provide safe access to the town centre. Hope the developers, County Council and District Council can cooperate to achieve this vision of safe, sustainable travel, connecting the site to the wider community, schools, shops and employment.</p>	<p>Support for retaining the open field next to the A60 and for the defensible northern boundary are welcome. The policy requires a community woodland on site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. Requiring the developer to fund a cycle lane into Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick would be unreasonable. But new and improved cycle routes which connect to existing routes are required by the policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1664256	Resident	<p>Strongly OBJECT to your Peaks Hill Farm Project. This is prime farm land which is currently being used by a farmer to grow consumable vegetables and should not be used. . Under Government instructions this type of land should not be used to build housing and business. This type of land is to be preserved for farming only, due to us leaving the EU. The UK needs to increase its farming industry to provide its own food. The Council is using this land for 2 reasons and both are Lazy, irresponsible, selfish and are not in the publics' interest. i) The land owner is known to certain Worksop councillors from previous deals and this transaction will profit both parties rather than the public ii) This is an easy option rather than the 'correct' option. The correct option would be to use Brown land or unused green fields (NOT farmland). This land SHOULD NOT be used for your project because it is actively used FARM LAND. AGAINST the plan because you are using essential FARMLAND Wildlife The clue is in its name (Farm) I have read how you intend to protect the wild birds within your inept housing plan. What you fail to say is about the other wildlife within this area. You also fail to say about the noise pollution human pollution and building pollution your plan will create over a space of 10 years. Currently we regularly see peasants, woodpeckers, Goss hawks, rabbits & hares, foxes and even a deer frequents these fields. This is on top of the standard wild birds that feed off of this land. Can you honestly tell me you have planned to protect this wildlife from day 1 through your development until completion and onwards from there on. If so ... You clearly have either done no research OR you simply can't be bothered and just want your development and the money it will bring you. Strongly OBJECT to your plans because it does not even come close to protect the wildlife Current residents of Westerdale development will seriously and negatively affect the residents of Westerdale homes. Many homes back onto the farmland. A development which is the size of your inept design will have massive impact both financially and mentally on these home owners. i) The view these homes have will be taken away and replaced by ugly housing or industry. The wildlife from the gardens will be gone as well as the smell of fresh air. ii) the noise and air pollution of 10 years worth of building will be unbearable. who wants to be part of a building site against their will. iii) The property values of Westerdale homes will drop because of these houses will be facing onto a building site of a huge housing estate. The property values will drop because there will be too many available new houses to cover demand. The size of the plan is too Big and is irresponsible. It will be impossible to sell Westerdale houses going forward. AGAINST your plan because of the negative effects on existing home owners of Westerdale From the beginning the Worksop Council and the planners have acted irresponsibly towards their residents. This plan (ST 15) was original (2019-20) hidden from the public in order to get it passed through without objection. After residents complained and brought in the help of our MP Bredon C-S, only then did this plan get published in the correct way. Astonished that many of the councils team are still in employment further more still involved with this corrupt process. Was told by my councillor that they would object to the plan. They lied to me, will never forget that. This council and its planning team are not fit for purpose. ST 15 is not fit for purpose and should be suspended immediately.</p>	<p>The Council is required by national planning policy to identify and allocate enough land for housing for a minimum 15 year period. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. Loss of view and house prices are not planning matters. The Council's Environmental Health have not identified any pollution concerns relating to the proposed development. The Local Plan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of national legislation, planning guidance and the Councils' Statement of Community Involvement. At each stage of the plan-making process, the Council has exceeded the guidelines in national legislation and its own local policy in the way it has consulted the community and stakeholders. Engagement with landowners has been transparent and appropriate. Councillor involvement in the process has been appropriate and in accordance with the councillor code of conduct.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1664692	Resident	<p>Object to the local plan part ST15 because it makes no allowance for necessary additional health services. My doctors surgery (Larwood Practice) is struggling to cope with its current patient numbers. Its almost impossible to secure an appointment when needed. Your plan ST15 is directly in Larwood Surgery's captive area which means it will have upto an additional 3000 extra patients. This is beyond capacity and capability which means it is not in the publics interest. Your consultation advisor stated that it is neither the councils or developers responsibility to increase local doctors spaces. Your consultation suggested it is the responsibility of the NHS and Government. As you can not assure residents that additional improvements will be made to our Doctors and Dentist and Hospital services have to object to it. No Addition school places. object to the Plan because you have not made any arrangement for extra infrastructure to support it. In your consultation, the official stated that children will have to find school places outside of Worksop. The official said there would be a few spaces at Gateford school, Valley and Prospect but then back tracked when he was told these schools are already over subscribed. He said children could travel outside of the area for their education. The plan also shows big housing developments in these surrounding areas which will also become oversubscribed. The official said that school places were not the responsibly of the planners or council planning and could not be taken into consideration. objecting to the plan as it is not in the publics interest. The plan makes no allowance for health and now no plans for education. Use of farm land Why are you using essential farm land. Need our farmers and farmers need good farm land. This land is not fallow land. It is farmed every year. Once built on this can never be used for farming again. There are plenty of sites available around Gateford. A plot down the road from me was ready for use until someone found ancient remains on it. The Gateford sites have had builders on them for over 20 years and still have plenty of availability to use. Why are you not using the Gateford sites and completing that project. The fact that it has taken over 20 years to complete the Gateford project shows that plan ST 15 is excessive and not wanted. Please leave Peak Hill Farm as a Farm with fields full of crops and wildlife</p>	<p>The policy secures a financial contribution to improve health care facilities in the area to cope with the additional demand from the development. The Council will continue to work with Bassetlaw Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG - the Strategic Health Care authority responsible for NHS service provision in Bassetlaw) to determine the health facilities required to support the development. Bo evidence has been submitted by the CCG which has resulted in the site being considered unsuitable for development/allocation. Nottinghamshire County Council Education state that there are sufficient primary school places in Worksop for children to go to school. A new school will also be provided on site to support secondary education. The policy therefore ensures that the impact of Peaks Hill Farm on health and education infrastructure is appropriately mitigated. The Council is required by national planning policy to identify and allocate enough land for housing for a minimum 15 year period. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used.</p>
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	<p>As mentioned in previous responses, the allocation is adjacent to the mineral and waste site of Carlton Forest were 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. Due to the proximity of the allocation to the now closed landfill, it is recommended that advice is sought from the EA and the County Councils Landscape and Regeneration Team to understand what site investigation may be required if the proposed site is impacted by landfill gas emissions.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team has been consulted and they have raised no objections. BDC Environmental Health has advised that this can be dealt with at the Development Management stage.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF086	Resident	<p>Totally against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, within the Bassetlaw Local The proposal to build a new housing estate consisting of over 1000 houses, plus business premises will mean that residents in the area will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption, and inconvenience for many years to come. For many elderly residents, who cannot afford to move, the devastating impact of developing this estate will last for the rest of their lives. The Draft Plan does not appear to address the adverse impact caused by the massive increase in commuters going in and out of Worksoo bv road and rail if this new housing estate is built. The employment opportunities in Worksoop are extremely limited and this will remain the case even if new businesses are developed on Peaks Hill. Most people buying these new properties will therefore need to commute to get to work. There are already huge pressures on Worksoop's commuting infrastructure. For example, the connecting roads in and out of Worksoop to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country roads that are already full of traffic during peak commuter periods. Also, the train service from Worksoop to Sheffield is poor, unreliable, and often full to capacity during peak commuting periods. On many occasions I have witnessed people not being allowed on trains during peak times because the train was too full. Building over 1000 new houses on Peaks Hill will result in a massive increase in people commuting in and out of Worksoop by road and rail. Building a new road on Peaks Hill and a few new roundabouts in the area will not resolve the significant congestion issues that will be created when the number of commuters using the roads around Worksoop substantially increases. Also modernising Worksoop train station or eventually building a train station in the new Garden Village will not improve the actual efficiency of the train service to and from Worksoop when more commuters start to use it. Worksoop Town Centre is very poorly maintained, with no major shops or restaurants to attract people to visit it. If over 1000 increase in people travelling by road and rail to other nearby Towns and Cities to shop and socialise, with only minimal benefit to the economy of Worksoop. It is not clear how the housing requirement for Worksoop in this plan has been determined. A huge volume of new housing has already been developed in Worksoop in recent years e.g. in the Gateford area. The plan should explain in more detail why the Council believes Worksoop needs thousands of additional houses on top of what it already has, and why other areas of Bassetlaw (e.g. some of the villages in the area) are not being subjected to such extensive development work. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm and destroying this greenfield area will significantly increase pollution in the area at time when Councils should be doing all they can to improve the environment and mitigate the impact of climate change. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm will have an adverse impact on the established wildlife in the area including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards, frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, and insect population. The proposal to build a road across Peaks Hill to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will increase the pollution from noise and fumes in this area. Councils are supposed to be implementing plans to help to reduce the impact on Climate change and pollution (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with that approach. If my concerns are over-ruled, my feedback is as follows:- Totally against the development of a walkway between Westerdale and the new Peaks Hill Housing Estate. The proposal to develop an estate of over 1,000 new houses behind where we live is bad enough. However, building a walkway/cycle path to link Westerdale to this estate will attract anti-social behaviour to the front of where we live. The existing walkways in this area attract fly tipping, dog fouling, rough sleepers, graffiti, and a wide range of other anti-social behaviour. If my feedback re this is ignored and a walkway is developed it needs to be well away from my property and in a position where the public will not have to pass my property when they access it. There should be a green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. This buffer zone should be a minimum of 20 metres from the border of these properties. Existing hedgerows at the rear of the properties on Westerdale should be retained as part of the buffer zone. The new dwellings nearest to Westerdale should have their gardens positioned so they back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and the new houses that are being built. Any social housing that is developed on this housing estate should be located well away from current houses on Westerdale. The development should maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment on this estate. It should also retain existing wooded areas and as many hedgerows as possible. Against the development of a road being built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm. If this is built it needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale. Any "green technology" that is developed needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale.</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of Peaks Hill Farm will bring jobs to Worksoop and other sites are identified close to Worksoop on the A57. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely in the area's road network with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. Rail services are a matter for Northern Rail. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. New homes in Worksoop will support the regeneration of the Town Centre. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			Good connections to the surrounding residential area are essential to ensure new and existing residents can access services and facilities by walking and cycling. No decision has been made regarding the location of the connecting routes. The policy identifies a green buffer along the site boundary to help protect residential amenity. Improved and enhanced green infrastructure is an important aspect of the Peaks Hill Farm proposal. These are a requirement of the policy. Retention of woodland and tree planting is a requirement of the Local Plan (five trees per dwelling). The employment area is proposed to be located on the northern boundary some distance from existing residents homes.
REF096 Carlton Members	Councillors, Bassetlaw District Council	Note that there have been revisions to the January 20 version of the plan that took into account out earlier feedback and that of others . This focussed on the impact of the development and can be summarised as a concern about Worksop encroaching onto the village of Carlton. Approve of the decision to make the site fronting the A60 publicly accessible green space (7.2.14) and to appoint a Green Gap to the north of the site (7.2.14) and an enhanced green buffer at the sites northern boundary. Thank you for these major revisions. There is still concern locally about the impact the distributor road will have on the landscape quality as it crosses the open land alongside the A60 and its climb through the tree line. Its route should be subject to consultation with Carlton parish council and Carlton Members. At the moment many think the least intrusive route would be to the southern end of the site pursuing a direct approach to near the junction with the road through Gateford. Para 7.2.9 recognises that the site is within Carlton Parish. It is covered by the Carlton neighbourhood plan. It still rankles within Carlton that the parish council, Members and the neighbourhood plan group were not consulted . We are pleased that ‘evidenced impacts on Carlton’ will be addressed in S106 contributions but this will not cover the loss of CIL contributions the Parish Council could have expected to receive. Is there a mechanism for the Parish to be paid some form of compensation by Bassetlaw for the unilateral decision to make this site CIL exempt?	Carlton Parish Council has been consulted on the Local Plan at every stage of public consultation. All matters raised by the Parish Council have been taken into consideration by Bassetlaw District Council as the plan has evolved. The road line has yet to be agreed. As this is a highway issue, the road alignment will need to be agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council (as the Highway Authority). The Parish Council and Members will continue to be consulted on future versions of the Local Plan, the development of the masterplan framework and planning applications for the site. The decision to make the site CIL exempt is based on the financial viability of development as evidenced by the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. National legislation requires CIL be subject to a review, therefore there was never a guarantee that CIL could be secured from the scheme.
REF112	Resident	Totally against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The proposal to build a new housing estate consisting of over 1000 houses, plus business premises will mean that residents in the area will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption, and inconvenience for many years to come. For many elderly residents, who cannot afford to move, the devastating impact of developing this estate will last for the rest of their lives. The Draft Plan does not appear to address the adverse impact caused by the massive increase in commuters going in and out of Worksop by road and rail if this huge new housing estate is built. The employment opportunities in Worksop are extremely limited and this will remain the case even if new businesses are developed on Peaks Hill. Most people buying these new properties will therefore need to commute to get to work. There are already huge pressures on Worksop's commuting infrastructure. For example, the connecting roads in and out of Worksop to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country roads that are already full of traffic during peak commuter periods. Also, the train service from Worksop to Sheffield is poor, unreliable, and often full to capacity during peak commuting periods.	There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>On many occasions have witnessed people not being allowed on trains during peak times because the train was too full. Building over 1000 new houses on Peaks Hill will result in a massive increase in people commuting in and out of Worksop by road and rail. Building a new road on Peaks Hill and a few new roundabouts in the area will not resolve the significant congestion issues that will be created when the number of commuters using the roads around Worksop substantially increases. Also modernising Worksop train station or eventually building a train station in the new Garden Village will not improve the actual efficiency of the train service to and from Worksop when more commuters start to use it. Worksop Town Centre is very poorly maintained, with no major shops or restaurants to attract people to visit it. If over 1000 new homes are built in Worksop it will just result in a significant increase in people travelling by road and rail to other nearby Towns and Cities to shop and socialise, with only minimal benefit to the economy of Worksop. It is not clear how the housing requirement for Worksop in this plan has been determined. A huge volume of new housing has already been developed in Worksop in recent years e.g. in the Gateford area. The plan should explain in more detail why the Council believes Worksop needs thousands of additional houses on top of what it already has, and why other areas of Bassetlaw (e.9. some of the villages in the area) are not being subjected to such extensive development work. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm and destroying this greenfield area will significantly increase pollution in the area at time when Councils should be doing all they can to improve the environment and mitigate the impact of climate change Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm will have an adverse impact on the established wildlife in the area including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards, frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, and insect population. The proposal to build a road across Peaks Hill to connect Blyth Road and Carlton Road will increase the pollution from noise and fumes in this area. Councils are supposed to be implementing plans to help to reduce the impact on climate change and pollution (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with that approach.</p> <p>If my concerns are over-ruled my feedback is as follows:- totally against the development of a walkway between Westerdale and the new Peaks Hill Housing Estate. The proposal to develop an estate of over 1,000 new houses behind where we live is bad enough. However, building a walkway/cycle path to link Westerdale to this estate will attract anti-social behaviour to the front of where we live. The existing walkways in this area attract fly tipping, dog fouling, rough sleepers, graffiti, and a wide range of other anti-social behaviour. If my feedback re this is ignored and a walkway is developed it needs to be well away from my property and in a position where the public will not have to pass my property when they access it. There should be a green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. This buffer zone should be a minimum of 20 metres from the border of these properties. Existing hedgerows at the rear of the properties on Westerdale should be retained as part of the buffer zone. The new dwellings nearest to Westerdale should have their gardens positioned so they back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and the new houses that are being built. Any social housing that is developed on this housing estate should be located well away from cunent houses on Westerdale. The development should maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment on this estate. It should also retain existing wooded areas and as many hedgerows as possible. Against the development of a road being built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm. If this is built it needs to be located wellaway from existing homes on Westerdale. Any "green technology'that is developed needs to be located well away from existino homes on Westerdale.</p>	<p>requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of Peaks Hill Farm will bring jobs to Worksop and other sites are identified close to Worksop on the A57. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely in the area's road network with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. Rail services are a matter for Northern Rail. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. New homes in Worksop will support the regeneration of the Town Centre. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site.</p> <p>Good connections to the surrounding residential area are essential to ensure new and existing residents can access services and facilities by walking and cycling. No decision has been made regarding the location of the connecting routes. The policy identifies a green buffer along the site boundary to help protect residential amenity. Improved and enhanced green infrastructure is an important aspect of the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			Peaks Hill Farm proposal. These are a requirement of the policy. Retention of woodland and tree planting is a requirement of the Local Plan (five trees per dwelling). The employment area is proposed to be located on the northern boundary some distance from existing residents homes.
REF114	Resident	<p>Totally against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The proposal to build a new housing estate consisting of over 1000 houses, plus business premises will mean that residents in the area will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption, and inconvenience for many years to come. For many elderly residents, who cannot afford to move, the devastating impact of developing this estate will last for the rest of their lives.</p> <p>The Draft Plan does not appear to address the adverse impact caused by the massive increase in commuters going in and out of worksop by road and rail if this huge new housing estate is built. The employment opportunities in Worksop are extremely limited and this will remain the case even if new businesses are developed on Peaks Hill. Most people buying these new properties will therefore need to commute to get to work. There are already huge pressures on Worksop's commuting infrastructure. For example, the connecting roads in and out of Worksop to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country roads that are already full of traffic during peak commuter periods. Also, the train service from Worksop to Sheffield is poor, unreliable, and often full to capacity during peak commuting periods. On many occasions have witnessed people not being allowed on trains during peak times because the train was too full. Building over 1000 new houses on Peaks Hill will result in a massive increase in people commuting in and out of Worksop by road and rail. Building a new road on Peaks Hill and a few new roundabouts in the area will not resolve the significant congestion issues that will be created when the number of commuters using the roads around worksop substantially increases. Also modernising worksop train station or eventually building a train station in the new Garden Village will not improve the actual efficiency of the train service to and from Worksop when more commuters start to use it. Worksop Town Centre is very poorly maintained, with no major shops or restaurants to attract people to visit it. If over 1000 new homes are built in worksop it will just result in a significant increase in people travelling by road and rail to other nearby Towns and Cities to shop and socialise, with only minimal benefit to the economy of Worksop. It is not clear how the housing requirement for Worksop in this plan has been determined. A huge volume of new housing has already been developed in Worksop in recent years e.s., in the Gateford area. The plan should explain in more detail why the Council believes Worksop needs thousands of additional houses on top of what it already has, and why other areas of Bassetlaw (e.g. some of the villages in the area) are not being subjected to such extensive development work. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm and destroying this greenfield area will significantly increase pollution in the area at time when Councils should be doing all they can to improve the environment and mitigate the impact of climate change. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm will have an adverse impact on the established wildlife in the area including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards, frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, and insect population. The proposal to build a road across Peaks Hill to connect Blyth Road and Carfton Road will increase the pollution from noise and fumes in this area. Councils are supposed to be implementing plans to help to reduce the impact on Climate change and pollution (e.g. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with that approach. If my concerns are over-ruled, my feedback is as follows:-totally against the development of a walkway between Westerdale and the new Peaks Hill Housing Estate. The proposal to develop an estate of over 1,000 new houses behind where we live is bad enough. However, building a walkway/cycle path to link Westerdale to this estate will attract anti-social behaviour to the front of where we live. The existing walkways in this area attract fly tipping, dog fouling, rough sleepers, graffiti, and a wide range of other anti-social behaviour. If my feedback re this is ignored and a walkway is developed it needs to be well away from my property and in a position where the public will not have to pass my property when they access it.. There should be a green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. This buffer zone should be a minimum of 20 metres from the border of these properties. Existing hedgerows at the rear of the properties on Westerdale should be retained as part of the buffer zone. The new dwellings nearest to Westerdale should have their gardens positioned so they back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and the new houses that are being built. Any social housing that is developed on this housing estate should be located well away from current houses on Westerdale. The development should maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment on this estate. It should also retain existing wooded areas and as many hedgerows as possible. Against the development of a road being built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm. If this is built it needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale. Any "green technology" that is developed needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale.</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of Peaks Hill Farm will bring jobs to Worksop and other sites are identified close to Worksop on the A57. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely in the area's road network with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. Rail services are a matter for Northern Rail. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. New homes in Worksop will support the regeneration of the Town Centre. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site.</p> <p>Good connections to the surrounding residential area are essential to ensure new and existing residents can access services and facilities by walking and cycling. No decision has been made regarding the location of the connecting routes. The policy identifies a green buffer along the site boundary to help protect residential amenity. Improved and enhanced green infrastructure is an important aspect of the Peaks Hill Farm proposal. These are a requirement of the policy. Retention of woodland and tree planting is a requirement of the Local Plan (five trees per dwelling). The employment area is proposed to be located on the northern boundary some distance from existing residents homes.</p>
REF115	Resident	<p>Totally against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm, within the Basseflaw Local Plan. The proposal to build a new housing estate consisting of over 1000 houses, plus business premises will mean that residents in the area will be subject to the noise, pollution, disruption, and inconvenience for many years to come. For many elderly residents, who cannot afford to move, the devastating impact of developing this estate will last for the rest of their lives. The Draft Plan does not appear to address the adverse impact caused by the massive increase in commuters going in and out of worksop by road and rail if this huge new housing estate is built. The employment opportunities in Worksop are extremely limited and this will remain the case even if new businesses are developed on Peaks Hill. Most people buying these new properties will therefore need to commute to get to work. There are already huge pressures on Worksop's commuting infrastructure. For example, the connecting roads in and out of Worksop to the A1 and M1 are congested single lane, country roads that are already full of traffic during peak commuter periods. Also, the train service from Worksop to Sheffield is poor, unreliable, and ofien full to capacity during peak commuting periods. On many occasions have witnessed people not being allowed on trains during peak times because the train was too full. Building over 1000 new houses on Peaks Hillwill result in a massive increase in people commuting in and out of Worksop by road and rail. Building a new road on Peaks Hilland a few new roundabouts in the area will not resolve the significant congestion issues that will be created when the number of commuters using the roads around worksop substantially increases. Also modernising Worksop train station or eventually building a train station in the new Garden Village will not improve the actual efficiency of the train service to and from Worksop when more commuters start to use it. Worksop Town Centre is very poorly maintained, with no major shops or restaurants to attract people to visit it. If over 1000 new homes are built in Worksop it will just result in a significant increase in people travelling by road and railto other nearby Towns and Cities to shop and socialise, with only minimal benefit to the economy of Worksop. It is not clear how the housing requirement for Worksop in this plan has been determined. A huge volume of new housing has already been developed in Worksop in recent years e.g, in the Gateford area. The plan should explain in more detailwhy the Council believes Worksop needs thousands of additional houses on top of what it already has, and why other areas of Bassetlaw (e.9. some of the villages in the area) are not being subjected to such extensive development work. Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm and destroying this greenfield area will significantly increase pollution in the area at time when Councils should be doing all they can to improve the environment and mitigate the impact of climate change Developing a new housing estate on Peaks Hill Farm will have an adverse impad on the established wildlife in the area including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards, frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, and insect population. The proposal to build a road across Peaks Hill to</p>	<p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of Peaks Hill Farm will bring jobs to Worksop and other sites are identified close to Worksop on the A57. The</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>connect Blyth Road and Carfton Road will increase the pollution from noise and fumes in this area. Councils are supposed to be implementing plans to help to reduce the impact on Climate change and pollution (e.9. Clean Air Zones) and this is not in accordance with that approach. If my concerns are over-ruled, my feedback is as follows:- totally against the development of a walkway between Westerdale and the new Peaks Hill Housing Estate. The proposal to develop an estate of over 1,000 new houses behind where we live is bad enough. However, building a wallway/cycle path to link Westerdale to this estate will attract anti-social behaviour to the frant of where we live. The existing walkways in this area attract fly tipping, dog fouling, rough sleepers, graffiti, and a wide range of other anti-social behaviour. If my feedback re this is ignored and a walkway is developed it needs to be well away from my property and in a position where the public will not have to pass my property when they access it. There should be a green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. This buffer zone should be a minimum of 20 metres ffrom the border of these properties. Existing hedgerows at the rear of the properties on Westerdale should be retained as part of the buffer zone. The new dwellings nearest to Westerdale should have their gardens positioned so they back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and the new houses that are being built. Any social housing that is developed on this housing estate should be located well away from current houses on Westerdale. The development should maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment on this estate. It should also retain existing wooded areas and as many hedgerows as possible. Against the development of a road being built to link Blyth Road and Carlton Road through Peaks Hill Farm. If this is built it needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale. Any "green technology" that is developed needs to be located well away from existing homes on Westerdale.</p>	<p>Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely in the area's road network with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. Rail services are a matter for Northern Rail. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. New homes in Worksop will support the regeneration of the Town Centre. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site.</p> <p>Good connections to the surrounding residential area are essential to ensure new and existing residents can access services and facilities by walking and cycling. No decision has been made regarding the location of the connecting routes. The policy identifies a green buffer along the site boundary to help protect residential amenity. Improved and enhanced green infrastructure is an important aspect of the Peaks Hill Farm proposal. These are a requirement of the policy. Retention of woodland and tree planting is a requirement of the Local Plan (five trees per dwelling). The employment area is proposed to be located on the northern boundary some distance from existing residents homes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF119	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>In response to the first Draft Local Plan, in January 2020, raised objections to the inclusion of the field adjacent to the A60, at the western end of the proposed Peaks Hill site. I objected (as did many others) to the loss of amenity from loss of beautiful countryside and open views. The wooded ridge, running NE from G4S on the A60 at south of this site to N of Peaks Hill Farm itself, was I felt, a natural topographical boundary between Worksop and the open countryside which slopes downhill towards Carlton in Lindrick. Very pleased that planners and developers have listened to reasoned arguments and have now designated the triangular field, adjacent to the A60, a piece of ‘green infrastructure’ (hope this will be managed as a flower meadow?) within the development site. Therefore the wooded ridge, referred to above, becomes the effective boundary of the residential development. It is vital, as the plan develops, to ensure that this field and the open views, are protected.</p> <p>Believe consideration should be given to designating the woods within the site as a community woodland, developing access paths, while at the same time enhancing the management of the woods for the benefit of wildlife. Covid lockdowns have shown how much access to nature, and woodland especially, is valued by people for exercise and mental health. Still have concerns and wish to make a number of points that I hope will be incorporated into the design of the site – First, the new access road will still run through the field to join the A60. It remains to be seen what Highways engineers will say on the siting of this road but I have concerns on a number of issues – This is a dangerous stretch of the A60, particularly on the hill/bend nr Peaks Hill farm with a history of fatal accidents. There will also be considerable visual impact of the road on the landscape. The road will create a new link to the A57, by traffic using the new road to bypass the north of Worksop, travel along the A60 towards Carlton, turning into Owday Lane, then Woodsetts rd to travel to the A57 roundabout. Both the A60 and the minor road of Owday lane (with two lots of Z bends) are very busy with frequent accidents. To minimise the impact of the above – the new road should take a line towards the south of the site, nearer to Worksop, so a new roundabout could be built at the new rd/A60 junction just south of Freshfields. Traffic will therefore be more likely to travel on the Eddison Park/Ashes Park road through Gateford estate to join Gateford Rd and then on to the A57. The road through Gateford, with its roundabouts and traffic lights at Gateford Rd junction, is a much safer route for any increased traffic than Owday lane. To minimise the visual impact, the new road will need to be screened by planting large numbers of grown trees along its length, matching the species in the surrounding woods. In the plan, the northern boundary of the site is to be screened by a planted belt of trees and want to emphasise how important that is, in terms of visually screening the houses from Red lane to the north and creating that ‘green buffer’ between Worksop and Carlton – and also to act as a corridor for wildlife. A welcome aspect of the plan is to provide cycling and walking routes within the site. To realise the full potential for greener/active travel by residents, these cycle/walking routes will have to connect to the wider Worksop and Carlton communities. There should be a wide shared use cycle/pedestrian path alongside the new road and joining the A60. From there, safe cycle/walk crossing of the A60 and safe routes into Worksop/Carlton should be provided in both N/S directions. How that should be achieved is not relevant to this site but is relevant to the plans of both Bassetlaw District and Notts County Councils, so therefore I’ve set out below in an appendix, some suggestions, but of course, it would need consultation with experts and landowners to achieve the connecting routes. Still have concerns about the large scale of this development in open countryside and the limited provision of affordable housing. Recognise that Worksop will need to grow to prosper and welcome the consideration that has been given to sustainable and landscape issues in this latest version of the plan. If my suggestions above are implemented then they will mitigate some of negative impacts and create positive opportunities in terms of creating a more sustainable and healthier community e.g. connecting cycle routes. Appendix – Cycle/walking routes connecting the site to Worksop and Carlton. The cycle route to Carlton would be simplest to achieve by widening the existing pavement alongside the A60 and re-designating it as shared use. An alternative, which would need the landowner’s agreement, would be to establish a safe and durable surfaced route from the northern boundary of the site to Red lane, and then on to Carlton (it needs to be considered by experts on how practical it is to make this connection). A cycle route into Worksop could be achieved by a shared use path from the new roundabout on the A60, south alongside the A60 and along the wide pavements on Eddison Park Ave (re-designated shared use) to join the existing cycle route that goes through the Gateford estate, south to the Toucan crossing on Raymouth Lane and then the ‘cycle lane’ along Valley Rd to Valley School. The route would then have to be extended to provide safe access to the town centre. Hope the developers, County Council and District Council can cooperate to achieve this vision of safe, sustainable travel, connecting the site to the wider community, schools, shops and employment.</p>	Support for retaining the open field next to the A60 and for the defensible northern boundary are welcome. The policy requires a community woodland on site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. The road line for the link road has yet to be confirmed. Any provision for a new road requires safe cycle access to be designed in. The use of developer contributions are governed by national legislation; to that where there is a proven link to the impact generated by a development. Requiring the developer to fund a cycle lane into Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick would be unreasonable. But new and improved cycle routes which connect to existing routes are required by the policy.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF031	Resident	Now see that they are indicating where the proposed playing fields are planned. The question is what security are you planning for the properties which are there now on 2 sides, mine being one. Have now an undesirable element of off road bikes quads and people coming off the A60. Let alone the projected noise element. This will not be conducive for senior citizens to enjoy the use of their gardens. No doubt having read this you will file it with no further action or thoughts. Regret dearly moving to Worksop all those years ago you could drive down Bridge Street. Yes it was a large village but we were proud to be a part of it. Sadly we have people of the caliber of the Council overseeing the place. Very disappointed.	Policy ST37 Design Quality requires development to be designed to address crime and the fear of crime by ensuring there is natural surveillance through the incorporation of active frontages onto the street. Cycle and walking routes are also required to be designed to promote natural surveillance, thereby creating safe spaces. The detailed design of the site will be taken forward through a masterplan framework, and then a planning application. Through that process, which will involve community engagement, residents will be able to see how the amenity of existing properties will be protected.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 80, Para 7.2.9 – Financial Contributions – it is a little unclear where these financial contributions should come from. If they are to be from a developer then that should be clarified and noted.	Policy ST60 Provision and delivery of infrastructure makes it clear that developers will be required to contribute towards the delivery of any necessary infrastructure. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document. As such, no amendments are necessary to Policy 17.
REF153	Natural England	Welcome the requirements set out within the section on Green Infrastructure & Biodiversity which aims to retain the woodland setting, make connections to surrounding natural habitats and to provide climate resilience.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the additional criteria for protecting landscape, views and heritage assets. This should also alleviate some at least of the concerns expressed by residents.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF048	Resident	Against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm Policy 15 within the Bassetlaw Local plan. 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. 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. 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 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 centre of employment hubs thus shortening the commute. Loss of prime local farm land is in the light of climate change is also to be deplored. 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. Should my concerns be over-ruled I would like to see:- A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. A little like farmers wildlife margins around their fields Sympathetic development arrangements planning gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing and new homes. Any communal area to be centrally located in the new development and away from the existing homes. Provision of Low level housing near any existing homes such as bungalows not higher-rise town houses.	There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify when infrastructure is to be delivered, it will be phased to support the development. This will be secured via planning conditions and legal agreement.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>This will include transport provision. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of employment land will be provided on Peaks Hill Farm and further employment land will be provided close to Worksop along the A57. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The Policy requires development to be of a high quality and makes provision for a green buffer around the edge of the site to protect amenity. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. The Local plan requires the development to provide for a housing mix that meets local needs. This could include low level accommodation.</p>
REF050	Resident	<p>Opposed to the plan to build 1000+ houses on the fields around Peak Hill Farm, 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 1000+ houses on one site, could be classed as 'green' by planting a few trees, is 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. It's impossible to get an appointment at the Larwood Surgery, given another 1000+ 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 unnecessary houses, puts that at risk for generations to come. The road and rail network is currently inadequate for the current population; with the addition of 1000+ 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. 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 least 15+ meters and the existing hedgerow be retained . This should contain a mixture of deciduous and ever-green trees to a) reduce the amount of noise pollution, and b) to stop the existing residents from being overlooked by any new development, and c) to give the wild-life some refuge. It should be a permanent fixture with NO public right of way, and should be made into law that no builder can ever infringe up on it. It should also be designed not to encourage any form of criminal or anti-social behaviour. Would expect that no properties be built that exceed 2 stories, preferably 1 along the boundary. 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</p>	<p>In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of employment land will be provided on Peaks Hill Farm and further employment land will be provided close to Worksop along the A57. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. The policy requires developers to provide financial contribution to improve health facilities, including GP surgeries and the policy identifies land for secondary school facilities on site. Nottinghamshire County Council</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		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. Strongly object to the top of Westerdale being 'opened up' to adjoining roads from the new estate, including cycle and foot access.	state that there is sufficient capacity in Worksop primary schools to accommodate the growth associated with the site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The Policy requires development to be of a high quality and makes provision for a green buffer around the edge of the site to protect amenity and states the mature hedgerows be retained. The design policy states that development should design out crime and anti social behaviour. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. The policy requires pedestrian and cycle access between the site and Thievesdale. The location of the link has not yet been agreed. There will be no vehicular access between the existing and new development.
REF201	Severn Trent	Supportive of the approach to incorporate Multifunctional connected green infrastructure, where this contains SuDS features it could be used to manage surface water sustainably and convey it safely through the development. Recommend that section 3 of the policy also refers to the incorporation of SuDS to manage surface water sustainably delivering against the 4 key principles of SuDS. A statement regarding Water efficiency and the promotion of the 110l/p/d water efficiency target are included as a requirement. Peaks Hill Farm site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF218	Resident-member of Residents Against Peaks Hill Farm Development	Peaks Hill Farm will have severe and irreparable damage to the environment and wildlife i.e. deer, birds, blue tits, blackbirds, sparrow's, house and hedge, fieldfare's, buzzard's, crows and many more, rabbits, hares and all types of insects. Every morning the crow's leave there roosts and fly from West to East and back again at night times vary with the time of year, the roosts are beyond the Long Plantation in the woods to the West. What are Council planning to do with the crows, send in the bailiffs to evict them or rehouse them or just leave them to find new roosts? When the developers move in to cut the trees down, as they did with the magnificent Silver Birch tree near the entrance to the existing development what a loss to this area a local landmark, and also some of the crow's sat in this tree in the daytime. What is going to happen to the Long Plantation will this also be cut down and lost forever? The Council seen to be hell bent on building house's on Green Belt land mostly farm land surely since Brexit we need the farm land to produce more of our own food and not to rely on other countries. Most of the brownfield sites around the area have been used for building supermarkets and fast food outlets, why not houses instead and leave the green belt area's for future generations to enjoy. With the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic we need more than ever our open space's. As for the link road all we will see instead of the crow's moving from West to East and East to West will be boy racer's and lorries going up and down, with some of the lorries turning into the large warehousing complex at the BLYTH ROAD end, which will no doubt get much bigger when the road is built. The hospital's, doctor's surgeries, school's, transport system's are struggling to cope now what will it be like in the future with this influx to the population? Just one more thought it will truly and literally be a MURDER OF CROWS.	Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The policy states that the majority of trees will be protected and any loss should be re-provided on site. Bassetlaw does not have any green belt. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement.
REF219	Resident-member of Residents Against Peaks Hill Farm Development	Peaks Hill Farm will destroy the aspects of the north end of Worksop and do severe damage to the environment. Not forgetting all the wildlife that frequent the woodland adjacent to the Long Plantation. At present we have the pleasure of watching the deer, rabbits, hares, hedgehogs and numerous species of birds and insects. There is a family of jays, hawks, sparrowhawks amongst the more common birds ie robins, jenny wren, dunnoek, blue tits, blackbirds, sparrows, chaffinch etc also what will happen to the beautiful skylark that nests on the ground on the long plantation? Never thought for one minute that a housing estate would be built at the rear of my bungalow. My late husband and myself purchased our property for our last forever home as near to the countryside that we could afford. In 1999 when we purchased the property the solicitor told us that there would never be any kind of buildings on the above stated land as it is green belt land! Since Brexit and leaving the EU the farmers lose their subsidies, but the Government has said that they will pay the farmers to plant trees on their farmland as this will help with the Climate Change! Also with Covid 19 pandemic would have thought that the U.K would be better to grow our crops locally and not having to rely on other countries (we are a greener, cleaner country). I believe that all green belt land should be kept in tact for our future generations to enjoy. Don't know how the local infrastructure is going to cope. The Bassetlaw Hospital is at breaking point shipping patients out to Doncaster Royal Infirmary whilst we have got ward closures. Trying to see a Doctor is like trying to see Royalty and it's not just so because of the Covid 19 pandemic. The police are never seen, the police station and courthouse are closed so offenders have to be taken to Mansfield etc. Don't know how the	Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The policy states that the majority of trees will be protected and any loss should be re-provided on site. Bassetlaw does not have any green belt. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>ambulance and fire services will cope with more influx. The local schools cannot cope, but you do say new ones will be built like the ones that were supposed to be built on other new estates! There will be more roads so that means more traffic, more deadly fumes and more oversized lorries going in and out of the warehousing complex off Blyth Road. Will the warehouse site be extended and also what will happen to the tip that was covered over and has a chimney/pipe stuck in it? (Presumably for the release of gasses!) At the entrance to the outgoing site off Thievesdale Lane, there was a magnificent Silver Birch tree, who gave permission for it to be cut down and thrown behind the hedge? (Probably hoping that no one would ever notice that it had been removed). Area of Thievesdale Lane, Carlton Road and Blyth Road will not be able to cope with a big influx to the population.</p>	<p>number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Infrastructure Delivery plan and the draft policy identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at peaks Hill Farm. This includes a financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. Nottinghamshire Police, Ambulance, and Fire Service have been consulted on the Local Plan. No concerns have been raised regarding capacity of the services. The employment land at Carlton Forest will be expanded to provide space for more businesses. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development.</p>
REF214	Historic England	<p>Historic England has no objections in principle to the potential concept plan. It is not clear whether the HER has been consulted as part of the Plan process and wish to stress that your archaeological advisors should be consulted on the concept plan. The landscape is Iron Age, and there is evidence of a Roman settlement and associated farming as indicated by aerial photo enclosure features on adjacent land. There is potentially an extant earthwork - a boundary is visible in the long plantation area on EA Lidar running NE-SW and legible into arable field to NE within the proposed allocation site. Aware that a geophysical survey has been undertaken in relation to the land west of Blyth Road which may be of assistance. In addition, the (site of) Pen Cottage is shown on 1st edition OS. Note the comments in supporting text paragraph 7.2.12 relating to the aircraft crash site and the 'equivalent status of a scheduled monument'. It would be helpful for any substantiation of that statement within the text. It is recommended that the statement, or the subsequent sentence, be reworded as the text implies that a memorial is required on the basis of the scheduled monument assumption which is misleading since a memorial would relate to the incident that occurred and the life lost rather than heritage designation status.</p>	<p>As confirmed in the updated Historic Environment Assessment (2021), the HER and Lincs Archaeology have both been consulted. No objections have been received from either parties. Lincs Archaeology has indicated that archaeology can be addressed through the development management process. Paragraph 7.2.12 has been amended to remove 'equivalent status of a scheduled monument'.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF220	Resident	<p>Concerned about the amount of development proposed for Worksop. In particular Peaks Hill Farm site. Houses are already being built on this site and some appear to be lived in. So the council is conducting a Public Consultation on housing already built. The proposed site is a very large area of farmland which slopes quite steeply down to Blyth Road and Carlton Road. The area of Carlton Road that runs along where the development would be gets a lot of water on it in heavy rain and does flood across the road near Red Lane. Has any consideration been given to how concreting over such a large area of steep farmland could cause more significant flooding along Blyth Road and Carlton Road? Concerned about new access road that is being built running from Blyth Road through to Carlton Road. The area of Carlton Road where the through road would have to exit has had several accidents, some of them fatal, over the years and there is no clear line of sight where traffic would be able to see vehicles pulling out onto Carlton Road. This will be quite dangerous. Concerned about how close this development will come to Carlton, both on the Carlton Road and Blyth Road ends. Already being advanced upon by the rapidly growing Ashes Park/Eddison Park development. The houses there can now be seen from Owday Lane and Carlton Road. How many more houses are going to be built there on farmland and how close to Carlton are they going to come? Is Carlton eventually going to be swallowed up by Worksop and stop being a separate village?</p>	<p>The site under development was granted planning permission in June 2018 (15/01477/OUT). The Council is not consulting on the housing development consented, rather the neighbouring land. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has not identified any significant flood risk issues. However a flood risk assessment will be required to inform the masterplan and planning application. This will include provision of mitigation to address surface water run-off. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used.</p>
REF221	Resident	<p>As I live on Westerdale am very interested in this, attended the public meeting in early 2020 and I also wrote to BDC at the time. Will repeat my views. Broadly in favour of the development, realise new housing is needed and targets are set by government. See the access road going through the estate as a positive. The speed limit of 30mph on Blyth Road is not adhered to very well and the signage is poor. Hopefully the new junction, a roundabout I think, and Blyth Road will help to filter and slowdown traffic as well as becoming a link road to the by-pass. Reservations:- When I was interested in buying my existing property in 1982 the Ashes Park development was proposed. Went to the town hall to look at the plans. They included a doctor's surgery at what is now known as Monty's Meadow, shops, a public house, a play area and a school. The school was built but it was too small and St John's was extended. So most of this didn't happen and are forty years on. Main concern for Peaks Hill is that the same will happen. An area of this size needs the infrastructure plus public transport to be put in at a very early stage, not forgotten as appears to be the case with Ashes Park. A doctor's surgery is a must, as a patient of Larwood must say appointments are in short supply. Hope that accommodation for mixed age groups is preferable. Interested in Worksop and surrounding area. Have taken a lot of time to write this. Hope it is of some use and would appreciate feedback or new information when available.</p>	<p>Support for the principle of the scheme is welcome. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1670232	Resident	Object to any building on farmland and woodland. The biodiversity and food production will most likely never be recovered. Further development within Carlton parish boundaries can only erode its village character and blur the distinction between Carlton and Worksop. Carlton residents voted for the village plan having been led to believe that doing so would limit development within the village to less than we have already seen since. The plans in the first section for Good Quality Design and Local Character, while along the right lines, are not enough. Similar assurances were given over the development east of the A60 at Hawfinch Place and they have not been implemented. The country cannot need any more greenfield developments of three- and four-bedroom detached houses when the countryside is already filling up with them. What is needed to solve the housing crisis is affordable housing, and this should be built on brownfield sites.	There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Policy ST42 Biodiversity and Geodiversity requires development to deliver at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity on the site. The policy identifies a green gap between Carlton and Worksop, which provides a defensible boundary between Worksop built up area (including this site) and Carlton settlement. There is also a strong belt of trees separating the two settlements which will be retained. 20% of new homes on site will be affordable housing.
1670552	Resident	Against Peaks Hill farm and would like to make the following points: 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 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. Currently Worksop's secondary schools are almost at capacity and as Valley has been over-subscribed for the past 3 years in year 7 the residents of this development would not have a secondary school and possibly a primary school within walking distance. This will put added pressure on the infrastructure. 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. 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. There is also the issue of the impact of covid 19 and whether people will be able to afford to buy these homes once they are built. Increased commuting will add to pollution, traffic and reliance on poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield and Doncaster. Certain parts of Worksop such as the Cannon crossroads and the mini roundabout at the bottom of Kilton Hill will not be sufficient for the extra traffic coming into Worksop and whilst the new road will connect with Eddison Park Avenue, people will not drive through Gateford if they are wanting to go into town or to a supermarket or to get to school with the exception of Gateford Park. The site will mean loss of prime local food growing land when Councils should be helping to mitigate climate change. The site will contribute to the loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop’s local character. The site will effect and cause the loss of our established local wildlife and green environment – birds (including sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards), frogs, toads, newts, bats, hares, hedgehogs, deer as well as insect population. <u>If my concerns are over-ruled, I want to see:</u> 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	The Local Plan states the site will provide for at least 1000 dwellings. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement. In accordance with national Policy (NPPF), the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing and employment need. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment evidences the housing figures and also evidences the level of job growth that will be supported on employment allocations. 10ha of employment land will be provided on Peaks Hill Farm and further employment land will be provided close to Worksop along the A57. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation,

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) Minimal or environmentally friendly 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. Affordable housing to be sited at the other side of the development away from existing homes and close to the road. Access on to existing estates including the top of Winster Grove to not be facilitated. This is a narrowish and steep hill and my concern would be that people on bikes could come flying down the hill and be hit by a car coming the other way or they hit the children who play in the street when the weather allows. People who bought their homes on Ambleside, Winster and Appleby including elderly residents did so because of it being a small estate with dead end streets and due to the presence of the woodland and farmland behind. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes and 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 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’! (as stated in the plan) Ensure that the road built is not able to be used as a race track by putting in traffic calming and islands so residents can cross safely. This road is going to generate a lot of traffic cutting through to get to the A1 or the A57 depending on which direction they are travelling in.</p>	<p>including the new link road. Financial contributions will be sought via the policy for improvements to Cannon Crossroads and Kilton mini roundabouts. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. 10% biodiversity net gain will enhance biodiversity value on site. The Policy requires development to be of a high quality and makes provision for a green buffer around the edge of the site to protect amenity. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. The design policy requires parking to be provided in accordance with Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing. The Distributor Road will be required to meet the highway standards adopted by Nottinghamshire County Council. The Policy requires: Well-connected street patterns that deliver high quality, safe and direct walking, cycling and public transport routes through the development.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
1670598	Resident	<p>Concerned about the increased urban sprawl that the development proposes, impacting those in Carlton in Lindrick as well as those in the land adjacent to the proposed development. The huge number of houses planned for this development (1000) will not only impact local wildlife and the beautiful views, but the rural gap between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick as well. The view is irreplaceable. Once built on, it will be lost. Whilst the rural gap between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick is being proposed to be maintained, the precedent being set is a dangerous one that states that if new homes need to be built, to build them in the north of Worksop on green land. Increasingly, with Gateford being developed, that appears to be the trend. The new proposed road which has the potential to become very busy as it could serve to direct traffic away from the current canon cross roads if you're coming from the Gateford/the north rural villages and instead direct traffic through the site if you wanted to get to the east of Worksop. This will mean potentially more noise pollution and the potential for accidents.</p>	<p>The policy identifies a green gap between Carlton and Worksop, which provides a defensible boundary between Worksop built up area (including this site) and Carlton settlement. There is also a strong belt of trees separating the two settlements which will be retained. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. Financial contributions will be sought via the policy for improvements to Cannon Crossroads and Kilton mini roundabouts. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development.</p>
1671174	Resident	<p>Despite stating that following the consultation in January more details would be shared, this is not the case. On the Peaks Hill Farm Concept Plan there are still no confirmed plans for link roads. This infrastructure could have a devastating impact on existing homes.</p>	<p>The Concept Plan was produced following the January 2020 consultation, and in response to the comments made. The concept plan indicates where different land uses could go, this information was previously not available. The alignment of the new link road will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority, work is underway. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement.</p>
1671189	Resident	<p>Support the proposals set out in this latest draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. While there has been a clear evolution of proposals from the January 2020 consultation, will reiterate my comments. Acknowledging the relatively constrained nature of Worksop, 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 to Worksop. As such, any potential developer contributions that may be secured towards enhancement of existing community facilities should be allocated to Worksop-based facilities and not Carlton-in-Lindrick. Accepting the need for a comprehensive masterplan for the site, in the form of an SPD, the infrastructure provision highlighted at this stage, including a distributor road to link Carlton Road and Blyth Road is 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 would encourage a strong emphasis on connectivity in to and through the neighbouring estates. Current road connectivity within the Hemmingfields/Wensleydale estates is poor, consideration should be given to vehicular linkages for north-south connection. One such example would be at the northern end of Hemmingfield Rise, where 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</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. It indicates that the vast majority of infrastructure will be delivered in Worksop. Any improvements in Carlton in Lindrick would need to be based on evidence of need in relation to the impact the development would have on local services. The Local highways Authority do not require vehicular access to the existing development therefore the Policy is seeking</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>Westerdale, Bransdale and Colsterdale should also be considered as vehicular links as part of the masterplan, in the interests of a truly ‘connected’ development. The NPPF (para.110) does specify giving priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, within the scheme and within neighbouring areas, Manual for Streets and Notts County Council’s Highways Design Guide (NCCHDG) promote creation of networks of streets that provide permeability and connectivity to main destinations with a choice of routes, whilst also highlighting that connected or permeable networks lead to a more even spread of motor traffic throughout the area. In this case, allowing vehicular movements from the existing adjoining residential areas to utilise new access points on to Carlton Road and Blyth road could be expected to further reduce through traffic. Similarly, with ever increasing demand for home delivery services for convenience and comparison goods, vehicular connectivity would be of customer benefit by allowing delivery vehicles to make more direct connections. Although written in the context of planning applications, NCCHDG (para. 2.5) makes clear that developers should aim to provide multiple points of vehicular access onto the wider highway network where land availability and where the external road network permits. These access points should be to adoptable standards and available for general public. Where multiple points of vehicular access are not provided, the reasons for not doing so must be justified within the submission. Many residents are focused upon objecting in principle, of the opinion that this consultation represents a unique opportunity to influence the form of the new development and, to remedy the evident urban design short-comings of yesteryear. Every effort should be made to maximise connectivity and permeability that will benefit old and new residents alike. Again referencing NCCHDG (para. 2.7), ‘If there is a likelihood that adjacent land will come forward that can be practically served through the development in the future, suitable ransom free connections should be provided to maintain and enhance the movement framework’.</p>	walking and cycling connections only. Policy ST37 Design Quality is seeking to ensure developments are well connected and permeable.
REF079	Resident	<p>Formally object to the development of Peaks Hill Farm. The ancient woodland, which follows the contours of the ridge, and is an integral part of the land, is a beautiful natural vista visible from many of the local walks and bridleways. This provides a natural boundary between the settlements of Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick, with its historic conservation area of South Carlton. Once it is removed, altered, destroyed it is gone forever along with the deer, hedgerow creatures and birds which frequent this area. The natural beauty and historical division cannot be replaced. The proposed link road will carve another concrete scar through the ever dwindling countryside to facilitate even more speeding vehicles. The increase in vehicular traffic through Carlton in Lindrick over the past decade has increased massively. The introduction of a high speed link road from Blyth Road, which effectively links to the A1 and the Motorway network and the A60 Carlton Road can only add to the over capacity of the local road system with the inevitable noise, pollution and speed. With the capability and willingness of more people to work from home why is another high speed road necessary? What consideration has been given to the brave World War Two pilots whose plane crashed on Peaks Hill, with the loss of their lives. Is it right their sacrifice should be buried under concrete in the name of progress. Peaks Hill is locally known as the Sand Hills. A natural sponge to soak up water. Covering this natural flood management with houses and roads will push the water elsewhere. Carlton in Lindrick is at the bottom of the hill. Given the increase in flooding over recent years this potentially puts, Carlton in Lindrick, areas around Carlton and Worksop at greater risk of flooding. Surely with the development of the old Gateford Quarries, the farmland to the North West of Worksop towards Carlton in Lindrick and the land to the East of Thievsdale Lane for huge housing estates the North of Worksop has surrendered enough green and brown land to satisfy council targets without destroying further green land to fuel this unbalanced expansion of Worksop towards Carlton in Lindrick. The huge local opposition to the proposed development of Peaks Hill should be considered and acted on and the response from officers should show empathy rather than a cut and paste dialogue.</p>	<p>Whilst there are mature trees present, the woodland on the ridge is not designated ancient woodland. The policy requires the majority of the woodland to be retained and lost trees to be replaced on site. The policy identifies a green gap between Carlton and Worksop, which provides a defensible boundary between Worksop built up area (including this site) and Carlton settlement. There is also a strong belt of trees separating the two settlements which will be retained. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) the new link road is necessary to improve the traffic flow in Worksop and improve highways safety at key junctions. The Distributor Road will not be a ‘high speed’ link road. It will be a connecting route from Gateford and Blyth Road, and beyond to the A1. It will save time by reducing the length of the journey, not by increasing the speed of vehicles. The planning permission will be subject to conditions which address noise and</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>disruption during the construction stage. Development also is required to ensure residential amenity is protected (Policy 50 Protecting Amenity). There policy requires the crash site to be protected and added. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site.</p> <p>There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used.</p>
REF084	Resident	<p>Opposed the development for the following reasons. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty and ancient woodland. Destroying this is contrary to current ideas and policy on environment and global warming. It is a valuable asset to the people aesthetically and recreationally and promotes good mental health and well-being. It provides countless habitat for all manner of flora and fauna some of which are protected species. It is morally reprehensible to build on greenfield sites when there are many brownfield sites in Worksop that could and should be developed. A ton of cement produces almost a ton of the greenhouse gas Carbon Dioxide and a ton of steel even more. Building a thousand houses has a direct and indirect negative effect on global warming. More concrete means more chance of flooding, something the town has already endured. Where are the extra school places for the two thousand extra pupils in our already over-crowded schools. Where are the extra hospital places in our already overstretched hospital. Waiting lists will increase. Where is the extra land fill or recycling plant. More houses means more waste. Where are the extra roads for the commuting and recreation of these residents, Existing residents will face even more traffic congestion with the reduction in quality of life and increased accidents that will inevitably result. The environment takes another hit. Congested traffic produces more pollution. Don't suppose any thought has been given to upgrading electrical capacity and charging points?</p>	<p>The site is not designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or ancient woodland. However, the policy requires trees and woodland to be protected and any lost to be replaced. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. With regard to its recreational use, the site is privately owned and does not contain any public rights of way. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. The Local Plan contains policies which seek to</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>address the effects of climate change. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement. Nottinghamshire County Council is the Waste Authority. The Waste Local Plan has taken into consideration growth in the District. As such, it is not necessary to include policies relating to waste in the Local Plan. The Local Highway Authority has agreed the transport provision and any necessary financial contributions towards highway improvements. National Grid, Western Power, and Northern Powergrid have all been consulted on the Local Plan and they have not raised any concern about the capacity of the electricity network. A connection for a charging point is required for new dwellings.</p>
REF080	Resident	<p>Would like to re-confirm our objections we previously submitted. Very concerned that the green buffer will be in place prior to the building work starting, to minimise disruption and noise given that multiple builders will be building on the land but to also create a safe place for the wildlife during the building works. If you're planting trees they will take years to create the sort of boundary that would hope to be in place. If the plan does go ahead I would like the following points to be considered: A green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. Preferably building behind 'Long Plantation' (Figure 14 in the Draft Plan) or a minimum 15 metres from the existing housing on Westerdale, 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. 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 creating a 'concrete city' environment.</p>	<p>The policy identifies a green buffer to separate existing and new. The timing will be considered when a planning application is submitted. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. Green tree lined corridors are identified by the policy. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. The Plan requires a contribution of 5 trees per</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			dwelling which will be provided on site. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing.
REF081	Resident	Re-confirm our objections we previously submitted. Concerned that the green buffer will be in place prior to the building work starting, to limit disruption and noise given that multiple builders will be building on the land but to also create a safe place for the wildlife during the building works. If you're planting trees they will take years to create the sort of boundary that we would hope to be in place. If the plan does go ahead would like the following points to be considered: A green buffer zone between current homes on Westerdale and any new development. Preferably building behind 'Long Plantation' (Figure 14 in the Draft Plan) or a minimum 15 metres from the existing housing on Westerdale, 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. 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 creating a 'concrete city' environment.	The policy identifies a green buffer to separate existing and new. The timing will be considered when a planning application is submitted. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. The Plan requires all development to have appropriate car parking in line with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. Green tree lined corridors are identified by the policy. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. The Plan requires a contribution of 5 trees per dwelling which will be provided on site. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing.
REF083	Resident	Strongly object to Peaks Hill Farm. Visual / Aesthetics This area is an unusually beautiful and unique rolling sandhills terrain, offering a wonderful approach into Worksop (just before the sign showing "Worksop" is reached so does Worksop Council really have any business planning housing outside the town boundary?). The view to the East, just South of Peaks Hill Farm is so beautiful, it adds such great value to Worksop. The abomination of constructing a sprawling housing estate and road junction upon this astoundingly beautiful vista would reflect the brutality of you planners, apparently/evidently simply striving to meet the so called "Government Targets" of throwing up houses everywhere, no matter what! If you have interests and concerns about your town and the people you serve, you should eschew the Government's demands as Worksop is already full of unsustainable housing. Planners should say "No. We've had enough housing put upon us and we reject your bribes, Government!". The Sandhills and surrounding woodland have delighted my eyes for over 60 years	There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. The

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>now, whenever travelling to and from Worksop to Carlton in Lindrick. It would greatly sadden me and thousands of other residents in this region, to lose this area of natural beauty in your dash for a botched housing estate, evidently being rushed through to reach Government cash incentive targets now that Bassetlaw has apparently recently lost the Gamston Garden Village. You have a duty to serve us, not simply serve yourselves and you have a duty to not to follow your misguided leaders instructions. Urge you to retain your professional integrity as once these poor leaders are swept away in the next elections you will still be holding the can in your conscience (They will be swept away the same way as our town was swept away in November 2019 due to those poor leaders' dithering and inaction when begged to open the sluice gates but didn't until it was too late . . . and indeed we had been earlier swept away in 2007 after which these poor leaders have since failed to learn any lessons nor form any sensible flood prevention strategies). Road Safety Am a motorist, a motorcyclist, a cyclist and a pedestrian. One of my motorcyclist colleagues was recently killed at the very spot along the A60 where you are considering to construct houses and create a junction for a link road joining Blyth Road to the A60. The junction would be in the blind hollow / blind bend which is where my fellow motorcyclist was caught-out by a turning vehicle at the very spot you are considering creating a junction. Another one of my friends was killed on a motorcycle in an accident close to the Red Lane junction at the end of the 1970's. At this point along the A60, noticed that you now constantly have difficulty controlling water run-off from the Sandhills, and the road at this point is always constantly flooded when it rains. If you construct housing on this side of the Sandhills uphill of the A60 and build climbing roads to access these houses and construct a link road to the Blyth Road, the water run-off back down onto the A60 would become greatly exacerbated as is indeed proven by urbanisation / concreting / tarmacking over previously natural land, limiting natural drainage, causing rapid surface run-off. If you can't presently even control simple field run-off, little confidence that you could control the increased water run-off from this ill-considered estate onto the A60 in the future. Sadly, another young man was recently killed in a car crash, in between the Red Lane and the proposed housing estate and link road. This is another tragedy which reinforces the need to ensure that "A" roads are kept as safe as possible and be designed to have the least possible distractions / hazards and must be maintained correctly including road surfaces, drainage and you must not consider constructing junctions in hazardous blind spots and must not increase the risk of the flooding of this A road (A roads are designed to provide rapid safe links between major towns, not to be beset with hazards and restrictions - need progress not regression or restriction). Regarding the proposed link road and the construction of almost 1,000 of houses at the proposed Peaks Hill Farm, it is obvious that many more than 1,000 households would use this road. Since the construction of the sprawling Gateford Estate and the main access road off the A60 called Eddison Park Avenue, noticed so many more people seem to be using the small roads linking Wigthorpe with Blyth road as a rat-run to reach the A1, particularly during the rush hours. If you built this link road, then thousands of Gateford rat-runners would then use this road. Imagine that you would surround this road with Peaks Hill Farm housing and then suddenly be surprised regarding the huge increase in traffic and then would adopt your somewhat counter intelligent strategy of constructing hundreds of speed humps to slow the traffic down that you didn't really want! These counterintuitive practices would not be sensible engineering. It would reek of botched planning and the adoption of the usual hassle speed hump strategy adopted by thoughtless councils. Believe me, as a motorcyclist, these speed humps are potentially deadly, particularly when allowed to fall into disrepair which is frequently observed - and they are often not signed/painted correctly - and so can potentially catch out motorcyclists and unseat them, potentially leading to injury or death. So do you want a link road? Do you want a rat-run? Think this through carefully and sensibly. Do the Eddison Park Avenue people want the 1,000 homes' Peaks Hill Farm people rat-running through their estate to access the M1? Have you considered this too? Speed humps there too in the future? Ludicrous. Peaks Hill Farm is ill considered regarding transport. Already overloaded with traffic. More houses make more traffic, more pollution and more risk of accidents along rat-runs. Include a sap in your document regarding provision for cyclists and buses, but Peaks Hill Farm is very far away and uphill from the town centre (and far away from our pathetically small local industrial sites), so where are you imagining the cyclists would be going? Evidently not to their workplaces . . . as there seem to be no new local job opportunities associated with this unsustainable plan. Natural Habitats and Ancient Woodland On observance of the awful pink blot in the Bassetlaw plan, which illustrates Peaks Hill Farm, it is apparent that it involves the planned cutting down of some 15 acres of particularly beautiful ancient woodland immediately adjacent to the A60. This ancient woodland provides natural habitats for many species of trees, plants, animals, birds and bats and according to my father who is now 88, it was already a fully established habitat and looks exactly the same as when he was a boy, living in Langold and travelling to Worksop frequently to court my mother who is also 88. Another 15 or so acres of woodland in a half a kilometer strip right in the centre of the pink blot is also destined for the chop according to your plans. This would be shamefully hypocritical, as on the one hand you talk about "managing growth in a responsible way" and are then estolling "carbon offsetting and promoting green initiatives" in the Bassetlaw Plan, whilst on the other hand you are planning to cut down 30 acres of Natural Habitat, Ancient Woodland, Carbon Dioxide absorbing woodland in an area of particularly natural beauty of rolling sandhills where natural woodlands frame the view and the woods house Birds of Prey, English Wild Birds, Owls and Bats. This makes you</p>	<p>Local plan is delivering a Garden Village, just not at Gamston. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site. Initial ecology assessment has been undertaken. This did not identify any significant constraints to development of the site. Neither have Natural England and Notts Wildlife Trust. Further ecology assessments will be required through the development management process. 10% biodiversity net gain will be a requirement of the proposal to enhance biodiversity value on site. There is no designated ancient woodland on the site. The policy protects the majority of trees on site and requires lost trees to be replaced on site. Bassetlaw District Council's Environmental Health Team and the Environment Agency have not identified any concerns with the landfill site and state there are expected to be no pollution concerns associated with the development. Peaks Hill Farm includes new job opportunities associated with the 10.6 Hectares of employment land. It also include new services (local centre, primary school, etc) all which would generate jobs opportunities. There are also a number of other employment sites near to Worksop along the A57 supporting local opportunities for jobs. These include in offices, industry and logistics. The number of people commuting out for work is comparable with that in-commuting. The way people work is changing, working from home is becoming more prevalent due to advances in technology. This is likely to increase due to recent events relating to the pandemic. As such, commuting is likely to decline in the future.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>hypocrites. Suggest the words of platitude you print are merely a diversion to hide your intentions. Every tonne of cement produces around 700kg of CO2. How much cement would be used to construct all of these 1,000 houses at Peaks Hill Farm? How much gas/electricity would their heating systems produce all of the time thereafter following construction? Local Landfill and Local Industries Towards the North of the planned abomination, Peaks Hill Farm borders a VERY toxic (Carlton Forest - an abandoned site) landfill which still emits bad odours, emits methane and oozes deadly leachates. This landfill is built in a redundant quarry sitting in the Sandstone Aquifer / catchment, which according to the local topography may well be allowing toxic leachate flows towards the land that this proposed estate is planned to sit upon. . . And of course when the prevailing wind doesn't prevail, the opposing winds could also blow the toxic landfill stench across the houses frequently. Towards the North East of the planned estate, there is a bone rendering / tallow / animal feed factory which is also odorous and could alarm the new residents when the prevailing wind ever changed direction. Sustainability Noticed that in an earlier version of the Bassetlaw Plan, you printed that 17,000 people travel out of Bassetlaw per day for work. Noticed that you have since removed this in the latest version, i.e. redacted this information. Imagine you have removed this out of shame, trying to disguise what I have to say now regarding sustainability . . . Once a proud production and manufacturing hub, powering the Nation with our coal (6 mines within Bassetlaw borders and 9 mines within just a mile of our border) and our power stations West Burton, Cottam and High Marnham. In addition, Worksop had Textile Manufacturing, Footwear, Glass, Chemicals, Refractories and many mining support industries including e.g. Dosco at Tuxford. It is estimated that these jobs would have equated to around 17,000 production and manufacturing jobs . . . that have evidently been replaced with NOTHING (except a few sandwich jobs and warehouse/distribution jobs importing cheap Chinese goods to put even more of us out of useful work). The recent advent of the pandemic showed how inept and inadequate we were to even produce simple masks and gloves and other personal protective equipment. Cannot be left so vulnerable in the future and just as a sensible example, we MUST produce all of our own drugs, PPE and machinery and equipment for the NHS within the Nation i.e. all used in the UK and made in the UK. Have had our pride and employment and sustainability stolen from us over the last 30 years by political spite, by Globalism and by political elites based in London who view us up North as inconvenient pet rabbits who just need feeding and mucking out now and then (but what gets the chop first whenever times get tough?). The Council is falling into the Government's hands by turning Worksop simply into a Garden City, tempted by handouts. Must reject this situation and fight back for our pride and productivity and local and National resilience. If we have jobs on our doorstep, do not need to travel out of Bassetlaw and hence would not congest and pollute the atmosphere with our vehicles as we could indeed walk, cycle or catch a bus to local jobs. The businesses would contribute to rates and rent and taxes (see every morning how congested the Worksop by-pass is during the rush hour as thousands of people rush out of Worksop to go to work!). Boris Johnson appeared on television saying "Buy British" so . . . give us back the opportunity to manufacture for Britain and the UK Boris! Given the unfolding situation around the globe, we must start to build National Resilience now! See that the Peaks Hill Farm plan mentions no industrial accomodation but does give the sap saying "business space". In Worksop town centre, there are hundreds of empty offices and shut down shops, so there is plenty of business space empty so how could you fill the proposed ones at Peaks Hill Farm? The town has become unsustainable (notice in the Bassetlaw plan a "Former Knitwear Factory". Why isn't it becoming a New Knitwear Factory?). Notice that there is 60,000 tonnes of stinking plastic waste still in the (former) industrial heart of the town at the bottom of Sandy Lane, which has been there for over 10 years since the collapse of a recycling firm (As I recall, associated with the Council at that time). It is suggested that before sprawling the town any further, the Council should clean up their act and clear this rubbish away and open new useful production industries on the site and on other brownfield land, where people could sustainably walk to, cycle to, or catch a bus. Suggest that before you build another house, that every new house MUST have a useful production job assigned for it and the job be proven to have been created within Worksop/Bassetlaw before that house is ever built. This is what sustainability means! Strain on Local Services Every single house built in Worksop may accommodate 2.5 people, so the 1,000 houses planned at Peaks Hill Farm would acquire another 2,500 people within the folds of Worksop. The services in Worksop are stretched to breaking point, particularly so far away from the town centre. Schools, Surgeries, Hospital, Electricity, Gas, Water, Sewage, Communications, Roads, Transport, Tips/recycling and Town centre parking would all be hit by this additional 2,500 people, which are all services stretched to breaking point. Because there are no jobs within Bassetlaw, around 1,000 of these people may also have to travel out of Bassetlaw every day for work, congesting all of the roads in the area and polluting the air around the town. Need local sustainability, need to preserve our natural beauty and natural habitats, need to create local/National resilience, need to plan our town carefully to achieve this.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is also proposing to deliver new jobs in Worksop. Over 11,000 new jobs are proposed at Apleyhead adjacent to the A1 and A57. The proposed regeneration of Worksop in the Local Plan should also deliver new employment. The Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 indicates that the number of new homes proposed is required to support the level of growth/new jobs proposed in the district. The Worksop DPD sets out the regeneration strategy for Worksop town centre to introduce new uses into the vacant units. The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF103	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The discussions about Peaks Hill Farm have been mainly about the traffic on the A60 Carlton Rd but concern is about the Blyth Rd A6045. The amount of traffic already on that road towards Blyth is constant with lorries from Carlton Forest. My ward includes Thievesdale Lane up to the junction of Blyth Road. The junction of Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road is very dangerous at the fork junction. Although the speed of the traffic on the main stretch from the BDH and the junction has been decreased to 30mph, when turning right from the fork up to the Hospital it is virtually impossible to see what is coming down the hill, even with the speed reduction. The new housing development at the junction does not cause traffic issues but feel infrastructure is a important issue for the safety of residents crossing to use the field plus cyclists and car owners. All this is waiting for an accident to happen and one has already all be it not a serious one. Have residents concerned about the volume of traffic already so my concern is the junction and not in disagreement with any future developments. The Local Plan is an essential part of the progress we require but hopefully the infrastructure will be part of the Outline Planning application when it comes forward.</p>	<p>The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. A transport assessment will also be required to support future planning applications for the site, the results of which will be taken into consideration in the decision making process. The Policy requires developer contributions for all necessary highway improvements, including Cannon Crossroads for example.</p>
REF105	Resident	<p>Against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm because: The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 1000 dwellings (plus 120 after 2037) and business/ employment land in addition to the houses already 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 17 years building site. For many elderly residents, that is the rest of their lives. There is already a vast amount of housing being built in Worksop. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists, and schools. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the long wait to see a GP. Schools in Worksop are already busy and most full. The School on Gateford cannot accommodate the children already living on that development. As there are no plans to build a Primary school until after 2037 any children on this proposed new development will not be within walking distance of a school so will more than likely be taken to school by car adding, to the already congested roads at this time of day. All our connecting roads to the A1 and the M1 are single lane, country- style roads. These pass through small villages which already get very congested. The train car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. Increased commuting will add to the pollution, traffic and poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. Say Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement but there is no mention of how the infrastructure will be improved between now and 2037. To build the connecting road from the B6045 to the A60 will mean cutting down mature trees on the A60 side of the development. Should be protecting them not destroying them! Know you say more trees will planted, which should be happening anyway, but how long will it before these are mature as trees grow slowly.</p> <p>The land is a natural soakaway but if vast numbers of dwellings and roads are built there is the potential for flooding. Living at a time when extreme weather conditions are going to be expected so heavy rain is something we will have to accept. The drains don't always cope at the moment so more buildings and roads will only add to the problem. Loss of prime food growing land is wrong when the council should be helping to mitigate climate change. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's local character. Effect and loss of the established wildlife which will surely disappear if any building work begins. If my concerns are overruled I would like to see The green buffer zone along the southern boundary to provide appropriate separation with existing residential properties to be a minimum of 15 metres, which should be established before the development with shrubs and trees to encourage birds and wildlife to become established, and not left until 2037! New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and to extend the green corridor. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution. Low level dwellings built near existing homes. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space. The employment land to be behind existing Carlton Industrial site.</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement. Infrastructure will be phased so that it is delivered in parallel to the development. The policy protects trees and woodland on site, any lost will be replaced on site. New trees will also be planted as a result of the development. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. A transport assessment will also be required to support future planning applications for the site, the results of which will be taken into consideration in the decision making process. The Policy requires developer contributions for all necessary highway improvements, including Cannon Crossroads for example. The policy identifies a green buffer to separate existing and new. The timing will be considered when a</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			<p>planning application is submitted. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Plan requires all development to have appropriate car parking in line with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. Green tree lined corridors are identified by the policy. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. The Plan requires a contribution of 5 trees per dwelling which will be provided on site. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing. The Concept plan identifies the land to the rear of Carlton Forest as new employment land.</p>
REF108	Resident	<p>Against the inclusion of prime farmland and green space land at Peaks Hill Farm because: The development is too large and will have too great an impact on local residents of Worksop. 1000 dwellings (plus another 120 after 2037) and business/ employment land in addition to the houses already 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 17 years building site. For many elderly residents, that is the rest of their lives. There is already a vast amount of housing being built in Worksop. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems. The dwellings will be built before any supporting infrastructure such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools. There is already pressure on Worksop's infrastructure, such as the long wait to see a GP. Schools in Worksop are already busy and most full. The school on Gateford cannot accommodate the children already living on that development. As there are no plans to build a Primary school until after 2037 any children on this proposed new development will not be within walking distance of a school so will more than likely be taken to school by car, adding to the already congested roads at this time of day. All our connecting roads to the A1 and the M1 are single lane, country-style roads. these pass through small villages which already get very congested. The train car park is often full and the train services poor and unreliable. Increased commuting will add to the pollution, traffic and poor connections to external areas of employment, such as Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. You say Worksop is a highly sustainable settlement but there is no mention of how the infrastructure will be improved between now and 2037. To build the</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery plan identifies the infrastructure needed to support the development at Peaks Hill Farm. This includes a new link road, financial contribution to improve health facilities including the hospital and doctors, a site for new secondary school facilities, bus service and walking and cycling links. All will be required by the Local Plan policy and secured via planning condition and/or legal agreement. Infrastructure will be phased so that it is delivered in parallel to the development. The policy protects trees and woodland on site, any lost will be replaced</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
		<p>connecting road from the B6045 to the A60 will mean cutting down mature trees on the A60 side of the development. We should be protecting not destroying them! I know you say more trees will be planted, which should be happening any way, but how long will it be before these are mature as trees grow slowly. The land is a natural soakaway 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 is something we will have to accept. The drains don't always cope at the moment so more buildings and roads will only add to the problem.</p> <p>Loss of prime food growing land is wrong when the council should be helping to mitigate climate change. Loss of invaluable green space that has always been there and forms part of Worksop's character. Effect and loss of the established wildlife which will surely disappear if any building work begins. If my concerns are overruled I would like to see The green buffer zone along the southern boundary to provide separation with existing residential properties to be at least 15 metres, which should be established before the development with shrubs and trees to encourage birds and wildlife, and not left until 2037! New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the buffer zone to increase the distance between existing homes and to extend the green corridor. New dwellings to have minimum car- parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution. Low level dwellings near existing homes. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space. The employment land to be behind existing Carlton Industrial site.</p>	<p>on site. New trees will also be planted as a result of the development. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the site is not within a high risk flood area. The Policy requires a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken to inform the approach taken to surface water management (SuDS) to manage flood risk on and off site. The Local Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) state that the Peaks Hill Farm development can be accommodated safely with mitigation, including the new link road. A transport assessment will also be required to support future planning applications for the site, the results of which will be taken into consideration in the decision making process. The Policy requires developer contributions for all necessary highway improvements, including Cannon Crossroads for example. The policy identifies a green buffer to separate existing and new. The timing will be considered when a planning application is submitted. Communal areas will be required to serve both the existing community and new residents moving onto the site so should be in accessible locations. It is important that new facilities are accessible to existing residents to discourage car use in the local area. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. All available sites have been assessed and the Land Availability Assessment states that Peaks Hill Farm is suitable and deliverable to accommodate the homes required. National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. The Plan requires all development to have appropriate car parking in line with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Street lighting and garden size is a detailed matter that will be addressed at planning application stage. Green tree lined corridors are identified by the policy. The Plan requires a housing mix to meet local needs</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
			but this should be delivered across the site to support mixed communities. The Plan requires a contribution of 5 trees per dwelling which will be provided on site. 20% of the homes will be for older people and 20% will be affordable housing. The Concept plan identifies the land to the rear of Carlton Forest as new employment land.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	With regard to Peaks Hill Development, acknowledging that earliest housing development may be 2026, the plan states at 7.2.15 'On that basis, the new Local Centre, health and education facilities, community hub/sports facilities, and open space should be appropriately located to encourage sustainable access, to reduce car use for local journeys'. It is not clear what the new health facilities would be, but recognise and thank the council for the financial contribution identified for health care infrastructure. Welcome working with BDC to further define in due course.	Comments noted and welcomed. The Council will continue to work with the CCG to confirm the approach to be taken to health care facilities required.
REF212	Councillor, County Councillor	Concur with all the comments made by Carlton parish Council in respect of the Local Plan notwithstanding my previously objection to the proposals to build on green field land at Peaks Hill Farm, which continue to be strongly opposed to.	Comments noted.
REF195 PHF	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management	Note the reference in para. 7.2.5 in recognition of the complex nature of delivering a large urban extension, however, it is considered that the expectation for delivery not to proceed 2026 is unduly pessimistic. Work is already underway in preparing a masterplan for the site and the promoters of the site remain committed to working and engaging with the Council in the preparation of supporting studies and surveys for a planning application during the Local Plan process. This will enable end users and developers to be secured to ensure early delivery from the site. It is considered that the site could deliver dwellings as early as 2024/5 which would support the potential for more dwellings than 1,000 coming forward within the plan period. Support Policy 17 but would make the following observations and recommendations regarding the some of the specific requirements for this site. In relation to sub-paragraph: 1. (a) (iv). note the reference to use of level access accommodation and bungalows along the urban-rural interface. Noting that this falls under the heading relating to "Design and Character" it would seem the objective of this requirement is to enable a visual transition along the new urban-rural boundaries of the site that will be created by the development. This objective is supported in principle but the reference to bungalows is considered overly prescriptive and should be omitted. 4.(d). support the principle of providing local services to serve this urban extension but consider the reference to "a local centre in a central location on site" is prescriptive suggest this should be amended to "in a location within safe, easy walking and cycling distance on the site". This would provide appropriate flexibility for master planning of the site. 4.(g). recognise the development may involve the need for provision for community infrastructure, but consider that reference to improvements at Carlton in Lindrick Civic Centre through appropriate financial contribution is prescriptive. Note that para. 7.2.9 of the Local Plan refers to residents of the urban extension potentially using nearby strategic community facilities in Carlton in Lindrick but this acknowledges that the financial contribution should be assessed on the basis of any evidenced potential impacts. This should be reflected in the reference in sub para.4 (g). 5.(a)(iii). The requirement for a planning application to be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan is acknowledged. This will include assessment of impact of the development on the surrounding highway network. The requirement of sub.para.5 (a) (iii) is to identify this impact and relevant mitigation measures, where necessary is acknowledged. The reference to specific mitigation by financial contribution towards improvements at Kilton Road/East Gate and Cannon Crossroads and the A57/Claylands Avenue/Shireoaks Common roundabout is not as yet established as necessary. Suggest that sub.para.5.(a)(iii) be amended by removing the reference to these junctions and require that relevant mitigation measures are provided where necessary.	The Council has taken a prudent approach to the commencement and build out rates of sites proposed for allocation in Bassetlaw Local Plan. This does not restrict sites coming forward earlier. Once the Local Plan is adopted, sites could come forward sooner than anticipated. A strategic urban extension should provide a mix of house types to support sustainable communities. Therefore with a growing older population lower level housing on the periphery of the site is not unreasonable and would contribute to good design, particularly along the rural interface. Proposed to change the policy from 'bungalows' to 'such as bungalows'. The requirement for financial contributions towards improvements at Carlton Civic Centre has been removed because there is no evidence to demonstrate that the development will impact on the centre. The Bassetlaw Transport Study justifies the approach taken to the requirement for highway improvements associated with the development. Highway improvements identified by the Transport Study will be required to be delivered to make the development acceptable. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides details of required infrastructure improvements associated with the development and these will be reflected in policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 17: HS1 - PEAKS HILL FARM			
REF185	iba Planning on behalf of Carlton Forest Partnership	The Council is aware that our client, alongside Hallam Land (promoting the balance of the Peaks Hill Farm allocation on behalf of the adjoining landowners), has confirmed their willingness and ability to deliver Peaks Hill Farm at the very earliest opportunity – working with the Council every step of the way to ensure that the project is a viable one and the level of development can be delivered during the Plan period as anticipated and required. Whilst the overall allocation straddles two ownerships, both landowners have confirmed the principle of collaborating together to meet the above objectives – and there is already a commitment between the parties to invest significantly in the various investigatory surveys to be able to demonstrate the lack of any technical constraints with regard to the delivery of the development and to be in a position to submit a planning application so as to provide comfort to the Council and the Examination Inspector regarding the timing and delivery of the development. Our client has a strong track record for delivering housing in Worksop promptly following the grant of planning permission and intends to carry this forward should land at Peaks Hill Farm be allocated. Has already been approached by several regional and national housebuilders expressing an interest in purchasing their land with the benefit of the allocation – further confirming the location of the site for housing to be a good one, and the appetite for developing on this side of the town. The level of development identified will be critical to the delivery of the new distributor road which is essential i) to ease town centre congestion; ii) to mitigate for existing junctions which are already at capacity; and iii) to help unlock other town centre/regeneration sites which could otherwise not be delivered. For all these reasons, the inclusion of the Peaks Hill Farm allocation is supported - and it is hoped the same will be carried forward into the Submission Version. Remain committed to assisting the Council and Hallam Land in any way that it can to demonstrate the viability and delivery of the site as part of the draft of the Plan and the Examination in Public.	Comments noted and welcomed. The approach taken in terms of collaborative working with the adjoining landowner both in terms of supporting the preparation of the plan and its subsequent delivery is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 18 Site HS2: FORMER PUPIL REFERRAL CENTRE WORKSOP			
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF201	Severn Trent	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. 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.	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 20 - Site HS4 FORMER MANTON PRIMARY SCHOOL			
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Thank you for your comment.
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. Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 20 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. Whilst Policy 20 makes a reference to multifunctional open spaces there is no reference to the use of SuDS or the Drainage Hierarchy, recommend that there is a reference to both SuDS or and the drainage hierarchy is included. 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.	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
REF058	Sport England	Site HS4 and Policy 20 - Object – in 2012 Sport England commented following a pre-application consultation on the development of the former school site with the retention of the school playing fields for sports use. Para 9.4.3 and 9.4.4 advises shortfalls is evidenced from the Playing Pitch Strategy. Has the evidence shown that in this area the whole playing field should be retained for youth and mini-football to meet those shortfalls.	Thank you for your comment. Please see policy amended to include financial contribution towards play pitch improvement/provision in the area, as per the recommendations in the 2019 Play Pitch Strategy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 19 - Site HS3: RADFORD STREET			
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	2. Policies 17 to 30 (Site Allocations) Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, I welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent would recommend that Policy 19 also includes a reference to the use of SuDS and water efficiency to ensure that development is carried out sustainably utilising resource in the most effective way. We would also recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. 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.	Comments noted and welcomed. SuDS and Water Efficiency are covered by separate DM policies. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 21 - Site HS5 TALBOT ROAD			
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Thank you for your comment.
REF201	Severn Trent	Surface water sewers indicated within the vicinity of the site therefore no connection of surface water to Foul Sewers shall be permitted. Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 21 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. 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. Recommend that a specific statement is made regarding SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy within Policy 21. Talbot Street Site is within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of response.	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	As per our previous responses, Part A, point 1, e) 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.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF089	Resident	Could the footway along North Road be widened to include a shared cycleway? There is no mention of a contribution to Education in this Plan or the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	The Policy requires well-connected street patterns that deliver high quality, safe and direct walking, cycling and public transport routes through the development and to neighbouring areas. Highway improvements, including cycling infrastructure will be informed by a transport assessment under taken by the developer, to be agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Highway Authority. Nottinghamshire County Council as the education Authority states that there is sufficient capacity within the schools in the Retford catchment area. As such, there is no requirement for education contributions from this site.
REF094	Network Rail	This allocation may have an impact on traffic flows over the nearby Botany Bay level Crossing, and this needs to be assessed in any transport assessment for the site. We request an addition to criterion 5 (iii) of policy 23: Add “....where necessary, including Botany Bay Level Crossing (Sutton Lane).”	Comments noted. This has been added to the Policy as requested.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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. The Boards 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. HS7 Trinity Farm The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management. A criterion has been added to the water quality policy to cover climate change allowance. As the Plan should be read as a whole document, it is not considered necessary to repeat the policy requirements within this policy.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted.
REF126 - intro of response includes surveys	Retford Cycling Campaign	We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan (as of 12th Jan 2021), which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below. HS7: Trinity Farm, Retford Pros - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development on the North Road development, note from the developers submission they intend to link to the HS7 plot, but this at the time of writing didn't not align to good practices for segregation of people on cycles, foot, and cars (as per LTN 1/20) - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards, however encourages cycling (e.g. catchment area for the train station, schools and employers) - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that wish to choose or do not have a choice of the car (e.g. carers, parents, children, people with disabilities) Cons 1. suggest the path on the North Road is taken into account and enhanced for pedestrians, and if possible cyclists (residents or not, users of or access to the Idle Valley Nature reserve need safer access) as an contingency route to the main estate thoroughfare (e.g blockage due to a broken down bus, accident etc) 2. removal of regular walking route for people of the present neighbourhood area (people visit the fields to walk themselves and their pets) - support objections from the Wildlife Trust should there be any 3. lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and how infrastructure will work with modern design standards (e.g. direct, safe, attractive, convenient, cohesive) for all abilities 4. lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children for school and work cycling (e.g. Bikeability for adults contributions) – by increasing and encouraging use of sustainable transport, urge that Nottinghamshire County Council and Bassetlaw District Council and central government consider this seriously - existing/past efforts are not sufficient in our view to enhance safety and encourage take up of sustainable transport 5. public transport access should be considerate of design principles for people on cycles and foot - not detailed e.g. routing of cycle and walking infrastructure designs 6. cycle parking / mobility scooter, all abilities storage not detailed	Comments relating to the benefits of development of the site are welcomed. Comments relating to the 'Cons' are addressed below: 1. The policy refers to the provision of a new footway along the North Road frontage and refers to the requirement for well-connected streets that deliver high quality cycling routes through the development and to neighbouring area. The details will be agreed through the developer's Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Highway Authority. 2. The site is privately owned and there are no adopted public rights of way. The policy makes provision for a public right of way through the site to connect to the existing network to the north-east, thus formalising the current informal use. Notts Wildlife Trust has not objected to the proposal. 3. The policy refers to quality, safe and direct cycling routes. The sustainable travel policy ensures all walking/cycling routes consider the needs of all abilities. 4. Education is not a Local Plan matter. 5. This is covered by Notts County Council's Highway Design Guide, which is taken into consideration when determining planning applications. The Council continue work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure highway safety is a major factor in the design of the development and the decision making process. 6. Policy ST37 Quality Design requires the use of the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards for all new development. This includes cycling, mobility scooters as well as cars. That is a strategic policy so applies to all relevant new development. It is not necessary to repeat the requirements in each site allocation policy. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
REF153	Natural England	7.86 note that this policy references the Idle Valley SSSI. Whilst it is the Idle Valley Nature Reserve, managed by the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, the SSSI designation is known as the Sutton & Lounds Gravel Pits SSSI. The impact of this housing allocation on the SSSI should be fully considered.	Not an issue for the HRA as its not a European designation. impact on the Sutton & Lounds Gravel Pits SSSI was considered in the SA. The site is within 500m of a SSSI. As such, a minor negative effect is likely. The draft Policies ST39: Landscape Character and ST37: Design Quality promote development that is sensitive to its surroundings, therefore helping to mitigate any potential negative effects.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	If any additions are to be made in Retford and Ordsall, the Trinity Farm development looks far the best solution for a number of reasons; 1 - the road network on the north of Retford is far more substantial. 2 - North Road is well lit, and has already had traffic calming / speed reduction implementation. 3 - there are existing services, ie: schools, Dr's surgery's, shops etc all within a short distance of this area.	Comments noted.
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site. Development proposals should demonstrate: Dwellings meet the Building Regulations optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day, as set out in Building Regulations part G2.	Policy ST52 Reducing Carbon Emissions, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption requires the Building Regulations optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day, as set out in Building Regulations part G2. This is a strategic policy so applies to all development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the provisions in the site allocations policies.
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. It is noted that Section 1 bullet point c references the use of SuDS, also recommend that this policy references the drainage hierarchy to ensure that developer utilise the most sustainable outfall. 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). 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.	sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
1666086	Resident	This is well placed for additional houses, unlike other places in Retford. Access to North Road would be easy though it would cause additional congestion to the North Road/Babworth roundabout. Why would extra health facilities be needed in this part of Retford when there are already 2 surgeries within the Primary Care Centre less that 1/2 mile away???????? Has the person who suggested it ever visited Retford or studied where the current health, sports and community facilities are located?	The Policy requires contributions towards necessary health facility improvements. It is likely that this will be improvements to existing facilities to accommodate new patients. It is important that all new development address adverse impacts on existing infrastructure so that existing residents are still able to use the facilities appropriately. NHS CCG has identified the need for improvements to the current facilities to accommodate growth identified by the Local Plan.
REF220	Resident	object to the housing development proposed for Trinity Farm next to the Idle Valley Nature reserve. To build that amount of housing next to a nature reserve would be damaging to the reserve and would, I believe, spoil the reserve.	The Habitat Regulation Assessment informed the sites selected for allocation. No significant constraints have been identified in terms of adverse impact on the Idle Valley.
REF109	Resident	7.8.5. No bungalows or care home have been included in the revised phase 1 plans. Phase 2 plans not available at current time. 7.8.6 & 7.8.9 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	The Council has worked with a range of partners to assess the suitability of the site for housing, including Natural England, the Environment Agency, and Notts Wildlife Trust. No objections have been raised. The site provides for 6.5ha

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
		estate and this must surely have a big impact on wildlife. There are other areas around Retford which could be utilised without the environmental impact such a large development would make. 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. The existing green areas are already used by locals and visitors alike and the proposed plans do not offer substantial green areas. 7.8.7 There is only a narrow footpath between the existing estate and the proposed building plot and currently the rain water drains into the fields with no other drainage. Concerns about the risk of flooding to both the new estate and existing properties despite the few run off areas proposed. 7.8.10 Additional provision for improved cycle routes and footpaths is welcome although in practical terms, the majority of new residents will not utilise these whilst travelling to and from work or the local amenities.	of open space which will include space for wildlife and flood management. The site will provide 10% biodiversity net gain which will add biodiversity value to the site. The policy requires the amenity of existing residents to be maintained. The approach taken which could include a green buffer will be a matter for the planning application. The Policy requires development to be of a high quality design with green infrastructure forming an important element. The site is privately owned and there are no adopted public rights of way. The policy makes provision for a public right of way through the site to connect to the existing network to the north-east, thus formalising the current informal use. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the site requires the Policy to secure a flood risk assessment to inform the proposal. This will confirm mitigation to address flood risk. The Council will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water, to ensure flood risk is fully considered and appropriately addressed by the development.
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	A community woodland is an attractive prospect for this development. With the Beck nearby, and increasing risk of flooding, all mitigation measures to prevent flooding must be carried out if this development is to go ahead. It is encouraging that green travel routes such as cycling are being considered and a public transport provision should be provided. Could the North Road path be improved for pedestrians and cyclists? Storage for all forms of transport, including storage for mobility scooters as well as cycles should be considered.	The Council has undertaken a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the site. The policy requires a flood risk assessment as part of the planning application process. This will confirm the mitigation required to manage flood risk. The Council will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water, to ensure flood risk is fully considered and appropriately addressed by the development. Highway improvements will be informed by a transport assessment under taken by the developer. The policy requires a new footway along the North Road frontage. Improvements for cycling will be assessed through the Transport Assessment for the scheme. The design policy requires that all development make provision for parking in accordance with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. This includes cycles and mobility scooters.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>This extension to the already approved housing scheme would appear to be a logical move. Unconvinced of the effectiveness of a planting belt along the railway to reduce noise to an acceptable level. Generally noise reduction due to tree and shrub planting would be in the order of 5-10dBA for every 30 metres of intensive planting and this would need to be coniferous if this reduction was to be provided all year round. The noise level typically produced on a rail line is dependent of course on speeds, the higher the speed the louder the noise. At 50kph (31mph) the noise level at 25 metres is about 60 dBA, at 100kph (68mph) it is 68 dBA. The normally acceptable noise levels that would not cause a nuisance is around 40 dBA but of course this is dependent upon the current background noise levels. In this location there will be noise from the A638 as the background but this is sited to the east of the site and with prevailing westerly winds it will fluctuate and reduce dependent upon wind strength. The rail line is on the west of the site and although general noise itself is not a major planning issue, development adjacent to high noise levels should be avoided. Noise reduction due to planting will require a buffer width in excess of 50 metres if a level of 40-50 is to be achieved. It should not be forgotten that for this wooded belt to become effective it will require some considerable time so if this allocation is to be adopted then planting should start now and development not commenced until a noise survey has substantiated the effectiveness of the planting. It is a shame that the northern entrance into Retford could not have had better commercial development along the lines of a technology park or similar offices to those that exist at The Enterprise Centre and the old Retford copy shop, both of which are examples of good modern design, visually attractive and would suggest a vibrant, confident and successful town and present a different visually attractive entrance to Retford. Give it some more thought, once we have a housing estate that is it. These dwellings will be speculative built and as such will more than likely be traditional in design and layout with dwellings interspersed with roadways and planting. Commercial on the other hand brings a vibrancy throughout the day with comings and goings, it shows the town is alive.</p>	<p>BDC Environmental Health are confident any noise impact can be addressed through appropriate mitigation at the development management stage. The Council will also work with partner organisations, such as Network Rail, Notts Wildlife Trust to identify the most suitable methods for noise reduction where necessary. The site identified for employment has planning permission. The details of the design has not yet been agreed. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment does not identify any need for additional employment land in this location. The Policy is considered to be sufficiently detailed enough to deliver a development of a high quality design.</p>
REF180 Trinity Farm - assessments attached	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>The allocation of land at Trinity Farm, Retford for residential use is supported. This land is sustainably located adjacent to Retford and will form part of a wider mixed-use development to the north of the town, inclusive of employment and community facilities. The site is within close proximity to a number of existing bus stops, which provided easy and regular access to Retford's town centre, Doncaster and other locations. The site also enjoys a good synergy with existing and proposed employment development, which will enable people to live close to their place of work. This is particularly important given the key linkages within the Plan generally between housing and employment. This allocation is sound and will make a vital contribution to meeting future housing needs within the town. The masterplan and these representations have been prepared having regard to a number of site-specific assessments which have been undertaken. These include Ecology, Flood Risk and Drainage, Highways and Landscape Impact. A summary is detailed below. Copies of the technical reports will be provided in due course. Ecology A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (PEAR) has been undertaken on the site. This sets out the site is predominantly formed of arable land, surrounded by poor quality semi-improved grassland field margins, tall ruderal vegetation and hedgerow. The site also contained a field compartment of short mown poor semi-improved grassland and broadleaved scattered trees. A small brick-utility building is present within the site to the north-east. Just beyond the sites northern boundary is a small easterly flowing brook. The site does not contain or adjoin any designated sites, however it is within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone for the Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits, as such Natural England may make comments, albeit it is considered unlikely this will preclude the uses proposed on site. The PEAR sets out that habitats onsite are generally of low botanical diversity and species found are common, widespread and typical of such habitat. There is higher biodiversity value in the hedgerows and the brook to the north, albeit still not of great local significance. Hedges will be retained where possible throughout the site, and any loss needed to facilitate the scheme (such as to deliver an access onto North Road), will be mitigated by compensatory planting. With regards to the brook, the illustrative masterplan demonstrates how the site can be delivered inclusive of a substantial</p>	<p>Support for the allocation is noted and welcomed. The Council welcomes the proactive approach taken by Avant Homes. Evidence undertaken at an early stage in the Local Plan process demonstrates the developer's commitment to bringing forward development of the site in a sustainable and timely manner. Ecology findings are noted and the early assessment approach is welcomed. Further ecology assessments will be required as part of the development management process. Work undertaken in relation to flood risk and drainage is welcomed. As acknowledged, further flood risk and drainage assessment work will be required through the development management process. Work on the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is welcomed. The propose retention and enhancement of the site's key existing green infrastructure assets (in order to retain and enhance the site's character and distinctiveness) is welcomed. Confirmation that the site can accommodate the number of dwellings proposed whilst also retaining existing habitats is welcomed. The integrated approach to highway design is welcomed. A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required at the development management stage. As the 244 dwellings is a minimum figure, and the policy does not restrict a higher yield, it is not considered necessary to increase the requirement. Confirmation that the housing mix policy and supporting evidence will be</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
		<p>landscape buffer to the north, in line with the PEAR. There are no ponds present onsite, or within 250 of the site. Whilst there are ponds within 500m, this is beyond the intermediate zone for Great Crested Newts and beyond barriers which would likely prevent dispersal onto the site. The site is considered to be of moderate value to roosting bats, due to the presence of hedgerows, scattered trees onsite, and adjacent railway, woodland and brook. As much of the hedgerow is to be maintained, combined with new landscape features, the PEAR concludes that the value of the site will not be significantly impacted post development. Hedgerows and trees could provide habitat for nesting birds, as such an additional Nesting Bird check will be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist prior to any works on site if commencing between March-September. The site is considered to be of relatively low value to reptiles, water voles, otters, Terrestrial Invertebrates or white-clawed crayfish. Some mitigation measures suggested, but no significant residual impacts. There is no setts or signs of badgers recorded within the site survey. Mitigation is recommended in new open space features. Similarly for principal species, again hedgerow which is likely to be of greatest value to such animals will be largely retained and new landscape features can provide habitat. Flood Risk and Drainage The indicative masterplan illustrates how the site can be brought forward accommodating the area of flood Risk to the north of the site. A comprehensive drainage strategy which has regard to the current Reserved Matters site is currently being prepared, however initial works have not suggested any issues in delivery of the site. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken which concludes that the proposed development promotes a sensitive and considered development which relates to the existing and emerging urban edge and character of Retford. The LVIA confirms that consideration has been given to the scale and layout of the proposals, to the proposed landscape structure, and provision of open space seeking to promote a strong green infrastructure. The proposals seek to retain and enhance the site's key existing green infrastructure assets in order to retain and enhance the site's character and distinctiveness. The considered development layout ensures that the proposals can be integrated into the site and its immediate setting within the market town of Retford. The Assessment confirms that the application site and receiving environment have the capacity to accommodate the proposals. The proposals will not result in significant harm to the landscape character or visual environment and that the proposed development can be successfully integrated in this location, is supportable from a landscape and visual perspective, and therefore meets the landscape requirements of both national and local planning policy. Highways In preparing the movement strategy for the land to the south of the proposed allocation (planning references 15/00493/OUT & 20/01477/RES) consideration was given to a future second phase on the proposed allocation site. As such the land to the south was designed with a spine road to its northern boundary. The spine road has been designed so that it is capable of accommodating a bus route which can extend further through the proposed allocation site in the future. A roundabout is proposed on North Road. Updated modelling is being undertaken on this, but work undertaken has indicated that it has capacity to accommodate any future traffic flows arising from the proposed allocation. The work Avant Homes have undertaken on the site confirms it can deliver in excess of the 244 dwellings proposed within the emerging Plan. A comprehensive masterplan for the site, having regard for the consented land to the south, it is clear that the allocation could deliver in excess of 297 dwellings and accommodate the additional requirements of Policy 23. It is recognised the dwelling numbers are a "minimum" in Policy ST16 and "at least" in Policy 23: Site HS7 for transparency, and to support the delivery of the Plan, the true quantum of housing should be expressed in the policy. Aany eventual housing mix will have due regard for adopted policy, evidence of local need at that time as well as local market signals to ensure any proposed scheme is both meets need and is viable. The need for self-build units is discussed at 2.21-2.25. Policy HS7 seeks the provision of 6.5 ha of open space and at least 0.5 ha for a community woodland on the proposed allocation (Phase 2 land). The provision of 6.5 ha of open space is in excess of what would be sought through the Council's open space requirements for a scheme of even 297 dwellings and is not justified. Such a requirement seems to reflect the entirety of the North Road site, incorporating the consented land to</p>	<p>taken into consideration at the development management stage is welcomed. In error, the November 2020 draft Policy was seeking 6.5Ha of open space. This has now been re-visited to at least 3.4 Ha of high quality, multifunctional open space. The policy now requires a Surface Water Management Masterplan and Strategy to be produced to inform the approach taken to SuDS. The results of the SWMMS will be used to determine the amount of additional green infrastructure required for flood management. The requirement to deliver 0.5ha of community woodland is sufficiently justified in relation to the vision and spatial strategy of the Local Plan, both of which seek to address the effects of climate change. This approach accords with national policy and planning legislation: Section 19(1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to include in their Local Plans "policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change". This will be a consideration when a Local Plan is examined. Public consultation on the Masterplan is considered necessary due to the nature and size of the site, and its potential impact on neighbouring residential areas. The site has the potential to adversely impact upon the environment (flood risk and lying in the SSSI impact zone) and infrastructure and therefore the masterplan should provide a response. Such a consultation at an early stage will enable all the public to become better aware of the approach taken by the development to address these potential issues which may have a positive impact at planning application stage. The Statement of Community Involvement also requires that developers of strategic developments undertake public consultation at pre-application stage. This would be part of that process. It is acknowledged that the provision of open space is that sought for the committed and allocated part of the site. The figure will be amended to reflect the requirement for the allocation.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 23 - Site HS7 TRINITY FARM			
		<p>the south, not the phase 2 land the subject of the proposed allocation. A comprehensive scheme will be brought forward which works with the consented land to the south, this does not justify a need for a far greater quantum of open space to be delivered on the proposed allocation. Concern raised in relation to to deliver 0.5ha of community woodland. This requirement does not appear to be sufficiently justified in relation to the delivery of the site. Reference to it should therefore be deleted. Trinity Farm will provide for extensive open space which will include a robust landscaping scheme inclusive of new tree planting. The quantum proposed through the policy is not provided. The policy wording, and supporting text, should be amended: "Provision of 3.9ha of high quality, multifunctional publicly accessible open space, which could include an area for community woodland. The future management and maintenance shall be agreed through a planning application" A landscape buffer will be provided between the site and the railway, to protect residential amenity and to separate the site from this infrastructure and has been demonstrated as an acceptable approach through the consented site to the south. Criteria B of Policy 23 suggests the need for a masterplan to be prepared, consulted on and agreed with the Planning Authority ahead of the submission of a planning application. Avant Homes are committed to the delivery of a comprehensive scheme across the consented site to the south and the proposed allocation at Site HS7. An indicative masterplan has been provided to Officers (submitted) to demonstrate how a comprehensive scheme can be brought forward. It is agreed that a masterplan is beneficial to inform the coherent delivery of the wider site, do not agree that it is necessary for a masterplan to go through public consultation, nor are we clear through what mechanisms Council approval will be derived. Given the work undertaken to date and recognising that the submission of any outline/reserved matters application offers further scope for conversations relating to the masterplan it is considered that Criteria B of Policy 23: Site HS7 should be deleted.</p>	
REF180 Trinity Farm	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>Relationship with this Local Plan and CIL It is understood that the Council intend to review the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in parallel with the preparation of the Local Plan. Paragraph 7.1.11 of the Plan advises that large number of allocated sites, including Trinity Farm, can only reasonably deliver infrastructure, affordable housing and other developer contributions on site if the site is exempt from CIL as it stands. As such, the delivery of this Plan is intrinsically linked to the review of CIL. Clearly without such a review, a number of the Council's employment allocations may also not be able to come forward immediately, which could have an impact on housing delivery and also the ability for the Council to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Given the importance of this issue to housing delivery, and the delivery of the Plan's wider aims, the Council should commit in policy to undertake the review to commit to timescales for the review, should the intention and timetabling of undertaking the review in parallel with the Plan slip.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.8 of the Local Plan identifies the approach to CIL review. The Council have also set out the CIL timetable in the Local Development Scheme. This will be considered at Examination, at which point the CIL Charging Schedule will have been submitted alongside the Local plan for Examination. It is not considered necessary to commit to this in policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 24 Site HS8 MILNERCROFT			
REF006	Resident	<p>Re: HS8 Milnercroft.</p> <p>I am interested in the reasons why this site was deemed suitable for development. Reading the Draft plan it seems that because the allotments are under used at this location and thought of as poor quality makes the site suitable for building on? My view, in case I don't get the chance in the consultation to air it is as follows. If these are the reasons then the decision seems short sighted. It would mean the permanent loss of a piece of green in our urban jungles and the opportunity and convenience lost to future families to garden on their doorstep. Even if the allotments aren't utilised as standard allotments the lost of wildlife habitat is something that has been highlighted as beneficial to avoid in towns. I know that a pledge has been made to replace any active allotments with one in the local area before development begins. However this doesn't really reiterate other parts of the Draft Local plan i.e. making the future better. If you were following the essence of making the future better you would allocate land available for all the allotments that would be lost, whether they were active or not. Then there is the knowledge that something you can access that is right outside your front door so to speak is a lot better than an alternative provision made in the locality. What may benefit the area even more is encouragement to use the allotments as they exist, by local families. I did not know that these allotments were under utilised or even available. Maybe if they were advertised more then the uptake might be higher.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site is currently identified as allotments, however the Open Space Assessment Update 2020 identified that it has limited quality with only one plot currently being used. To ensure no loss of provision all active plots will be re-provided within the locality. Details of this will be determined at a future stage.</p>
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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.</p> <p>The Boards 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.</p> <p>HS8 Milnercroft</p> <p>The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Within the Local Plan there is a strategic policy which deals with SUDS and can be applied to all development in the District.</p>
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	<p>2. Policies 17 to 30 (Site Allocations)</p> <p>Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, I welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 24 Site HS8 MILNERCROFT			
REF126 response includes surveys	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/6065/idp-part-2-nov-2020.pdf (as of 12th Jan 2021), which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). We acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. We don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. We are also grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below. HS8: Milnercroft, Retford</p> <p>Pro's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates, and more so to as this is for affordable housing, where more families and key workers will be in greater need of infrastructure for sustainable mobility - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards (and engagement and commitment from NCC/Highways et al) - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) <p>Con's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure e.g. will it be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards - lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support safer, direct, cohesive, attractive, infrastructure, and education for adults and children - NCC are reportedly looking at bike aid to provide support to those who cannot afford a cycle e.g. key workers and others - we would encourage that this could become something that is formally adopted across BDC, NCC and other organisations - e.g. a compliment to the cycle to work scheme (for those that cannot afford it) - this potentially promotes health sustainable travel for all - lack of detail on improving cycle infrastructure for connectivity, directness for school, employees et al - density of population and motor vehicle needs, may cause conflict and resentment with people who drive, leading to downturn or lack of appetite in taking to alternative transport - necessitating priority for sustainable health transport - public transport access should be considerate of design principles for people on cycles and foot - not detailed e.g. routing of cycle and walking infrastructure designs - cycle parking / storage, mobility scooter access, all abilities storage not detailed 	Thank you for your comments. Due to the size of the proposed development we are unable to ask for developer contributions. As a result, no infrastructure improvements are specified within the Policy. However, safe access via cycling will be required for access and will therefore be provided.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	The figure 22: is titled incorrectly.	Thank you for your comment. Figure 22 displays the red line boundary for the proposed Milnercroft site.
REF175	Resident	<p>Policy 24, HS8 Milnercroft – It is not a site I am familiar with but it seems wrong to dispose of/build on a green space used as allotments especially when the Draft Plan promotes growing your own food. Are people of the area aware of the allotments? Do they need advertising? Can the soil be improved?</p> <p>Many people of all ages and abilities feel isolated even more so over the last year. A community garden would bring people together to experience social interaction, the sharing of life skills as well as promoting a healthy, active lifestyle. Perhaps this is something that BDC could initiate with a view to it become a charitable/self-funding group.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The site is currently identified as allotments, however the Open Space Assessment Update 2020 identified that it has limited quality with only one plot currently being used. To ensure no loss of provision all active plots will be re-provided within the locality. Details of this will be determined at a future stage.
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>See Anglian Water general response in PDF in folder. POLICY 24: Site HS8:</p> <p>Milnercroft, Retford (page 95) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.</p>	Thank you for your comment, your support is noted.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent acknowledge that this development is small in scale at that the legal requirement to implement SuDS is not applicable, however we would still encourage the use of SuDs principles and the implementation of the Drainage Hierarchy to	Text has been added to the supporting text for the Policy which recommends that developers consider

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 24 Site HS8 MILNERCROFT			
		<p>manage surface water sustainably.</p> <p>We would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 24 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. We would also recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset.</p> <p>The Milnercroft Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>the use of sustainable water management techniques, such as SuDS.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that the site is within a SPZ. Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage sufficiently sets out the requirements in relation to this. It is therefore not considered necessary to amend this policy.</p>
REF030	Resident	<p>A case in point is Milnercroft and the existing allotments. Five houses are planned and a community garden, with the one allotment still in use being relocated.</p> <p>Even if the existing residents of Milnercroft have not made extensive use of the allotments available what about future generations? The appreciation of allotments local to people if not obvious enough has been shown by the Leaffield allotments and the feelings about developing that site.</p> <p>Another reason or excuse has been that the allotments are of poor quality. Are there no resources available from the Council to help improve the quality? Think of the benefits to the residents and the Council if the allotments were put to use?</p> <p>Further, does the Council not think that allotments are a resource that we should think long and hard before losing? How much they benefit the people who use them and thus go toward making living in Retford a better experience. The fact that they are so easily accessible increases their chance of people using them (a relocated allotment will not so readily be taken up and used).</p> <p>I have not ascertained how many allotments were originally at Milnercroft but an indication of the short sightedness or narrow-mindedness of the Local plan is that it was prepared to relocate the one remaining allotment still in use. Why just this one, why not promise to relocate and make available all the previously existing allotments or better still not to move them at all and encourage people to make use of them.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site is currently identified as allotments, however the Open Space Assessment Update 2020 identified that it has limited quality with only one plot currently being used. To ensure no loss of provision all active plots will be re-provided within the locality. Details of this will be determined at a future stage.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 25 Site HS9 FORMER ELIZABETHAN HIGH SCHOOL			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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. The Boards 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. The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.</p>	<p>Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management. A criterion has been added to the water quality policy to cover climate change allowance. As the Plan should be read as a whole document, it is not considered necessary to repeat the policy requirements within this policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 25 Site HS9 FORMER ELIZABETHAN HIGH SCHOOL			
REF021	Resident	<p>During the consultation Site HS9 was mentioned, the former Elizabethan School and that access to the development would be via West Furlong. Queries were raised during the online consultation by more than one person regarding the location of this access. The Planning department's response was that this was the preferred access identified by the Highways dept and that they would be asked to review it if there were a number of queries raised. However, no reference to the decision of access by vehicles via West Furlong can I see in the Draft consultation paper? So unless a person attended one of the online consultations they would not necessarily know of this proposal. Further, because previous development plans have concluded that the best access would be via Leafield road, residents in the area may have assumed that as no access was detailed, that this is still the case. I certainly did. So whether you will get a true reflection of peoples' views regarding this, is debatable. Further, the number of queries you might receive re the mentioned access via West Furlong may be significantly less than if the proposal was publicised more clearly. Viewing the area and reflecting on the Highways decision re the access via West Furlong does make me wonder the parameters for such a decision, or the fact that it had not already been asked to be reviewed by the Planning staff at the council. In terms of impact on the number of residents I cannot think of a worse proposal. West Furlong has houses down both sides of the road; Leafield road for the most part has houses down just one side of the road. The entry into the proposed site via Leafield road could be at a slight angle thus reducing the effect of car lights at night and it would not run along any existing houses rear gardens whereas access via West Furlong would have to be at 90 degrees to the existing road and run along existing houses' rear gardens. If the access were at the western corner of the proposed site on Leafield road the impact of the new development on existing residents would be at a minimum and far, far less than if the access were to be via West Furlong. During the consultation of the Local plan the Council officers mentioned 'maintaining the existing quality of living'. This statement to me does not tie in with the briefly mentioned proposed access to the future development on site HS9, I repeat again, the current proposal seems to affect the most number of residents any access could.</p>	<p>The Council has been in discussion with the Highway Authority in response to this query. It is likely that vehicular access will be from Leafield and access via West Furlong will be by walking and cycling. But this will be confirmed at planning application stage once the detailed design and mix of properties is known and will reflect the outcome of the Transport Assessment for the site. The Council will be guided by the Highway Authority at planning application stage regarding access. The Policy indicates that development should be supported by a transport assessment detailing quality, safe and direct footpath and cycle links to integrate with existing neighbouring development at West Furlong. The consultation was well publicised locally including via site notices, and a range of public consultation events were held on line which were free for residents to attend. Access information available to the Council was shared in the Plan and through the consultation.</p>
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	<p>Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 25 Site HS9 FORMER ELIZABETHAN HIGH SCHOOL			
REF126 response includes surveys	Retford cycling Campaign	<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below. HS9: Former Elizabethan High School Pro's - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) Con's 1. lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards 2. lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children, signage, behavioural changes e.g. active signage, road markings etc 3. NCC are reportedly looking at bike aid to provide support to those who cannot afford a cycle e.g. key workers and others - perhaps this could become something that is formally adopted across BDC, NCC and other organisations - e.g. a compliment to the cycle to work scheme (for those that cannot afford it) - this potentially promotes health sustainable travel for all 4. lack of detail on improving cycle infrastructure for connectivity, directness for school, employees et al 5. density of population and motor vehicle needs, may cause conflict and resentment with people who drive, leading to downturn or lack of appetite in taking to alternative transport 6. public transport access should be considerate of design principles for people on cycles and foot - not detailed e.g. routing of cycle and walking infrastructure designs 7. cycle parking / mobility scooter, all abilities storage not detailed - this encourages use of cycles et al, and sets a message that this is not fringe transport</p>	<p>The identification of positive benefits is welcome. With regard to the 'Cons':</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not possible to provide the level of detail sought at the Local Plan stage. The policy requires proposals to be designed to a high standard, ensuring walking and cycling routes connect to neighbouring areas. In terms of policy requirements, this is sufficient detail to ensure the development will connect to existing routes. 2. Signage would be dealt with at the development management stage. This would be informed by the Highway Authority and transport assessment. It is not the role of the Local Plan to educate people on cycling matters. 3. This is not a planning policy matter. 4. and 5. The site allocations policies can only identify infrastructure needed to deliver that development. New infrastructure provided by development cannot address existing deficiencies/issues. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies all necessary infrastructure, including cycling provision required to deliver the Local Plan. 6. This is covered by Notts County Council's Highway Design Guide, which is taken into consideration when determining planning applications. The Council continue work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure highway safety is a major factor in the design of the development and the decision making process. 7. Policy ST37 Quality Design requires the use of the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards for all new development. This includes cycling, mobility scooters as well as cars. That is a strategic policy so applies to all relevant new development. It is not necessary to repeat the requirements in each site allocation policy. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document.
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Comments note and welcomed.
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. Note that there is no reference to the incorporation of SuDS or the drainage hierarchy within policy 25, and would advise that development of this scale looks to incorporate these design principles to ensure the sustainable management of surface water. Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 25 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. The Former Elizabethan High School Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 25 Site HS9 FORMER ELIZABETHAN HIGH SCHOOL			
			STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
1666086	Resident	In the past the council talked of developing this site for the 'older residents' of Retford with facilities and services geared to their specific needs. What has happened to this plan?	This was a proposal submitted to the Council by the landowner, Notts County Council. NCC has confirmed that they are no longer planning to develop the site for older people and it is available for housing development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 26 - Site HS10 ST MICHAEL'S VIEWS			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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 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. The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage. Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management. A criterion has been added to the water quality policy to cover climate change allowance. As the Plan should be read as a whole document, it is not considered necessary to repeat the policy requirements within this policy.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted and welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 26 - Site HS10 ST MICHAEL'S VIEWS			
REF126 response includes surveys	Retford Cycling Campaign	Refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from p42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below. Pro's - options for people at different life stages, encourages use of healthy personal transport - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration/creation of new route on Hallcroft Road (also for the benefit of children and staff at the Elizabethan School), with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) Con's 1. concerns on lack of segregate cycle and walking infrastructure on Hallcroft Road, more could be done for the school, cadet hall, and those who chose to cycle 2. lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards 3. lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children - with the schools being so close 4. cycle parking / storage / mobility scooter access, all abilities storage not detailed 5. encourage the use of the inclusivity design guide from Wheels for Wellbeing and DfT Cycle Infrastructure Design Note 1/20 - improvements for cyclists and walkers of the Hallcroft Roundabout, urge serious consideration of a Manchester CYCLOPS junction (https://www.cyclingweekly.com/news/latest-news/could-this-be-a-game-changer-britains-first-cycling-safe-junction-is-officially-open-459511) or dutch style approach such as the one in Cambridge (https://www.camcycle.org.uk/blog/2020/07/cambridge-celebrates-arrival-of-uks-first-dutch-styleroundabout/)	The identification of positive benefits is welcome. With regard to the suggested 'Cons': 1. It is not possible to provide the level of detail sought at the Local Plan stage. The policy requires proposals to be designed to a high standard, ensuring walking and cycling routes connect to neighbouring areas. The Local Highways Authority have not requested that segregated cycling/walking infrastructure be a requirement for 20 dwellings. So the emphasis will be to ensure that safe walking/cycling access can be made to existing routes. 2. Policy ST37 Quality Design seeks to ensure all development is of a high quality design and requires the prioritisation of safe and easy access for pedestrians and cyclists. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document so this policy will apply to the design of St Michaels View. 3. This is not a planning policy matter. 4. The Design Quality policy provides the parking standards for new development. This applies to St Michael's View and covers all types of parking. 5. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies all necessary infrastructure evidenced as being required to make development acceptable in planning terms. It is not within the remit of the Local Plan to address highway matters not relating to proposed site allocations. These matters should be raised with the Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council).
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Comments noted and welcomed.
REF201	Severn Trent	Acknowledged that the development is a brownfield site would encourage that surface water is managed sustainably, utilising the principles of the Drainage Hierarchy. There is a surface water sewer indicated in close proximity to the site therefore a discharge of surface water to the foul system should be avoided. Recommend that Policy 26 incorporates a statement to highlight the application of the drainage hierarchy and the implementation of SuDS techniques to sustainably manage surface water. Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 26 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. St Michael's View is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified. STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
1666086	Resident	Apartments for whom?	The site can provide for 20 dwellings. This means that it will need to provide for affordable housing as well as market housing.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 26 - Site HS10 ST MICHAEL'S VIEWS			
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	The reusing of this brownfield site seems a positive way to contribute dwellings. Will appropriate parking be available onsite? Trees on site should be retained.	The Design Quality policy requires all new development provide for parking in accordance with the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards. Policy 26 requires an arboriculture assessment to ensure the proposal would not result in the loss of quality mature trees, and that all appropriate trees are retained and integrated positively into the design.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 27 Site HS11 FAIRYGROVE			
1655416	Resident	<p>Am extremely worried about the environmental and aesthetic impact on the protected conservation area of South Retford and have 2 specific areas for which would like you to consider as you look to finalise the plan. 1. Fairy Grove, South Retford, 60 properties As a resident of Blossom Grove, to the north side of this site. I have a number of concerns including... Access would like a clear explanation on the access to this planned site. The site plan has no access directly parallel to London Road, however the plan states 'one safe point of access from London Road for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. How can this be possible when the site boundary is not onto London Road? Properties between the Whitehouse Roundabout and the Grove Road Roundabout often have difficulty entering onto London Road by car safely, with even more cars coming off the proposed Fairy Grove site it poses even more traffic congestion and accident potential. The plan states 'existing right of way to SE and West from the site' where is this? Traffic congestion and safety extremely concerned about the additional burden on London Road South end (and the impact of 800 additional houses in South Ordsall see point 2) Improvements to Goosemoor roundabout at Whitehouses is not enough, traffic and pedestrian safety needs to be further considered. Grove Road Roundabout is a busy spot, with many accidents occurring. Visibility is poor and the traffic speed is a significant issue. When the A1 is closed and traffic is diverted through Retford this is particularly concerning and unsafe. This is a regular occurrence. Has this been considered? On Grove Road queues of traffic at the level crossing, sometimes for 15 minutes plus causes an additional burden on the traffic in this area, has this been considered with the addition of 60 properties worth of cars. Why Fairy Grove? Why are 60 properties required at this location? The plan includes 800 properties in South Ordsall, less than 1 mile away from Fairy Grove, why not plan 860 properties in this site? The infrastructure at this end of Retford is already swamped with planning for 70+ houses on Bracken Lane, 100+ on Norman's Nursery, with a further 100+ awaiting a decision.</p> <p>Environmental Impact On the Fairy Grove site the notes include a statement 'mature trees and hedgerows along site boundaries will be retained' don't believe this is enough. No trees should be removed and want to see provision for significantly more trees to be planted along the boundary. In particular I would like to see a full 'green corridor' along the whole of the north side of this site, to provide space for birds and wildlife, both sustaining existing and encouraging new. This will also provide natural privacy for existing properties and new adjacent properties in the plan. A 'green corridor' will be welcomed, and small compensation for those on Blossom Grove, who purchased a property with a view, which they will be robbed of should this Plan be approved. Trees will also add character in keeping with the surrounding area and reduce noise and also help to reduce pollution and release oxygen, something we'll need with 1000 extra homes in south Retford.</p>	<p>Access should be from Grove Road not London Road. The Policy text will be amended accordingly. The Council has worked closely with the Highway Authority (Notts County Council) on the assessment of sites. Notts County Council has confirmed that, subject to necessary highway improvements, the site is suitable for residential development. The Council has undertaken a Transport Study to assess the impact on the public highway. This has been agreed with the Highways Authority. The County Council confirm that with mitigation agreed in the Local Plan, evidenced by the Transport Study development would be acceptable.</p> <p>There is a public right of way to the south east of the site on the opposite side of Grove Road. There is also a public right of way to the west of the site on the opposite side of London Road. Footpaths from the site are required to connect to these existing rights of way.</p> <p>All sites proposed for allocation for housing are required to enable the district to meet Bassetlaw's housing requirement (as evidenced by the Bassetlaw HEDNA 2020). This is a requirement of national planning policy (NPPF, 2019).</p> <p>The site will be required to deliver a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity on site (see Policy ST42 Biodiversity and Geodiversity) which will strengthen the green infrastructure that exists. The site will also make provision for 5 trees per dwelling helping to reduce pollution and promote carbon offsetting.</p>
1655416	Resident	DO NOT support the proposals and would like further explanation in particular on why Fairy Grove is a pinpointed site. Have no doubt that its a matter of 'when not if' so would request the addition of a 'green corridor' to the full north side of this site plan to be included in the Bassetlaw Plan currently under review for Fairy Grove.	The Land Availability Assessment 2021 identifies that the site is located in an area which is well served by services and facilities, including a bus service directly adjacent to the site (also evidenced by the Bassetlaw Sustainability Appraisal). It is well

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 27 Site HS11 FAIRYGROVE			
			contained by residential development and forms a logical extension to Retford. The site allocation is also supported by statutory partners and infrastructure providers so is considered to be deliverable with current infrastructure in the area subject to mitigation. The site will be required to deliver a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity on site (see Policy ST42 Biodiversity and Geodiversity) which will strengthen the green infrastructure that exists. The site will also make provision for 5 trees per dwelling helping to reduce pollution and promote carbon offsetting.
REF060	Notts County Council	5a)i. NCC consider that there should be vehicular access from Grove Road and have no issues with two points of access which may be preferable but not essential.	Comments noted and welcomed. The Policy will be amended to reflect this.
REF106	Water Management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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. The Boards 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. The site lies just outside the Board's district but within the catchment. The Board's consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Drainage requirements are included in Policy ST54 Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management. A criterion has been added to the water quality policy to cover climate change allowance. As the Plan should be read as a whole document, it is not considered necessary to repeat the policy requirements within this policy.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Comments noted and welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 27 Site HS11 FAIRYGROVE			
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don't claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below. HS11: Fairy Grove, Retford Pro's - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) - opportunities to improve footway alongside Grove Road, from developer contributions Con's 1. only one point of cycling and walking access 2. lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards 3. lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children of all abilities 4. would encourage a dutch or CYCLOPS style roundabout/junction (or as good practices in LTN 1/20) - public transport access should be considerate of design principles for people on cycles and foot 5. not detailed e.g. routing of cycle and walking infrastructure designs 6. lack of and therefore suggest access for walking and cycling (scooters etc) to promote safer route for primary school children e.g. for Thrumpton and Bracken Lane academies</p>	<p>The identification of positive benefits is welcome. With regard to the suggested 'Cons':</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not possible to provide the level of detail sought at the Local Plan stage. The policy requires proposals to be designed to a high standard, ensuring walking and cycling routes connect to neighbouring areas. The Local Highways Authority have not requested that segregated cycling/walking infrastructure be a requirement for 20 dwellings. So the emphasis will be to ensure that safe walking/cycling access can be made to existing routes. 2. Policy ST37 Quality Design seeks to ensure all development is of a high quality design and requires the prioritisation of safe and easy access for pedestrians and cyclists. The Local Plan should be read as a whole document so this policy will apply to the design of Fairygrove. 3. This is not a planning policy matter. 4. The Design Quality policy provides the parking standards for new development. This applies to Fairygrove and covers all types of parking. 5. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies all necessary infrastructure evidenced as being required to make development acceptable in planning terms. It is not within the remit of the Local Plan to address highway matters not relating to proposed site allocations. These matters should be raised with the Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council).
REF169	Resident	<p>page 100, para 7.12.4 HS11 Fairygrove, Retford: plans for this site must have regard to the proposals by Network Rail to close Grove Road level crossing and replace it by a bridge. Following public consultation in 2014, the preferred option was an overbridge on the northern side of Grove Road, with its western approach ramp occupying some of the eastern section of this site. It would be prudent to consider adding this area to the list of safeguarded land in ST58, page 173, as anticipated in paragraph 11.1.13, page 168. Linked to this site allocation should be a developer requirement in ST27 A.5a to contribute to the upgrade of the northern footway along Grove Road to shared-use (walking and cycling) standard between the London Road and Allison Avenue junctions [project 11 in the Cycling Plan for Retford].</p>	<p>The Council has liaised with Network Rail regarding the proposed site allocation. They have indicated that safety improvements to the level crossing will be required. This is likely to include road markings, signal lighting, and speed restrictions. However, the suggestion of a bridge did not form part of the measures required by Network Rail. The Council will continue to liaise with Network Rail throughout the plan making and development management processes to ensure any necessary improvements are delivered.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 27 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. Recommend that the policy incorporates references to the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS to ensure that development is undertaken in a sustainable way. There are known constraints on the downstream sewer network, therefore there is an increased likelihood that development could increase downstream flood risk, by implementing the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS design this risk could be reduced. Fairygrove is partially located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. Water Efficiency and Water re-use including standards mentioned are outlined in policy ST52 Climate Change, sustainable drainage, including the drainage hierarchy is set out in ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage & ST55 Protecting Water Quality and Management, and groundwater related matters by ST55. These are strategic policies therefore the requirements cover all relevant new development. It is not considered necessary to repeat the requirements for each allocation, unless an additional site specific matter is identified.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 27 Site HS11 FAIRYGROVE			
			STW confirmed via email (on 4/3/2021) that this was an acceptable approach.
1666086	Resident	Why would anybody want to build houses for the elderly in this isolated part of Retford with no shops and a most inadequate bus service. Your leaflet suggests 'improved' open space and health facilities. Currently there are NONE!!!!!!	The Land Availability Assessment 2021 identifies that the site is located in an area which is well served by services and facilities, including a bus service directly adjacent to the site (also evidenced by the Bassetlaw Sustainability Appraisal). It is well contained by residential development and forms a logical extension to Retford. The site allocation is also supported by statutory partners and infrastructure providers so is considered to be deliverable with current infrastructure in the area subject to mitigation. The policy is seeking financial contributions to improve open space and health facilities in the locality. The Open Space Needs Assessment 2020 identifies the location, quality and accessibility of open space in each part of the district. This can be viewed on the Council's website: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/planning-and-building/the-draft-bassetlaw-local-plan/draft-bassetlaw-local-plan-evidence-base/healthy-communities/
REF148	Resident	A few questions POLICY 27: 5a) I One point of safe access from London Road for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians; The site does not appear to reach London Road. The site is situated at the narrowest section of London Road with little chance of widening the road and cycling into town is dangerous because cars are allowed to park on the cycle lanes, so how is safe access possible. London Road has already had two housing estates added to it in recent years and it is getting increasingly difficult to access the town with a long queue at peak times. POLICY 27: 7.12.1 Situated off London Road, Retford, land at Fairy Grove is located within a primarily residential area, accessed from Grove Road. The site (2.7ha) is well located for local services, health facilities and employment. Where is this employment in this area. Most of the young people I know have left Retford because there are no suitable jobs, not because of the lack of housing. To reduce our carbon footprint employment should be within easy reach of housing. A few years ago this field at Fairy Grove was considered to be a valuable open space, let's keep it that way.	Access should be from Grove Road not London Road. The Policy text will be amended accordingly. The Land Availability Assessment 2021 identifies that the site is located in an area which is well served by services and facilities, including a bus service directly adjacent to the site with employment in the town centre and at five employment sites, as well as through a new employment area at Trinity Farm (also evidenced by the Bassetlaw Sustainability Appraisal). It is well contained by residential development and forms a logical extension to Retford. The site allocation is also supported by statutory partners and infrastructure providers so is considered to be deliverable with current infrastructure in the area subject to mitigation. This is a privately owned site so is not considered to be publically accessible open space. Development provides an opportunity to improve footpath links to existing rights of way.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 28 Site HS12 STATION ROAD			
REF060	Notts County Council	3a)i. NCC think consideration should be given to vehicular access being taken from Victoria Road as the site does not really have a Station Road frontage. In addition, it should be noted that where the road faces the Station forecourt, the land is not adopted highway.	Thank you for your comments, the Policy has been amended to provide access through Victoria Road.
REF094	Network Rail	Page 101 – Housing Site HS12, Station Cottages Retford This allocation is noted, along with the proposed access direct onto Station Road. It should be noted that Station Road, from its junction with Victoria Road towards the station, is unadopted and is owned by Network Rail. Future access arrangements will have to take this into account.	Thank you for your comments, the Policy has been amended to provide access through Victoria Road.
REF106	Water Management Consortium	The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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. The Boards 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. HS12 Station Road The site lies just outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.	Within the Local Plan there is a strategic policy which deals with SUDS and can be applied to all development in the District.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	2. Policies 17 to 30 (Site Allocations) Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, I welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/6065/idp-part-2-nov-2020.pdf (as of 12th Jan 2021), which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). We acknowledge that these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. We don’t claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. We are also grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below HS12: Station Road, Retford Pro’s - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) Con’s - no mention of improvements to the awful potholed state of Westfield Road, Coal Drops, there are so many benefits for all of the town and station, if this was made usable for walkers, cyclists, mobility scooters, and residents (500,000 people come into and out of the station every year), we would encourage NCC/BDC/Network Rail and LNER/North Notts Lincs Community Rail Partnership, match funding/ideas or solutions to this (Sustrans/Cycling UK too?) - lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be fit for purpose and work with modern design standards	Due to the size of the proposed development we are unable to ask for developer contributions. As a result, no infrastructure improvements are specified within the Policy. However, safe access via cycling will be required for access and will therefore be provided.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 28 Site HS12 STATION ROAD			
		- lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children	
REF175	Resident	Policy 28, HS12 Station Road – No objection to this. However, on the opposite corner and the first building visitors exiting by the train station will see is a dilapidated disused blue and white building (former garage). We have an excellent train station, a lovely town with a great deal of history. We need to promote ourselves more as a destination. First impressions count. The street scene would be greatly improved if this blue and white building was either renovated or demolished and sympathetically rebuilt on.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted. The site referred to in your comment currently has planning permission for redevelopment. Further, information regarding this can be viewed through Public Access on the Council's website.
REF182	Anglian Water	See Anglian Water general response in PDF in folder. POLICY 28: Site HS12: Station Road, Retford (page 102) - SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Thank you for your comment, your support is noted.
REF197	Resident	Retford – there are two properties that appear to be vacant opposite the railway station – one is referred to in Policy 28 – HS12 – there is the opportunity to take a strategic view of the first thing travellers will see of Retford when leaving the station and possibly enhance the practical aspects of traffic approaching the station and turning around and possibly additional car (for electric)/bike parking spaces etc.	Thank you for your comments.
REF201	Severn Trent	As a brownfield development Severn Trent would recommend that the proposed surface water discharge from the site is as close as possible to the predeveloped greenfield rate. Whilst The development is not large enough to require SuDS as part of the Written ministerial Statement we would still recommend that SuDS principles are considered to ensure sustainable management of surface water. We would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 28 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. We would also recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. The Station Road Site is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.	Text has been added to the supporting text for the Policy which recommends that developers consider the use of sustainable water management techniques, such as SuDS.
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	This is a conveniently placed location for station access, and would be particularly attractive for those using the station on a regular basis. Parking is difficult along Station Road and the surrounding area, so it is encouraging that off-road parking is planned. However, this corner is busy with station traffic, people using it as a turnaround point, and as a taxi rank. Cars exiting the site will be feeding into a busy corner. Further clarity on the type of dwellings envisioned would be helpful. For example, would these be apartments or houses? The site is small and if apartments were proposed, would the height really be in keeping with the local area? It is very positive that pedestrian and cycle access to Station Road and Victoria Road is being considered, and this site is able to encourage sustainable transport options. Further information on how it would link into other walking/cycling routes as part of a sustainable transport network would be helpful, and improvements to the road surface of Westfield Road (with NCC) and the condition of The Coal Drops are badly needed as part of this.	As this is a site allocation proposal, the design and layout will come through and be formalised at the planning application stage. During this time there will be a consultation in which you will be able to submit your comments.
REF053	Land Owner	I would just like to let you know that I am so pleased to see 45a Victoria Road/ Station Road Retford Notts put forward and it is "available and deliverable" as a site for redevelopment.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 29: Site HS13: ORDSALL SOUTH			
REF002	Resident	<p>I see the formal notification of the consultation of the above development have been sited on the lamp posts around Ordsall. 1) not against new housing in Ordsall 2) We have an Industrial estate sited on West Carr Road where if the HGV's follow the stated route they go past the infants school twice therefore twice the risk An accident occurring. 3) Could you not consider moving the industrial estate say onto part of the airfield at Gamston therefore taking all HGV's out of Ordsall and significantly reducing the risk to members of the public. 4) If this were done there would be a large brownfield site that could then be used for housing instead of using greenfield areas. 5) a lot of talk about affordable housing but it does not appear to be what would call affordable, if the proposed development were to go ahead make it affordable with more emphasis put on smaller single storey (bungalows) where those who are trapped in 3-4 bedroom detached or semi detached houses could afford to move into releasing those houses onto the market.</p>	<p>The Local Plan seeks to provide a balance between the need for employment and housing. Within Retford there are several areas of employment that have been protected for that use. In addition, there are employment areas that are expanding such as Randall Way off North Road.</p> <p>In terms of housing, the Council is required to find land within more sustainable parts of the District. Retford is the District second largest town and therefore should take additional growth over the plan period.</p> <p>However, it is also important that the Local Plan identifies local issues in terms of infrastructure, flooding and drainage or the environment.</p> <p>Following feedback from the community, the Council is reconsulting on revised proposals for Ordsall South. This will provide more detail in terms of design, layout and associated evidence base such as transport and flooding. This consultation will be in Summer 2021.</p>
1638182	Resident	<p>This site is proposed for residential development and is also identified as a 'green gap'. 1. The land on the east side of Ollerton Road (adjacent to Lansdown Drive) is extremely visible on the approach into Retford from London Road as it is elevated. This is acknowledged by BDC. The existing properties on Lansdown Drive are obtrusive in the landscape from the A638 (London Road) between Eaton and the entrance into Retford. Any new development on here (even single storey) will be very visible. Surely it would make more sense to use this land for the country park rather than built development? The land is already enjoyed by a significant number of walkers etc. and it would be great to make a feature of the site frontage onto the river. All new built development could then be located on the west side of Ollerton Road where the land is flatter and less prominent. 2. Do not understand why the policy fails to mention traffic mitigation measures for the village of Eaton. 800 new dwellings in this location will have a huge impact on the village as anyone living on the new site who travels to Markham Moor in order to get to Newark or Lincoln will drive through Eaton in order to reach the A638. Eaton village has no pedestrian facilities and has a single width hump back bridge. The village REALLY isn't suitable for high volumes of additional traffic. This should be addressed before any new properties are proposed on site HS13.</p>	<p>It is important that landscape quality is preserved where appropriate. The Council recognises the importance of the Idle Valley and views from the area towards Eaton and the wider Countryside. The development at Ordsall South is partly located within a Green Gap and this means that the development will be subject to more detailed design codes. This particularly relates to layout, density and the position of the associated Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Traffic and transport impacts are included within the revised Policy for the site and are linked to a set of evidence base prepared alongside this plan. The Retford Transport Assessment identifies the relevant transport mitigation measures needed to accommodate the level of development on the site.</p>
1644872	Resident	<p>Highly supportive of this development. In desperate need of housing for the elderly it's nice to see this includes in this plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
REF007	Resident	<p>Regarding the proposal itself, biggest objection is a potential increase in vehicular activity. No doubt that any planners will do all they can to cater for this on the development itself, however, introducing 1000 - 2000 cars onto the road infrastructure of Ordsall will not be without consequence. Live adjacent to the proposed site and can say, with confidence, that the majority of traffic from this area heads into Ordsall in the direction of Babworth every morning then returns in the evening on their daily commute. There is frequently congestion at the following sites: • Shops on Welbeck Road where there is insufficient parking • The mini-roundabout at the junction of West Hill Road and Worksop Road, where there have been a number of vehicle collisions. • Outside both entrances to Ordsall Primary School • The Nursery on Welbeck Road. Also a number of other vehicle "pinch points" in Ordsall: • Ordsall High Street - it is never two way because of parked cars. • The narrow Bridge at the intersection of Ordsall High St and Goosemoor Lane • The single lane priority railway bridge on West Carr Road. Increased traffic, will without doubt, negatively impact all of these sites, also the single lane bridge in Eaton Village, for traffic heading toward Markham Moor. What are the plans</p>	<p>As part of the preparation work for the Local Plan, the Council has produced a Transport Assessment for Retford. This includes investigating the existing traffic issues, flow and capacity of the road network. It then looks at the impact of the proposed growth and determine the scale of the impact and what parts of the network will need improvement. Any improvement proposed will be in the form of physical improvement or a financial contribution. Mitigation is proposed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Retford.</p>

		<p>for improving these sites and easing congestion that will inevitably occur? The increased traffic generated by 800 households doing at least the weekly shop in Retford will also be felt throughout the town, especially as there are only two main routes to the supermarkets, both of which pass through some of the pinch points above. Has BDC conducted a traffic survey and does it have a plan to ease congestion on these roads before it happens? Lived alongside the Wilcon estate (adjacent to Ollerton Road), whilst it was being built in the 1990s, have no wish to repeat several years of noise, mess, dust, roads works and construction traffic again. The residents of Ordsall have had to endure at least six significant housing developments in recent years, each one causing anxiety and disruption for protracted periods, sometimes a number of years. Why should the same residents tolerate a huge and invasive building project that looks to vastly increase the size of Ordsall and disrupt village life for many years? The last proposal for building upon part of the land designated for this current proposal was rejected because of local opposition, what has changed such that this land can now be included within an even larger housing development? The boundary line abuts approximately 100 homes and affects the outlook of at least as many more, how does BDC intend to address the concerns of the residents in these homes? One of the joys of living in this area is the diversity of wildlife. There is presently a community of bats present on Brecks Lane (adjacent to the proposed building boundary), also a large number of songbirds resident in the mature hedgerow to the East of Retford Golf Club practice field. Additionally, there are many birds and mammals present in the woodland area alongside the proposed development. These include owls, foxes, badgers, two types of woodpecker and many others that will be disturbed by building work. Has BDC completed a full ecological survey yet, if so, what is the plan to protect these declining species? At a loss to understand why BDC is considering imposing 800 new homes upon the residents of Ordsall, when there is a new garden village proposed only a few miles away, could this not be increased to accommodate a controversial project such as this? In total opposition to this proposal in its present form, especially with regard to the large number of proposed dwellings. This will without doubt irreversibly change the character of our community which I have enjoyed for the last 34 years, the "village feel" and identity of Ordsall will be altered considerably, if not lost permanently.</p>	<p>Development can only pay for the impact it will cause and not solve wider traffic or road capacity issues.</p> <p>In addition, major new developments must provide a net-gain in biodiversity, so the proposals include a significant level of green infrastructure, such as a country park, which will help create new habitats for local wildlife as well as a recreation space for the community.</p> <p>The proposed allocation at Ordsall South and the Bassetlaw Garden Village are being planned strategically so any impacts are investigated at an early stage which is involving all the relevant statutory stakeholders.</p>
REF012	Resident	<p>Secondly your presentation contains some very specious points: to address Retford housing needs; Retford doesn't need further housing, above all the district of Ordsall where there have been some 1000 plus houses built in recent years. Nature Reserve?that really is a sop to modern thinking and somewhat ironic when you consider the amount of environment and wild life which will be destroyed by this development in a very rural area edged by several copses.....and one assumes that all the public footpaths in the proposed area will be honoured and preserved. Acknowledge comments that if this plan goes ahead attention will be given to the mini-roundabouts in the area and traffic calming measures in Ordsall High Street.....but, and this is a huge 'but', these measures would be totally inadequate. All roads are already saturated especially at peak times. The main access road to the site is only a country lane and needs complete revision including road widening. Any infrastructure improvement MUST be done prior to the commencement of any building. If not, as have seen with recent promises and housing projects in the area, it will not get done or only in a very superficial and inadequate way. In connection with that, when much, if not the majority, of the traffic resulting from this development would pass through the already congested Ordsall roads and narrow bridge to go to Retford or Worksop the proposal is laughable. Unless the shops in the plan include all those in Welbeck Road, Ordsall.....I.e. a Coop, Post Office, Pharmacy, Men's and Ladies hairdressers and Fish shop, that already overwhelmed and dangerous community area, the existing shopping area would become untenable and certainly a public safety hazard. Whereas a cursory survey would suggest this an ideal spot for development, a thorough examination and first hand knowledge of the district shows this is not so. It would destroy a rural environment, destroy habitats, create a serious public hazard in Ordsall and ruin a community. Think again BDC, think again. Footnote: as an 86 year old non native to Ordsall I am NOT a NIMBY!!!</p>	<p>The Local Plan is looking at housing need for the next 15-20 years. As part of its calculation, it does include previous developments across the town. Retford is the second largest settlement in Bassetlaw so therefore it does need to take its fair share of future housing growth.</p> <p>The proposed allocation at Ordsall South is a long-term site due to its scale. The type of housing on site will include a good mix of housing types, including accommodation for older people, specialist housing for those with disabilities and affordable housing for younger people.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment for Retford. This includes investigating the existing traffic issues, flow and capacity of the road network. It then looks at the impact of the proposed growth and determine the scale of the impact and what parts of the network will need improvement. Any improvement proposed will be in the form of physical improvement or a financial contribution. Mitigation is proposed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Retford.</p> <p>Development can only pay for the impact it will cause and not solve wider traffic or road capacity issues.</p> <p>In addition, major new developments must provide a net-gain in biodiversity, so the proposals include a significant level of green infrastructure, such as a country park, which will help create new</p>

			habitats for local wildlife as well as a recreation space for the community.
REF017	Resident	<p>As a resident of Ordsall am concerned about the plans to develop land behind my property on River View, Ordsall is in danger of becoming a giant housing development with little or no thought for the people who live in the area, the infrastructure can barely cope with the amount of traffic in the village at the present time and the construction of further housing will cause constant problems. Suffer total grid lock whenever there is a problem on the A1. There is very little parking near the few shops we have on Welbeck road, and this will become reduced even further when the proposed construction of flats adjacent to the Coop goes ahead (this is another planning master piece instead of creating parking for the local shops you have reduced the on street parking and will make the road junction with Ollerton road more dangerous). The proposed access to the new development is via Bankside/Farm View, who came up with this plan has never tried turning right onto the High Street from the Farm view junction it is only by good fortune that there has not been a serious accident, adding further traffic will only make the situation worse. West Hill road comes to a virtual standstill outside of the Primary school twice a day with people parking on pathways and double parking this will only get worse with a further influx of young families. No plans of the planned construction site are available but at the top of River View is all bungalows and the preference of house builders is to construct three storey properties not only will we be overlooked but there will be a loss of light into our properties. The hedge row behind us is a haven for wildlife and we even get the occasional Bat flying over our garden, will, this be destroyed to fill every available piece of land with housing. Bassetlaw Council have planned to build two Villages at Gamston and Bevercotes the amount of housing planed for south of Ordsall will result in all three development joining together and creating a giant housing estate and destroying a small market town. Seen two large development recently in the village and one developer was supposed to improve the road junction/ roundabout at the end of Ordsall road but they reapplied and the Council planners let them get away with carrying out the road improvements creating traffic problems with traffic coming From Worksop and Retford</p>	<p>Impacts to neighbouring properties is an important part of the considerations for new development. Land at Ordsall South will include a good mix of property types and the layout of these will be planned to have the least impact to adjoining properties in terms of impacts to private amenity.</p> <p>Any traffic impacts will be mitigated through improved access and contributions towards improving the wider network within the area. Traffic calming measures and infrastructure will form part of the proposals for High Street area of Ordsall. New walking and cycling infrastructure is also planned as well as a new and improved bus service.</p> <p>Land at the proposed Garden Village is being planned alongside Ordsall South so that the infrastructure impacts can be assessed strategically. A separation between both developments will be maintained.</p>

REF020	Resident	<p>Attached a letter that have sent to all our local councillors who feel need to have an input into the plans you have for development of South Ordsall. Not entirely opposed to some development of the land, but definitely not to increase the whole population of Retford by over 7% in that one development and definitely not, when the same policies and consideration that are being applied to the Bassetlaw Garden Village are not being applied to the development at Ordsall. There are a few areas of importance Bassetlaw Council are failing to mitigate for or even consider and these should be at the forefront:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The world as a whole is working hard to mitigate the effects of climate change by sourcing new forms of renewable energy and new ways to feed our over-populated planet. Currently the UK import 46% of our food and this is rising. Given also that we are leaving Europe and are entering uncertain times with regard to imports/exports - surely the agricultural land we have should be protected, enhanced and used to feed us. • Why are Bassetlaw Council not fighting for the residents already here by making our area sustainable, both in power and food. Take away the farms and you are not only removing jobs from local farmers and residents, but also taking away the potential business from our local area by removing the possibility of business diversification - food processing, local produce. After all, Retford is a famous Market Town and that is where our heritage lays. If managed and nurtured correctly, this could be where our future lays too. It seems a shame that our own Council, who we vote in to represent us, protect us and help us to be sustainable, is removing one of our greatest assets! Utter madness and extremely short sighted. Removing our greatest asset will create an area where residents are having to commute out of the area to work. Should be working on making what we already have the best it can be - people will then want to come into the area to invest in sustainable business - bring wealth. The current proposals are based on Government predictions to provide for people not already resident here. By following these plans, are taking away the very assets needed for our future generations to enable them to sustain their own local population. • Why are Bassetlaw Council removing areas of beauty and habitats for a diverse range of wildlife. The area you are looking to develop has unobstructed views right the way to Eaton and on a good day, Clumber. Have hawks, owls, birds of prey, rabbits, deer, partridge, pigeons, frogs, toads, newts, geese, ducks, snakes, bats, buzzards, hares, herons, swifts, crows, magpies, hedgehogs, foxes to name but a few and countless insects and grubs. Have areas of wetland and natural springs (Marsh lane) and the land adjacent, areas of sandy land, loamy land and clay, have areas of forest, hedgerows and shrub, marshy land and dry areas; all alongside our agricultural land - once this is built on, it is gone! • How can you justify increasing the population of people, that are already unable to feed and removing areas of natural diversity such as these? This is the polar opposite of what you should be encouraging! An increase in housing and people doesn't generate jobs. Why are you altering our area into a built-up urban sprawl! would be better investing in what we already have? If you create an outstanding area of natural beauty with a rich and diverse agriculture, can create jobs through encouraging leisure visitors, recreational business that enhance the nature and area that already have, nature reserves, woodland walks, cafes, processing and sale of local produce. With this comes wealth and sustainability for our already resident population and encourages others to invest. Once have these, can naturally increase the population and housing to accommodate need in line and beside our rich and diverse local area. Currently your proposals mean the local community become poorer through the mismanagement, development and lack of diverse thought before making unsustainable, environmentally, economically, thoughtless and damaging plans. 	<p>The Local Plan is proposing growth for the next 15-20 years. As part of its proposals for Retford, there are other developments allocated on brownfield sites across the town. However, there isn't enough brownfield land to accommodate the projected level of growth for Retford and therefore greenfield land is needed. As Ordsall South is located directly adjoining the existing built form, it is considered a logical and sustainable area to accommodate future development.</p> <p>Due to its size and scale, there will be significant investment in infrastructure so that impacts are appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>The development should be low-carbon using sustainable construction methods and materials. The inclusion of new landscaping, trees and a country park will provide a net gain in biodiversity and help maintain some of the key views towards the Idle Valley, Eaton and the wider countryside. Access to the countryside and other parts of Ordsall will be improved through improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure in the area.</p>
--------	----------	--	---

REF020	Resident	<p>Personally, feel like am preparing myself for a bereavement. To my neighbours and others within the Ordsall community, feels like the proposals are stripping us of the benefits we already have and have grown accustomed to within a rural community and offering nothing in return. Almost like someone stealing a valued asset. The current residents are losing something they hold very dear. There are no benefits to the current, local resident community through these proposals as already have everything the new proposals offer. The proposals take away our local assets with nothing in return - other than negatives. Further congestion on already congested roads making the area less desirable, commuting more difficult, further danger to pedestrians, poorer air quality and noise pollution. More strain on an already strained infrastructure - traffic jams, sitting vehicles, pollution. On rush hours, school times and work times, it can take over 45 minutes travelling from Ordsall, into Retford and longer if commuting from one side of Ordsall to the other - it is okay saying you are going to encourage public transport, this is not convenient, not used and expensive - you can only encourage but not enforce - creatures of habit, busy lives, convenience is key! The documents accessible through the Planning Website are dated 2014. Is there an up to date Infrastructure Capacity Study? Biodiversity, Geodiversity report? Has there been a detailed investigation and consideration taken to road capacity? There are so many questions and so little time - it is such a shame that this period of consultation is happening now, when the communication methods for the region's largest aging population has been removed - preventing them from having a voice! Discrimination at its worse! We are losing our area's rural character and one of its greatest assets (other than the people already within it). Our local councils should be looking to protect what we have and enhance this and should be listening to what current local residents have to say, rather than supplying the predicted needs of people not yet here!!</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and the capacity of the road network. This assessment also identifies what impacts new development will have on the network and what mitigation is required.</p> <p>The assessment also includes improvements to public transport include new bus routes through the site and an increase in frequency of other services.</p> <p>A development of this scale must provide a net-gain in biodiversity with the creation of new habitats. These include a country park which will see significant level of planting, trees as well as recreational benefits for the community.</p> <p>Further consultation on this site and its proposals is planned for Summer 2021.</p>
REF020	Resident	<p>Grade 2 Very good quality agricultural land - This land has minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. It can support a wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops but there can be some reduced flexibility on land within the grade, which causes difficulty in the production of more demanding crops e.g. winter harvested vegetables and arable root crops. This land is high yielding but may be lower or more variable than Grade 1. (http://www.lra.co.uk/services/soil-survey-soil-mapping/agricultural-land-grades) Having been resident in this area for nearly 20 years and having benefited from wandering the farm tracks have seen the crops and yield from this land. A good percentage of this land is now turned to grazing for cattle and sheep, however the land is a mix of both arable and cattle. According to: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/847722/fbs-businessincome-statsnotice-21nov19.pdf This is one of the few areas within UK farming where there has been an increase in profit. It seems coincidental that over the last 5 years, this land has been turned to grazing for cattle, which unlike its previous use, grazing profit per ha has dropped -23%. The land lends itself to diversification to the latest upcoming and profitable crops. https://www.fwi.co.uk/arable/crop-selection/market-opportunities/the-new-crops-that-could-soon-profit-uk-farmers</p>	<p>The Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and has allocated several brownfield sites within Retford. However, there isn't enough brownfield land within the town to accommodate the required development. Therefore, the use of greenfield land is necessary. However, the revised Policy for Ordsall South includes substantial and detailed development requirements for the site to deliver a sustainable scheme.</p>
REF020	Resident	<p>The vision will be achieved by meeting the following objectives: 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. New settlements: development on land South of Ordsall is not a new settlement - it is urban sprawl on an already over developed village. The development will take a village on the outskirts of a 'currently' small market town to a substantial sized development. Retford currently has around 22000 residents, the proposed development of 800 houses will increase the population of Ordsall by roughly 1600 (based on 2 persons per household average), this is an increase of 7% of the overall population of Retford within this one development. Makes best use of previously developed land and buildings: The proposed land is active agricultural land. There is a very small area of land that is not actively and currently agricultural - this is likely accounting to poor land management and blocked drainage where on occasion there is sitting water. Currently lends itself perfectly to an area enhanced for wetland and wildlife, conservation and nature. It is thought that historically, this land was used to water horses and that a hand water pump was removed by farmers within the last 15 years. It is questionable that, when the land was recently bored, that this was done on the dryer peripheries of the plot and not where locals suspect an underground spring.</p>	<p>Land at Ordsall South is directly adjacent to the existing built form of Retford. Therefore when assessing the potential for development on the edge of settlements it is considered more appropriate to identify land that has the potential to connect to existing infrastructure and make improvements where necessary.</p> <p>In addition, the Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and has allocated several brownfield sites within Retford. However, there isn't enough brownfield land within the town to accommodate the required development. Therefore, the use of greenfield land is necessary. However, the revised Policy for Ordsall South includes substantial and detailed development requirements for the site to deliver a sustainable scheme.</p>

1656296	Resident	<p>Concerns about the proposal which is considerably larger than the previous 2013 consultation. After the 2013 consultation the preferred site was for a development off Lansdown Drive which is still part of the current plans. The Lansdown sight is a continuation of the relatively new housing site. The site is in line with the boundary of Retford and will not exceed the current building line, it would also insure that Eaton remains separate from Ordsall. 800 new homes will obviously increase traffic through the old village of Ordsall including navigating a narrow bridge. 800 new homes will see a substantial increase in vehicles, maybe 1600 as most homes have 2 cars Ordsall has only on street parking for the local post office, chemist and convenience stores. Likewise Retford is lacking in parking for shoppers, which will need to be improved for the town to prosper. 20% of the housing will be for the 65+and 20% for people with disabilities. The development will be out of town away from the shops, public transport, medical services and the social activities that these groups attended during the day and in the evening. The proposal suggests that public transport will be within a 20 minute walk the above groups will be 40% of the inhabitants and would possibly find it difficult to carry shopping etc that distance. Will public transport be available into the late evening and on Sundays which isn't at the present time. The development will increase the local workforce, where will the employment opportunities be created. The local school has limited availability at present, will the new school be built prior to the completion of the development. Will the medical hub be up and running during construction of the development. Retford medical centre is on a small site and again with limited parking which will need improvement. The limited width of the roads proposed for access onto the development. The cycle lanes again the width of the roads and the current on road parking being used for the properties in and around Ordsall. The proposal includes a country park, sport amenities, allotments, community spaces who will be financially responsible for maintaining them and the running cost involved. Will this development merge with the new garden village ST4, has the proposer a legal right to all the land required.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Site Allocations Document identified part of Ordsall South as a proposed development allocation back in 2010. This was subject to public consultation and it was considered a suitable area at that stage. However, the Site Allocations document was never formally approved and therefore didn't form part of the adopted Core Strategy in 2011.</p> <p>Since then, the majority of development in Retford has been on brownfield land such as Thrumpton Lane, London Road or to the north of the town around Tiln Lane.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan is looking to 2037 and seeking to plan for the future needs of the town. The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and other infrastructure related documents that provide the necessary evidence to support the proposed sites, their infrastructure and the proposed policies.</p>
1655416	Resident	<p>Traffic Ordsall is a village, with narrow roads and a narrow bridge, Betty's Bridge, onto Goosemoor Road. Ordsall Road and West Carr Road currently have significant levels of 'on road' parking which brings problems with car and pedestrian safety. The burden of 800 properties worth of additional cars through Ordsall and South Retford, and potentially through Eaton is a nightmare for local residents. The consideration given to green space in the plan is welcomed. Where are all the people coming from to warrant the need for 800 properties? Where will the children go to school? What about the facilities for doctors, dentists and healthcare professionals?</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment for Retford, This looks at the existing issues and the impact of future development on the road network. It also identifies mitigation in Ordsall and Eaton to reduce traffic flow and speeds in those areas.</p> <p>At present existing health and education establishments can take additional capacity. However, land has been safeguarded on site for future social infrastructure use in case there is a need for new health or education services.</p>
REF038	Resident	<p>In principal my views remain the same about High Street, Goosemoor Bridge, Ollerton Road/Welbeck Road, West Hill Road, flooding of the River Idle, a reminder of my previous contact with you is detailed further below. Are you proposing creating 800 dwellings alongside and to the rear of the Gleneagles estate or are the 800 dwellings including using the site on the opposite side of Jockey Lane which sides on to Southgate, River View, Hill View and Bankside? If not, how many dwellings are proposed for the smaller site, running alongside Southgate, River View, Hill View and Bankside? Surprised that you haven't given the two proposed development sites different reference numbers. Where would access be gained to the new dwellings to the field at the side of Southgate and the Bankside estate? Should the fields be used at the side of the Bankside estate, then strongly propose that the boundary hedgerow is retained in its current format as it's a haven for a large variety of birds and wildlife, including Bats? Should the smaller site gain planning permission then propose that bungalows be built in the field where there are already existing bungalows on the Bankside estate? As the bungalows have very small rear gardens on River View & Hill View, should houses be built in the small field it would block light entering the bungalows, unless they were built far enough away from the existing boundary. This has been proven by the owners of the bungalows at the bottom of River View that are now overshadowed by the houses on Southgate. Would also like to propose that a footpath is incorporated at the side of this existing hedgerow. With regard to the development to the side/rear of Gleneagles estate, is it possible to put the exit roads to come out on the main Retford to Worksop road, the A620? If the access/ exit roads come out on to Jockey Lane then the automatic choice of getting into Retford would be via High Street/Goosemoor bridge or possibly via Eaton village, both of which would be unable to cope with the additional volume of traffic that is generated by the development. Please find below my previous comments submitted to you and they continue to remain the</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a detailed Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This looks at existing flooding and drainage issues within the area and identifies appropriate mitigation as part of the development.</p> <p>For Ordsall, the issue is surface water flooding where water runs off the fields into the area and can lead to large areas of standing water.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment identifies the need for onsite water storage capacity Which could be incorporated into the country park and other green infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The development area covers land both sides of ollerton Road. The amount of development will vary and will be phased over the plan period to enable it to be developed alongside the infrastructure and in a sustainable way.</p>

		<p>same: High Street Vehicles park on High Street at all times of day making this a single lane road over most of the length of the road making it difficult driving conditions in both directions. This is a busy road and not suitable for increased volumes of traffic that the development will generate. This was confirmed when a planning request for a chemist shop on High Street was refused in 2014 due to concerns about increased traffic levels.</p> <p>Goosemoor Bridge The bridge which links Ordsall to Goosemoor Lane & on to London Road is inadequate for today's traffic, it's bad enough with the current volume of cars that are using it but also buses & heavy commercial vehicles. On a positive note the new pedestrian footbridge is a big improvement. Not sure how old this bridge is but certain it was built many years ago before the significant development of Ordsall.</p> <p>Ollerton Road/Welbeck Road The area around the Post Office/Co-op and the other small shops is congested every single day with very limited off-road parking. Further housing development in or around Ordsall will make this situation significantly worse. There are numerous children using this area both to and from school and using local facilities. Please don't wait for a bad accident to happen before action is taken here.</p> <p>West Hill Road During morning and afternoon school times the main road in and out of Ordsall along West Hill Road is reduced to single line traffic due to parked cars either dropping off or collecting pupils at Ordsall Infant & Junior School. This is a difficult road to negotiate at these times of day and problems will obviously become more acute when traffic volumes increase.</p> <p>Increased Potential for Flooding of the River Idle The fields at the bottom of Bankside frequently flood. High Street regularly floods when we have persistent rain as the drains cannot cope. As understand it, the main sewer runs down High Street and even though there have already been several completed housing developments, no changes to the main sewer have been undertaken. Surely building yet more houses on the fields will only lead to more flooding problems on High Street and further into Retford and the surrounding villages further down the Idle Valley. The more fields that are built on, surely the more drainage problems we will have.</p>	<p>The development must provide a net-gain in biodiversity and the creation of the country park will provide new habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council has also produced a transport assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for improvements for development and their impacts.</p>
REF043	Resident	<p>The first objection that come to mind is the huge increase in traffic, onto an already busy road. Ordsall only has 3 main 'outward' roads, namely, West Hill Road, which already has a school, plus large Newland and Rosedale developments feeding onto it, making this an exceptionally busy road already-leading up to a mini roundabout, which also has to deal with heavy traffic from the main Retford to Worksop Road- A20. The next 'outward' road is West Carr Road, which now also has a large housing development feeding on to it, and that already busy road leads to an already very awkward roundabout, which has a large comprehensive school, plus a Special Needs school joining it. The other main 'outward' road, leading up to the busy London Road, is Ordsall High Street- a narrow road which is already almost single line traffic, due to parked cars, and which encompasses an historic old narrow bridge, which was never built to accommodate modern traffic. Ordsall has seen a huge amount of redevelopment over recent years, with over 1,000 houses being built in recent years so has had more than its share for its size, and this very large development would be far too much for the infrastructure it has. Indeed, its rural situation will be almost destroyed, and the ethos of the place taken away. The proposed large development is also going to be situated on land that is already liable to flood- we see the flooded fields in the winter months. My plea for Ordsall is that it has not the infrastructure for this huge development, and will be 'swamped' by it, bringing chaos to its existing roads, and the residents living here.</p>	<p>The Local Plan seeks to allocated land for future development over the next 15-20 years. Existing development has been factored into the evidence base and the distribution of growth across the District.</p> <p>The evidence base includes a Transport assessment which looks at existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for mitigation for future development and their impacts.</p> <p>A similar assessment has been done for flooding which looks at existing issues and provides recommendations for mitigation for future development and their impacts.</p>
REF046	Resident	<p>Para 7 14.1 Does Retford NEED more houses. Ordsall definitely does NOT- after 1000 plus extra homes in about the last 10 years.</p> <p>14.6 Western boundary country park would be excellent if it ever happens! 14.9 Yes- a vital aim but I question 10% biodiversity net gain when so much habitat etc. is to be destroyed. Are you even aware of the deer in the copses owls, foxes, bats and badgers?</p> <p>14.11 Active travel and transport will depend hugely on 7.14. 12 and 13. An immense amount of road and access work would be vital for public safety BEFORE building starts.</p>	<p>The Local Plan seeks to allocated land for future development over the next 15-20 years. Existing development has been factored into the evidence base and the distribution of growth across the District.</p> <p>The net-gain in biodiversity will be significant. The creation of a country park will provide new habitats for local wildlife as well as a recreational benefit for local people.</p>

REF047	Resident	<p>The Local Plan aims to achieve a pattern of development which minimises the amount of travel by car and supports the vitality and viability of town centres. Concentrating so much development in Ordsall would disproportionately increase the amount of travel by car and do little to benefit Retford town centre. The proposed site is as far from the town centre as it is possible to get within Retford and it is unlikely that anyone would cycle or walk to the town centre from there. There are sites closer to the centre where new housing would generate less travel by car and would be of more benefit to the town centre.</p> <p>The Draft Plan suggests that an extensive range of community facilities would accompany the Ordsall development. Not all of these are likely to materialise. 800 new houses may be insufficient for even one small shop to be viable within the development and the enhancements proposed for the existing shopping centre seem to be confined to improved paving. The long term financing and viability of the proposed country park is questionable. Bassetlaw District Council is unlikely to adopt and run it, and it is hard to see this as a realistic prospect. The improved cycling facilities suggested include a cycle lane down Brecks Road where parked cars already restrict the width of the carriageway and it is hard to see how meaningful cycle lanes could be created here and on other road in the area without displacing from the kerbside the cars of residents who have nowhere else to park. The additional traffic generated by 800 new houses would put a lot of strain on local roads. It may be possible to expand the capacity of the roundabouts on Babworth and London Roads, but there is little, if any, scope to improve roads within Ordsall itself. Bottlenecks at the river bridge on Goosemoor Lane and the railway bridge on West Carr Road would become more congested and dangerous and even the river bridge at Eton would be affected. If additional housing is to be provided in Retford on the scale envisaged it should be distributed more evenly around the town and more should be provided on sites within walking and cycling distance of the town centre. However, if the scale of house building proposed is reduced, the proposed Ordsall extension could be removed from the Plan without wider implications for the Plan as a whole</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates growth to Retford which has been distributed across several sites. Brownfield land is seen as a priority and a number of sites have been allocated. However, there isn't enough suitable brownfield land to accommodate the requirement for Retford and therefore some greenfield land is needed.</p> <p>The land at Ordsall South provides an opportunity to create a comprehensive and sustainable development where new homes, infrastructure, services and green spaces can be planned together over the plan period. The development will be phased and will form part of a masterplan for the site including the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, a Transport Assessment for Retford has been prepared. This look at existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for developments and their impacts.</p>
REF060	Notts County Council	The Policy should include measures to successfully limit through traffic via Eaton as the route is historic in nature and would not be considered suitable for a significant increase in traffic.	Traffic calming and preventative measures have been included within the Policy as a result of the recommendations within the Retford Transport Assessment.
1664654	Resident	<p>In the Transport and Movement section, no consideration appears to be given to the impact this large development will have on the nearby village of Eaton - specifically a substantial increase in through traffic. There is reference to a management scheme in Orsdall Old Village but question whether Goosemoor Lane bridge or Eaton bridge are suitable for a development of this size and the associated traffic. Believe this site would lead to a serious reduction in the quality of life for Eaton residents. Increasing traffic levels on Main Street, with a narrow bridge and lack of footpaths will increase the risk of accidents, and increase levels of pollution and noise.</p>	The Transport Assessment for Retford has identified an increase in traffic flow through Eaton. However, this will be mitigated through Traffic calming and preventative measures aimed to deter people from using Eaton as a link between Ollerton Road and Gamston. The majority of traffic heading South will travel to the A1 at Elkesley.
1664685	Resident	<p>Serious concerns about the resulting increase in traffic through Eaton from a development of 800 dwellings to the south of Ordsall. The narrow, single-file bridge has been damaged by vehicles twice in the past five years. In January 2018 it was closed for 4 weeks for repairs causing significant disruption to residents, and it then had to be repaired again in 2019 following an incident which resulted in a vehicle crashing through the bridge wall and ending up in the river. The bridge is not built for the volume of traffic that exits the A1 at Elkesley, travels down Jockey Lane and through Eaton towards Retford, or that travels through the village to and from Ordsall. Counts of traffic by residents in 2019 showed an average of 113 vehicles travelling through the village between 8 and 9am, and 117 between 4 and 5pm. Any increase in traffic from the proposed development will further exacerbate the problem, particularly as travelling through Eaton is currently the preferred route for Ordsall residents to access the A1 southbound rather than via the Elkesley bridge. Not only is the bridge unsuitable for the volume of traffic, but also the road through the village. There are no footpaths alongside the road, and with vehicles often parked alongside it, pedestrians have no choice but to walk into the path of the traffic. Do not allow my children to walk unaccompanied through the village for fear of an accident. Understand from the consultation event on 15th December that a 'traffic management scheme' would be in scope for Eaton should the proposed development be approved but concerned whether this would be sufficient to reduce the significant increase in the volume of traffic what would result from the development.</p>	The Transport Assessment for Retford has identified an increase in traffic flow through Eaton. However, this will be mitigated through Traffic calming and preventative measures aimed to deter people from using Eaton as a link between Ollerton Road and Gamston. The majority of traffic heading South will travel to the A1 at Elkesley.

1664699	Resident	As a resident of Eaton, very concerned about the impact of the Ordsall South development on the volume of traffic through the village. No mention of this in the plan, which seems to take the view that people will only travel locally. Given the current high volume of traffic through the Eaton, know that many people who live in Ordsall use the road through Eaton to access the A638 to travel to Markham Moor to access the A1 for work or other purposes (including to go to McDonalds as evidenced by the volume of takeaway litter along the road through Eaton and along Ollerton Road). This is currently the fastest route to access the A1 southbound rather than the Elkesley Bridge or Apleyhead junctions. This will be exacerbated if a further 800 dwellings were to be built to the south of Ordsall, not only with regard to the number of people with cars travelling to and from the development, but also the volume of deliveries to residents. The road and bridge are too narrow to accommodate the current levels of traffic, and the issue is made worse given that there is no path through the main part of the village meaning that pedestrians have to walk along the road. Already worried about this for my young children and have serious concerns that the problems will get far worse if the development is approved.	The Transport Assessment for Retford has identified an increase in traffic flow through Eaton. However, this will be mitigated through Traffic calming and preventative measures aimed to deter people from using Eaton as a link between Ollerton Road and Gamston. The majority of traffic heading South will travel to the A1 at Elkesley.
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	The Southern area of this proposed allocation falls within the MSA/MCA for brick clay. 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. Eecommand that Policy ST29, as per other policies within the draft plan, 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.	This has been added to the revised Policy For Ordsall South.
REF089	Resident	Could the footway along Ollerton Road be widened to include a shared cycleway? Rather than a marked cycleway along the roads to the senior school and leisure centre, could it be a cycleway at the path level protected by the road kerb? There is no mention of a contribution to Education in this Plan or the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	The revised Policy for Ordsall South include the necessary improvements to transport infrastructure including improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure and public transport. This includes Ollerton Road. Education provision will come via financial contributions and forms part of the revised policy for Ordsall South and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

REF095 - Pictures attached	Resident	<p>The houses that are proposed to be built are on land behind Bankside. This area holds a great deal of surface water which drains down to the dyke which takes water from Gamston and Eaton. It carries on below the gardens at the bottom of Bankside, under the river Idle and between two fields which runs alongside our garden and property before entering a culvert and under a driveway a neighbours garden and under the road on the five arches bridge. What the majority of people don't realise is that this culvert has collapsed which is something we have been asking the IDB to act on for the best part of 10 years. After two attempts at installing flaps it was deemed as a problem with the fall at the other end going into the river Idle therefore a problem for the Environment Agency. Dispite another meeting with the IDB and the EA where the EA refused to help nothing was resolved! Lack of funds was to blame but we were told it would be done in 2 to 3 years (we are now in year 3) the last person we had dealings with has now moved on so we are back to square one! The dyke in question sits with deep water in it all year round, so hence when we have any rainfall and flooding it cannot hold any more water without being full in a short space of time and cannot drain away. The job of the IDB is conveyance of water but in this case it doesn't happen. As I write this, literally the water is lapping at my door, dangerously close to the house, our two fields, garden and outbuildings are underwater. The EA wont help by maintaining the river, the IDB wont repair the culvert and our neighbours (Goosemoor produce) refuse to repair their riverbank (the EA have said they are not responsible for it) pushing the water into our fields and garden. The dyke in question and surrounding fields below Bankside is flooded. How can you propose to build further housing when already houses in the area are in danger of flooding. Further housing will push this situation over the edge resulting in the five houses on Goosemoor Lane to flood along with houses on High Street and All Hallows. Goosemoor Lane would be closed once again as it was before for 3 days. In favour of improvements to infrastructure and progress, always told, not at the mercy of other households that it could affect downstream. If these plans are passed without extensive work done to both the culvert and without working with the EA to solve the problem of the present flooding there will be major issues for so many people in the vicinity. Asked a question about the speed of traffic coming on and off the bridge in view of the fact that we have had one fatality. The reply was that there would be traffic calming methods in old Ordsall. Since the bridge was renovated the speed of traffic coming off and on the bridge has increased considerably making it dangerous for pedestrians and school children on the narrow path. There has been several non reported incidents where people have been clipped by cars. Still nothing is done to reduce everyones speed. It is an accident waiting to happen. At the other end of Goosemoor Lane going up to Whitehouses Road the entrance to Goosemoor produce is so dangerous. Despite someone being killed there last year, cars park on the road next to the entrance and on the path blocking it for anyone in a disability buggy or with a pushchair. Neither the owners or highways have made any improvements. Further traffic will increase the risk to life unless speed cameras are put in place.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Flood Risk Assessment which identifies the issues with flooding and drainage and provides recommendations for future mitigation where required. For Ordsall, the issue is surface water flooding where water runs into Ordsall off the surrounding fields.</p> <p>The assessment recommends that new water storage capacity is developed as part of the scheme where the flow of water is also sent away from the built up area.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has produced a Transport Assessment for Retford which identifies the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for mitigation for development and their impacts. This includes both on and offsite improvements to the area.</p>
----------------------------	----------	--	--

REF097	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>This proposal was considered a far less favourable option for the development of new housing in the Bassetlaw District. Councillors appreciate (d) the need for some development of housing in the Retford area and conceded that Ordsall South might be a suitable choice for a gradual and contained level of development. HOWEVER • The proposal to deliver ‘at least 800 dwellings during the plan period to 2037’ is way too high! It was considered that a much more realistic target would be for between 100 and 200 (Not 250?) houses built in a time scale which would allow (ed) the current and future infrastructure to support these dwellings to be both in place and effective. This would ensure (ensuring) the needs of the residents could be met.</p> <p>• Graver concerns were raised considering the impact of traffic associated with this development in terms of through traffic impacting on local villages especially Eaton. There is also concern regarding the issue of parking both on site as seen with the problems on the recent development on the old Bridon site and in Retford town centre itself. • Any residential development would produce significant additional traffic putting local roads under even more stress than at present. There is limited scope to improve the existing road system and progressively to accommodate the upgrading of these routes. • The two old bridges at Ordsall and Eaton which are very narrow and struggle with the amount of traffic passing through each village/settlement at present. • Recently Notts Highways/Via have been involved in devising and enhancing existing traffic measures in Eaton, following instances of speeding and antisocial behaviour – reckless parking. Even with recent improvements this has only had a negligible impact in terms of controlling the speed and volume of vehicles using the village as a ‘cut-through’ from major ‘A’ roads. To improve this situation will require substantial investment to reduce / manage the enormous amount of increased traffic. • Improvements for cycle and pedestrian traffic may be difficult to achieve without restricting much-needed kerbside parking on High Street in Ordsall and additional pavements for walking in the village of Eaton. In Eaton this situation is already compromised by no pavements and the fear of drivers speeding through this route on their way to Ordsall. The Council was strongly disappointed that the Transport Strategy 3 was not in place prior to this consultation as it forms a fundamental basis for the whole plan and the infrastructure which leads to the way for allocating land. • How can any item on Policy St29 (5) page 105 be justified without the above being in place? Councillors also discussed the absolute need to protect the nature of the rural communities /villages that would be impacted on by the proposed development within the draft plan. In proposing the Ordsall South development, Bassetlaw Council is more prepared to satisfy its own targets over and above the Government targets than to ensure that the residents of Ordsall and such villages as Eaton and other rural communities enjoy healthy and pleasant lives in areas of open countryside and agricultural land. Councillors appreciate that some local communities have to suffer in order for major residential developments as suggested in this Draft Plan. However, it was unanimously agreed that it would be more sensible and indeed beneficial to residents for the BDC to increase the number of houses to be built in the Bassetlaw Garden Village from the start thus being able to reduce the number of buildings in inappropriate sites such as the Ordsall South site.</p>	<p>The Council are required to deliver new housing and employment by National Policy. Its job it to distribute this growth to sustainable locations across the District. As Retford is the second largest settlement in the District, then it should take its fair share.</p> <p>A number of areas around Retford have been considered, but Ordsall South is considered appropriate in terms of its location and being close to existing infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Impacts from new development will be mitigated via physical improvements or by financial contributions such as health and education.</p> <p>Impacts to traffic have been assessed through the Retford Transport Assessment. This does provide recommendations for improvements to Eaton through traffic calming and preventative measures.</p>
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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. The Boards 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. The site lies partially within the Board’s district, the Board maintained Ordsall Drain is located to the eastern side of the site. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any works in, under, over or within 9 metres of the bank top of the watercourse. The Board requires an easement strip along the Board maintained watercourse in order to allow for continued maintenance and future works. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river. Reports of flooding to the North of the site have recently been received by the Board on land adjacent to Goosemore Lane.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk – Level 2 for the site and it identifies the existing issues with surface water drainage and the</p> <p>This assessment provides recommendations for the scale and location of the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems on site and the need for onsite water storage.</p>

REF107	Resident	<p>1. Retford whist being a Market town and continuing to increase in population does still not support enough industry and local businesses to warrant having a larger population than it can support. Whilst you would hope that residents buying their own properties, on a new development, would be financially stable enough to support them you also have to be aware of the fact that the property may be beyond their means, plus the residents taking on social developments may have also extended themselves financially, then it would be naïve to think that a development of 800 houses would be free of tenancy problems.</p> <p>2. In agreeing this development, thought should be given to Brickyard Lane and Jockey House Lane which both lead from the A1. It is already well known, and documented, that when the A1 suffers from a serious accident, roadworks or closure, then all traffic is diverted along these roads, through Retford causing massive congestion through Ordsall, currently causing residents problems with exiting the estates already in Ordsall and creating gridlock in the town centre. Considering that my investigations show that currently to build roads averages out at £10,000,000 a mile and probably 4 miles of road to the A1 will need this upgrade and that a roundabout costs in excess of £2.6 Million pounds then the council, plus county council, will be looking in excess of £42.6 million pounds being required for the road infrastructure alone.</p> <p>3. The land to the rear of the Gleneagles estate, which will be greatly affected by this development, rises up quite steeply. If the development goes ahead how would the developers, and the council, alleviate this problem. If by the laying of an underground drainage system is undertaken then this would have to be on a grand scale in order to take away the run off from heavy rain, thawing of ice and snow etc, as the run off has the potential to cause massive flooding problems on the Gleneagles estate which has a system currently that was never designed for a new development to latch onto. If the developers decide to level the ground to the rear of the Gleneagles Estate then that would be thousands of tons of soil and spoil having to be taken away, once again causing traffic problems or being redistributed around the adjoining land. There was originally behind Sunningdale two ditch systems for water run off but one of these has vanished in recent years. Neither of these ditches were ever cleared and over the years have become blocked by fly tipping. The current ditch and drainage system could not cope with a development of this size.</p> <p>4. Within the plan currently proposed see that a school is to be included close to a new wetland's nature reserve. One would assume that this would be a Primary School with pupils, maybe from nursery age, up to 11yrs of age. Suggest that with all the best will in the world building a wetlands area close to a primary school is an accident waiting to happen. Children of a young age being of an inquisitive nature could wander off into this environment leading to a possible fatality. Appreciate this area could be fenced off but as Retford already suffers from bad maintenance to fenced off areas one could only assume that vandalism of this area will occur leaving breaches in the said fencing which will leave the area open to access by children.</p>	<p>Retford does provide local employment opportunities and sites that accommodate employment have been protected through this plan. Others are extending like those off Randall Way. The town also has good rail links to other destinations so it makes it easier for people to access jobs outside of the town and travel in a sustainable way.</p> <p>The development will incorporate a good mix of housing types and tenures with provision for affordable homes – these are houses that are below market value and homes to accommodate the elderly or disabled.</p>
REF122	NNLCRP (North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership)	This site is situated on a potential walking and cycling route from the Garden Village. Extending the path through this site to Bankside would encourage access to the existing path between Church Road and Century Road enabling walkers and cyclists to reach Retford station via the subway off Tunnel Road. Recommend this path be constructed early in the development of this site. Such a path would be covered under Policy ST29 paragraph 5.iii.	<p>Where opportunities exist for the improvement of existing routes on site, these will be incorporated into the relevant site policies.</p> <p>Future improvements to the links between the Garden Village and Ordsall South will be subject to review through the review of the Local Plan.</p>
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REF121	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	<p>The land in MPG’s control that was refused planning permission extends to just over 7 hectares in size. However, MPG also control an additional 12 - 13 hectares as part of the same landholding, totalling just under 20 hectares. A site location is attached. MPG note the Council’s intention to allocate land at Ordsall South, Retford (HS13) for 800 dwellings. MPG wish to object to the draft allocation on the basis that if allocated and developed accordingly, then it would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Gap between Retford and Eaton. MPG’s wider land holding to the north east of Retford is not affected by a Green Gap policy and could accommodate development without eroding the separation between settlements. In landscape terms, this is considered a significant benefit of MPG’s site over the Council’s preferred allocation. In light of the ability of MPG’s site to accommodate development, the size of the HS13 allocation should be reduced, thereby limiting the impact of the development on the Green Gap between Retford and Eaton. The work undertaken in support of the outline planning application at MPG’s site confirmed that there would be limited landscape and visual impact and as such, MPG contend that its site would provide an alternative, less constrained site than the HS13 site. In addition, the land to the north of Bigsby Road is slightly closer to the town centre than the HS13 allocation. MPG, therefore, suggest that the size of the HS13 allocation is reduced so that it limits the impact on the Green Gap between Retford and Eaton and that instead the land to the north of Bigsby Road is allocated for housing instead, and by doing so the overall housing requirement for Retford could still be met in a more sustainable way, with less impact (particularly landscape impacts). Welcome the opportunity to discuss the land to the north of Bigsby Road, Retford as consider it is relatively unconstrained as evidenced by the Officer’s assessment of the recent planning application on part of MPG’s land holding. Consider it is suitable for development and could make a significant contribution to meeting Retford and the District’s housing needs over the Plan Period.</p>	<p>Ordsall South partly lies within the proposed Green Gap to the South of Retford. A Green Gap does not preclude development, it means that development must be appropriate to its location and setting. The design of this site is key to maintain important views south towards Eaton and the River Idle. It also means that the density of development should reflect its location.</p> <p>In order to achieve these measures, the developers must produce a masterplan that demonstrates how they have considered the Green Gap designation in their design. This forms part of the Policy requirement for the site.</p>
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>We refer you to the Bassetlaw infrastructure plan: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/6065/idp-part-2-nov-2020.pdf (as of 12th Jan 2021), which should be read in conjunction with our views below as it refers to the Retford maps and details from page 42 onwards (at the time of writing). Acknowledge these are draft plans, and share our compliments, in principle, on the good work done by all councillors, officers, and third parties that put this together. Don’t claim these pros and cons to be our ideas alone - we are influenced by the local community, our surveys, and conversations with a wide range of people and organisations. Grateful for those who share their ideas with the public, and ourselves, and where practical and possible we reference these individuals and organisations below. HS13: Ordsall South, Retford Pro’s - provision of cycle and walking routes, which have been missed on many of the newer estates - some connectivity planning for the proposed development north of the North Road development - integration with the wider cycle network - that in our view, require improvements and maintenance to modern standards - has potential to encourage and assist people to use alternative healthy, sustainable transport, and for those that do not have a choice (e.g. children, people with disabilities) - opportunity to create a cyclepath bridge over the river idle, to link up with Goosemoor lane bridleway Con’s - lack of detail in the design to provide comfort that proposed walking and cycling routes and infrastructure will be integrated, fit for purpose and work with modern design standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of information on safety and educational awareness, e.g. contributions to support education for adults and children, as well behavioural design change e.g. speed at junctions, and mixing of modes of transport, e.g. foot, cycle and bus - mention of cycle markings, rather than segregated cycle routes/tracks as per LTN 1/20 - with this being a greenfield site, there is plenty of time and provision for increased space for segregated routes for cycles and pedestrians - not clear how mobility scooters, and carers and parents with buggies will be catered for - no specific mention of a provision for cycle parking, storage or hire - reducing enablement people of all ages to take on cycling 	<p>The Council has produced a Walking and Cycling Audit for Retford. This looks at the wider network throughout the town and identifies a set of recommendations. However, not all recommendations will be made through the Local Plan as this can only deal with the direct impact of its proposed growth. Any new or improved walking and cycle routes required as part of allocated development will be included within the relevant site allocation policy.</p> <p>The broader improvement measures will have to be sought through discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council, Sustrans and other bodies via grant funding.</p>

REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Retford Labour Party was disappointed to note that high level discussions had taken place with Developers at the following locations: 1. Peaks Hill Farm 2. Apleyhead 3. High Marnham 4. Bassetlaw Garden Village However, no mention is made of any discussion/meeting with regard to the Ordsall South (800+ houses) Development. This is poor, and the Party notes that extensive Infrastructure improvements were gained at Peaks Hill Farm (1000 houses) with a new single carriageway road being built to link the development to the A60. The Retford Labour Party expects to submit all these concerns to the Inspector in due course.</p> <p>● If the Plan is to go ahead at Ordsall South with 800+ dwellings, it is essential that highway mitigations take place, and the three logical improvements are loop roads away from town to the A620 at Babworth, to the A638 between Eaton and Retford, and to the A1 via Jockey House. If none are delivered, there will be 850 dwellings in Ordsall joining with the already unhappy residents from Ordsall, cheated already by back word from previous intensive developments in Ordsall and cancelled highway improvements. ● The Labour Party expects the Plan to secure a significant highways mitigation for the 800+ development, using the metrics of the Peaks Hill Farm development, or a significant reduction in the numbers of dwellings.</p>	<p>The Local Plan has evolved throughout its production with land being considered at various stages. Where land has been made available and it is considered suitable for development, the Council has continued to work with landowners and/or developers about their proposals. This includes land at Ordsall South.</p> <p>All major sites will need to demonstrate that the development provides a sustainable extension to a settlement or new settlement in relation to the Bassetlaw Garden Village.</p> <p>Land at Ordsall South is being comprehensively planned and various evidence base assessments have now been produced. These have helped form a revised policy for the site and identify what infrastructure improvements are required.</p> <p>The Council believe it is important to understand local opinion and have considered the responses to its consultation and other consultation undertaken in the area. Due to the additional work undertaken, the Council are undertaking further consultation on this during Summer 2021. This will enable the community to see the further advanced proposals for the site and the associated evidence base such as plans for flooding and transport.</p>
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	<p>The planned 800 house development will have a major impact on the traffic using Jockey Lane, Brick Yard Lane and also moving through Elkesley – road improvements will be needed to accommodate this but not mentioned in the Local Plan. When leaving the A1 from the southbound carriageway to enter Elkesley it is barely long enough and could do with modifications as has been recognised for the exit from the A1 to the A57/A614 at Apleyhead.</p>	<p>The impact of the new development at Ordsall South will have a limited impact on Elkesley village. The large majority of traffic moving South along Jockey Lane will be travelling to access the new A1 junction with Elkesley and not to access the village.</p>
REF153	Natural England	<p>Note the provision of the Country Park in connection with this allocation and the provision of a multi-functional green infrastructure network across the site. Suggest that opportunities should be taken to increase the biodiversity of these areas and link to the wider Nature Recovery Network. Note that the golf course adjacent to this site is particularly important for Lowland heath priority habitat, which is rare in Nottinghamshire and could present an opportunity for expansion into the Country Park to create a mix of habitats.</p>	<p>It is expected that the Country Park will provide a large net gain in biodiversity with substantial tree planting and areas for natural green space. Opportunities will be explored to maximise the potential to link to, and extend the Nature Recovery Network.</p>
REF169	Resident	<p>para A.5a iii HS13 Ordsall South: there are several proposals (including Brecks Road) to provide a “marked cycle lane” along connecting streets. However, this appears to have failed to take account of the DfT’s design standard LTN 1/20 and is inadequate for a new state-of-the-art major greenfield development, which should have an ample provision of segregated cycle and foot paths incorporated into its design from the outset. A development of this scale will necessitate a complete review of the cycling needs and routes in Ordsall, perhaps to be carried out in conjunction with the proposal at A.5a ii 4 for a traffic management scheme in Ordsall old village, to correspond with ST56 A.3c, page 169. No mention or provision is made for a walking and cycling link between this site and the Garden Village at Apleyhead to correspond with the references in ST3, paragraph 5.3.34, page 42 and ST56 A.3a, page 169; this needs adding. This Policy should also extend to making provision for a new cyclepath bridge over the River Idle, perhaps in the vicinity of Bank Side in Ordsall, linking to Goosemoor Lane and the recently improved bridleway (East Retford BW34) to Thrumpton Lane.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Walking and Cycling Audit for Retford which identifies issues and recommendations for development. Where development is required to provide new or improved walking and cycling infrastructure, then this will be identified as a policy requirement for the relevant site.</p>

REF032	Resident		<p>Object to the proposed planning of Ordsall South. Do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; strongly feel that the existing boundaries of Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given. This area needs to be protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and resulting in the area merging with areas such as Eaton. The proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. There would be massive increase of traffic in the area, not only would this be detrimental to the environment but also to the health and safety of the current residents that live in the area. This would have an overall impact on climate change, due to the increase environmental damage and decrease of wildlife in the area. Retford as a whole cannot cope with any further increase of traffic. This proposed area, South of Ordsall, is agricultural land and should remain so. The fields to the south of Ordsall also flood when there is heavy rainfall. If this area was to be built on not only would this area be prone to flooding but also there is an increase to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. Bassetlaw District Council have also over subscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.</p>	<p>The Council is required, by National Planning Policy, to plan for more homes across the District. To do this in a sustainable and reasonable manner, the Council has undertaken a series of detailed evidence base. Firstly, it is looked at the amount and type of housing and employment development that is needed over the plan period. This is then distributed around the District in accordance with local need and infrastructure constraints. For Retford, as the District’s second largest settlement, it is important it takes its fair share – particularly as there is high-demand for housing within the town.</p> <p>As part of the process, the Council looks at the availability and suitability of land around the town. There are some areas where existing natural or infrastructure constraints are too significant to warrant development. These tend to be within areas where there are historical, environmental or flooding issues. The Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and there are recent examples of this in Retford such as the developments on former industrial areas at Thrumpton Lane. However, there isn’t enough suitable brownfield land within Retford to take the required housing growth. Therefore greenfield land is required. Ordsall South is located directly adjoining the existing built form of Retford and provides an opportunity to deliver a sustainable urban extension which includes land for new homes, affordable housing, shops and services, sport facilities and a new country park to provide recreational and environmental benefit.</p> <p>Where development requires improvements to infrastructure such as Transport or flooding, then these will form part of the development requirement within the relevant policy. These are also identified within the Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
REF172	Elkesley Council	Parish	<p>The planned 800 house development along with a country park will have a major impact on the traffic using Jockey Lane, Brick Yard Road, and Old London Rd. Noted that there is no provision for road improvements along this stretch of highway to accommodate lighting, footpaths, cycle lanes, which promote a healthy lifestyle and would go a long way to expanding the area that villagers within Elkesley can travel without using a motorised vehicle. Would like to see provision within the plan as these improvements will be needed to ensure that safety of the public and to ensure the outlying settlements are not disadvantaged whilst new areas are being developed.</p>	<p>The Council envisages no direct negative impact on traffic into Elkesley village from the proposed Development at Ordsall South. The majority of the traffic heading South will be to access the A1.</p>

REF178	Councillors, East Retford South, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Section 7.14.1 states: ‘The site will have good access to a range of employment, retail and community facilities within the wider planned development and Retford itself.’ It must therefore be assumed that the majority of employment opportunities for future residents of Site HS13 lie not only beyond the immediate local area, but beyond even the boundary of Retford.</p> <p>Given the gap between future employment opportunities within Retford and the growth in its projected population, adequate transport links to alternative employment locations are a major consideration. The Bassetlaw plan suggests at ST29 Sec 5. that development of HS13 be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, informed by Local Highways Authority advice ii. The impact on surrounding highways...including; 1. North Rd/Babworth Rd roundabout; 2. Goosemoor London Rd mini roundabout; 3. Ordsall/Babworth mini roundabout; 4. Ordsall Old Village. The scope of the suggested programme of works is too limited and ignores the obvious implications to the wider area south of the site, namely the route through Eaton village to the A638 and the link to the A1 via Ollerton Rd/Brick Yard Lane/Jockey Lane. The Impact on the natural environment is of great concern to many residents, second only to the issue of traffic. Residents are concerned about the loss of natural habitat for sky larks, owls and bats; they value the hedgerows on the sites and would prefer to see these retained. Many comments referred to the regular flooding of the eastern edge of HS13, and to the frequent impact this has on low lying areas of Retford further downstream. The occurrence of frequent flooding already causes considerable issues both locally within Ordsall and further on into Retford. This dire situation can only be exacerbated by development along the watershed of the Idle valley. Of those who are supportive of the proposal to develop HS13, eco technologies such as solar roof panels and rainwater harvesting were popular. Should the site come forward for development, the green buffer around the site, and particularly between the southern edges of the existing settlement boundary and the northern edges of the proposed development, should be wide enough to preserve the open aspect currently enjoyed by residents. When asked what potential land use they would like to see on HS13, out of 15 options available the three most popular choices were (1st) A Nature Reserve to protect local landscape and wildlife, (2nd) New green spaces for community use eg Parks and playing fields, and (3rd) Land for tree planting and enhancing biodiversity. Residents would like further details as to the ongoing management and maintenance of a Country Park, its financial sustainability and legal ownership. They greatly value the amenity of the open countryside and the easy access onto it via well used public rights of way and other longstanding routes. The residents of Ordsall value the landscape in which the community sits, and enjoy the natural environment around them. The development of the open land to the south of Ordsall was only supported by 65 residents, 13.1% of the total respondents. Policy ST29: Sec 4. a) Make provision for public realm improvements in Ordsall Local Centre ... This is particularly welcome. The Local Centre is extremely well used, and parking continues to be an issue for both nearby residents and for those using the shops and services. Investment in improvements, coupled with new facilities within HS13 to serve the immediate needs of its residents, will be a positive gain for Ordsall. Doubts remain, however, as to whether a second local centre would be sustainable, given the close proximity of the newer Ordsall local centre to the preexisting and long established Ordsall local centre. Local residents have concerns over the capacity of the local Primary school being exceeded if HS13 is developed. Anecdotal evidence from those using the school suggest that although ‘basic need’ provision maybe adequate for current use, the capacity within school for assemblies, dining, PE, Drama etc is already stretched. Growth in pupil numbers requires more than desks in classrooms if children are to experience a full curriculum. Type of Homes: Survey responses show support for the suggested mix of housing types with Sheltered homes and bungalows being particularly popular. However, most people do not want to see a development of 800 on the site. 67% would prefer to see a development of under 100 homes, with only 20 people supported a development of 800. Overall, 20% are in favour to some extent of seeing HS13 coming forward for development, 23% are unsure, and 57% oppose all development on this site.</p> <p>Conclusion: There are clearly some potential benefits to the inclusion of HS13 in the local plan. However, there are obvious concerns around the impact on existing services, infrastructure, the natural environment including flooding, and traffic. Whilst there is some provision in the plan to mitigate the impact of development, and some potential gains for the local community, there is anxiety that what is promised is not always what is delivered. Further, the lack of employment opportunity with easy reach of Retford, and the policies promoting Retford as a retirement enclave cannot be supported. On balance, we do not support the bringing forward of HS13 into the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p>	<p>The strategy for the Local Plan proposed improvements to transport infrastructure more widely including the potential for a new railway station at the Bassetlaw Garden Village, improved bus services and walking and cycling infrastructure. This will help the community access jobs and services in a more sustainable way.</p> <p>The Council have considered the responses to the local survey that was undertaken. This information has been useful and has helped inform the proposals for the site and the revised policy.</p> <p>The proposals for the site include a comprehensive and sustainable development that includes a mix of housing types and tenures, new services and facilities, green spaces, a county park, new wildlife habitats, flood prevention measures and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The development will be phased alongside the provision of new or improved infrastructure over the plan period.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Retford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REF207	Resident	<p>The main concern with this proposal is the risk of flooding, the land between Marsh Lane and Bankside has natural springs and as the name Marsh Lane suggests is marshy and floods. Over recent years there are serval times each year when our gardens are underwater and with more land built on this will only increase. Currently the footpath is not accessible as it is under water. The footpath was initially for parishioners to go between Ordsall Church and Eaton Church; it was not designed for the constant use of walkers, runners and cyclists as a consequence this is being eroded and destroying the lawned area of the gardens this passes through. This is the current situation without the proposed building of more housing. The wildlife in this area is wide and varied, listed below which have concerns will be lost, not listed the normal wildlife which can be found. Bats, Barn Owls, Little Owls, Buzzards, Lapwings, Sparrow Hawks, Frogs, Toads, Hares, Foxes, Deer There used to be Kingfishers along the dyke but due to the constant flooding have been lost. I walk, run and cycle in the area but don't feel safe at times due to the amount and speed of the traffic which will only increase. There have many incidents recently and in some places such as Eaton there are not even footpaths. Have the residents in Eaton been made aware of this proposal as the increased traffic will be going through their village. There are 2 old narrow bridges one entering Ordsall from London Road and the other in Eaton. The one in Ordsall is sometimes closed due to flooding and the one in Eaton closed due to traffic accidents and the need for repairs If the planning does go ahead the housing should be for the high end market to attract money and investors to the area.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2) for this site. It recognises the risk of surface water flooding to the area and provides recommendations on how the development could reduce the threat of surface water runoff from the site into neighbouring residential areas. This includes flood mitigation measures such as sustainable drainage systems and onsite water storage. The provision of green infrastructure such as the country park will also provide opportunities for water storage.</p> <p>Any development at Ordsall South will have to demonstrate that it will not increase the risk of surface water flooding on the site or to nearby areas.</p>
REF197	Resident	<p>how long will the subsidised bus service run for? Will it run at times allowing people who work in Retford's retail and hospitality sectors to get to and from work?</p>	<p>This will be dealt with at the planning application stage and form part of a legal agreement. The development will occur in a number of phases so any contributions towards infrastructure will also be phased appropriately.</p>
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are generally supportive of Policy 29, in particular the reference to the use of SuDS within bullet point 1.d).</p> <p>Recommend that there is a reference to the drainage hierarchy. The site is situated on a ridge line, but both the east and west boundaries of the site are indicated to be adjacent to watercourses, therefore no connection of surface water to the sewerage network shall be permitted. It is vital that this is picked up within a site wide drainage strategy, so that development is not delivered in small parcels that are not able to utilise a sustainable outfall. Severn Trent would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 29 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. Recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset. Ordsall South is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to the Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response.</p>	<p>These recommendations have been included within the revised Policy for Ordsall South.</p>
1666086	Resident	<p>This has to be the most ridiculous suggestion of all. The road infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the current new housing never mind adding to it with such large development. No mention of a new school, have any of your officers ever visited Ordsall Primary at the beginning and end of a school day? It is carnage. The houses from this new development would presumably want to access Retford town centre via the south entrance to the town. The bridges over the river Idle at Ordsall and Eaton are narrow and unsuitable for heavy traffic, the bridge at Eaton is single lane only and been damaged several times in recent years. Parked cars on the High Street in Ordsall mean it can be slow and difficult to travel along so I am not sure why traffic calming measures are needed?</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p>
1668443	Resident	<p>The land this is being planned for is often waterlogged. How will this effect and already very low water pressure? The view from my garden, which was the reason we purchased our home, will be destroyed,</p>	<p>The revised Policy for Ordsall South will incorporate mitigation measures for flooding and drainage measures.</p>
1669723	Resident	<p>Would like to know how you plan to integrate at least 1200 cars onto the roads in ordsall. At the moment it's very difficult to cross the roads particularly near the site of the planned build and on ollerton road. It's fine to say you will improve the roundabouts but what about the roads leading to the said roundabouts. And if you do a country park where will all the traffic go. Will you also build the infrastructure at the same time as the house building or will we have to petition for them after the building finishes like with the crossing outside the school by persimmon. Understand this land has already been purchased by builders if this why you change plans to build at bevercotes traffic wise this would have been much better.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p>

1670177	Resident	<p>As a resident of Ordsall, object to the proposal for 800 houses to be built in "Ordsall South" on the outskirts of the built up area. Disagree with the statement in the draft plan that this would be a "sustainable and wellintegrated" development as it is outside the established boundaries of Ordsall, which were already extended into the countryside by recent building off Ollerton Road. The number of houses proposed would overwhelm and dramatically change the character of Ordsall, which is still absorbing the new developments on the former Bridon Ropes site and elsewhere. Unavoidably, the "Green Gap to Eaton" will be reduced, significantly affecting the access of Ordsall and Retford residents to open countryside. There is very little consideration of the aspiration in the Plan for "biodiversity net gain" with no detail on a "country park" and a "green buffer" and feel this development would reduce the "easier access to better quality green space" described in the "Spatial Strategy: Green and Healthy". The increase in traffic from a development of this large size would lead to large increase in congestion on the narrow local roads, insufficiently considered in sections 7.14.12 and 7.14.13. For example, work on the roundabouts will not improve this situation and would lead to Ollerton Road/Jockey House Lane being used even more often as a "rat run" to access the A1 than occurs at present. The risk of flooding in Retford from the Idle river would be increased by runoff from building on Flood Zone 1 land adjacent to areas acknowledged to be in Flood Zone 2 and 3. These fields by the river flood regularly at present and the amount of water would increase. Object to this proposal for too large a development, in the wrong place on a green field site with a severely detrimental impact on Ordsall and the other communities south of Retford.</p>	<p>The Council is required, by National Planning Policy, to plan for more homes across the District. To do this in a sustainable and reasonable manner, the Council has undertaken a series of detailed evidence base. Firstly, it is looked at the amount and type of housing and employment development that is needed over the plan period. This is then distributed around the District in accordance with local need and infrastructure constraints. For Retford, as the District's second largest settlement, it is important it takes its fair share – particularly as there is high-demand for housing within the town.</p> <p>As part of the process, the Council looks at the availability and suitability of land around the town. There are some areas where existing natural or infrastructure constraints are too significant to warrant development. These tend to be within areas where there are historical, environmental or flooding issues. The Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and there are recent examples of this in Retford such as the developments on former industrial areas at Thrumpton Lane. However, there isn't enough suitable brownfield land within Retford to take the required housing growth. Therefore greenfield land is required. Ordsall South is located directly adjoining the existing built form of Retford and provides an opportunity to deliver a sustainable urban extension which includes land for new homes, affordable housing, shops and services, sport facilities and a new country park to provide recreational and environmental benefit.</p> <p>Where development requires improvements to infrastructure such as Transport or flooding, then these will form part of the development requirement within the relevant policy. These are also identified within the Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
1670113	Resident	<p>Believe that with building these houses the road network in ordsall will not cope. Currently goosemore bridge is old and even struggles for large vehicles. Eaton bridge to the east is weight limited so your putting up to 800 houses increasing capacity in a small village and not upgrading road networks. Recipe for disaster. Strongly appose the plans</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p>
1670841	Resident	<p>The land in first hand experience is already wet to the point that in mid summer, tracors cannot pass over a large area around the middle of the field, due to sinking to there axles. And putting 800 houses on said field with 800 roofs catching water will no doubt increase the flooding potential of the area around us. With the new potential houses there could be up to and more than 1600 more vehicle on a inadequate surrounding roads. And recent history tells us all that developers will soon rid themselves of planned obligations to financially contribute to surrounding highway's. And the plan to turn beautiful existing countryside with existing walks into a man made country park with walks on footpaths and cycle routes? Terrible thinking. Would building more house's at the planned site bassatlaw garden village be a far more realistic, safer, and above all a better option due to the planned houses being built are obviously aimed at people not from this area and are no doubts commuting using the A1.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2) for this site. It recognises the risk of surface water flooding to the area and provides recommendations on how the development could reduce the threat of surface water runoff from the site into neighbouring residential areas. This includes flood mitigation measures such as sustainable drainage systems and onsite water storage. The provision of green infrastructure such as the country park will also provide opportunities for water storage.</p> <p>To address traffic and transport, the Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p>

1671151	Resident	<p>The number of houses proposed for ordsall south (800) is far too high. The arterial routes into retford from these roads will place an enormous burden on ordsall road, and the combined traffic from the ordsall south and garden village on babworth road, hospital road and ordsall road are in excess of what a small undeveloped road can take. Small improvements to the mini roundabout on babworth road will not mitigate this. Babworth road serves a primary school and 2 secondary schools and yet there is no safe cycle route on hospital road. Some areas within bassetlaw have better developed road systems which are much more suitable. The sharing out of the housing requirement does not reflect the prior development spending on these areas or the suitability of sites, putting a higher burden on areas which have not benefited from infrastructure spending. i would like to see a much lower assignment of houses to ordsall south, due to the large number of houses already planned for the garden village at five lane ends.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p> <p>Existing health and education provision can be accommodated within existing facilities. However, an area of land has been safeguarded on the site for future social infrastructure if it is required.</p>
1671525	Resident	<p>Object to the proposal being considered further in its current form. The reasons for this are: 1. It would appear that part of the housing in this proposal is to be built on land believed to be at risk of flooding. 2. No consideration has been taken into account of the infrastructure required to service this proposal. 3. The local road infrastructure will not support this proposal in its current form. 4. No account appears to have been taken of the effects that this will have on other nearby villages such as Eaton, Gamston and Elkesley such as increased traffic, noise and pollution.</p>	<p>Existing infrastructure capacity has been assessed through the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan evidence base. Various detailed assessments have been undertaken to investigate local issues such as flooding and traffic. These help to understand existing issues and identify appropriate mitigation for development where it is required.</p> <p>Any required infrastructure improvement form part of the revised Policy for the site or through other policies within the Local Plan.</p>
1669725	Resident	<p>How are you going to integrate at least 1200 cars on the roads in ordsall. It is hard at present trying to cross the roads particularly near the proposed site and all along ollerton road. It is alright saying you are going to improve the roundabouts but what about the road leading up to said roundabouts. Why do we need a country park bringing again more traffic when climber ruffled and sherwood ar so close by. Will the infrastructure be built alongside the house build ar will we have to petition as we did with the crossing outside the school. Understand the land has already been purchased by builders is this why you changed from bevercotes to ordsall would have thought bevercotes would have been the better option</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton. Other assessment look at other parts of the District and assess the impacts of all proposed development on the road network include those between Retford and Worksop.</p> <p>The Location of the Garden Village has changed due to impacts to protected ground nesting birds at Bevercotes. The proposed location at Morton has less planning constraints and is closer to both Worksop, Retford and has the potential to provide wider infrastructure improvements such as a new railway station.</p>

1671392	Resident	<p>object to the element of the plan which covers the area where I live. 1. Principle of the development The proposal is to create 800 new homes in Ordsall. This is a massive development and will hugely change the area. This would be a massive development in any area in fact and the numerous impacts should be fully considered. Although there are government requirements in terms of development, nowhere is there an expectation that such a large number of properties are placed in a single area. Smaller developments should be considered across the region.</p> <p>2. Transport and accessibility Ordsall is currently accessed via 4 main routes. Two of these have the same basic source (Babworth road), one comes across a very narrow bridge at Goosemoor and the final access route is via narrow and unlit country lanes from the A1 and Eaton. None of these roads are suitable for significant increase in traffic that would be caused by a development of 800 homes. Average car ownership per household in the East Midlands is 1.33, so this could result in over 1000 additional cars using these 4 access roads. The roads currently are barely adequate for existing usage and the additional level with significantly impact on travel times, congestion and pollution. Given the narrow bridges and roads and the fact that the access roads pass a primary school there will be an increased risk of accidents. As we have seen, any incidents on the A1 sends a significant increase of traffic through Ordsall and any road closures of the existing routes, due to roadworks or flooding, causes gridlock. Significantly increasing the number of cars in the area can only make this worse. Whilst there are hopes that public transport links can mitigate this, the reality is that the current public transport links don't mitigate the current issues and proportionate increases will be unlikely to impact positively. Education East Midlands area averages just over 2 children per household. Allowing for the intended 160 homes for older residents, this would suggest an additional 1200 children at various ages will be new to the area. There is not going to be sufficient capacity in the current schools to accommodate this and there is no sign of additional education provision in the plan.</p> <p>Shopping There are currently 3 general stores in south Ordsall, a couple of pubs, a takeaway, a chemist and a hairdresser. The shops are generally busy and have inadequate parking for their customers. A significant increase in custom is likely to make this far worse, increasing the risk of accidents and pollution. Whilst the current plans allow for some retail development it remains to be seen how viable these are. Employment The plan anticipates increased employment resulting from the development. This "build it, they will come" notion is ill conceived and unrealistic. Retford has had significant additional property development in the past few years (in Ordsall at the Bridon site for instance) without there being any significant local employment. There is nothing to suggest that the new development will have greater impact. If that is the case the occupants of the new properties will be commuters either entirely by car or by train or bus. This will increase traffic flow at the pinch points at rush hour times.</p> <p>Drainage There is already a significant drainage problem with the proposed development land, as I write this they are significantly waterlogged and the river Idle is subject to flood warnings. Increased development will significantly increase runoff into the river and will result in downriver flooding. Wildlife In the fields subject to the proposed development have seen all manner of wildlife including deer, foxes, rabbits, kestrels, insects. These will inevitably be pushed further afield by the development. The proposed development will have a serious detrimental impact on Ordsall and therefore object to this part of the plan.</p>	<p>The Council is required, by National Planning Policy, to plan for more homes across the District. To do this in a sustainable and reasonable manner, the Council has undertaken a series of detailed evidence base. Firstly, it is looked at the amount and type of housing and employment development that is needed over the plan period. This is then distributed around the District in accordance with local need and infrastructure constraints. For Retford, as the District's second largest settlement, it is important it takes its fair share – particularly as there is high-demand for housing within the town.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport assessment for Retford which looks at existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for development in terms of mitigating any adverse impact it proposes.</p> <p>Similarly, a Flood Risk Assessment has looked at existing flooding a drainage issues and provided recommendations for improvements. Particularly towards surface water runoff and the provision of onsite water storage facilities.</p> <p>The development will incorporate a new Local Centre within the development which will provide opportunities for local retail, community space and businesses to establish.</p> <p>In addition land has been safeguarded on site for future social infrastructure such as health and education if it is required.</p>
---------	----------	---	--

REF066	Resident	<p>As a resident of Eaton, very concerned about the impact of the Ordsall South development on the volume of traffic through the village. There is no mention of this in the plan, which seems to take the view that people will only travel locally. However given the current high volume of traffic through the Eaton, know that many people who live in Ordsall or to the worksop side of eaton and surrounding areas use the road through Eaton to access the A638 to travel to Markham Moor to access the A1 for work or other purposes (including to go to McDonalds as evidenced by the volume of takeaway litter along the road through Eaton and along Ollerton Road). See traffic increasing for access to Rampton and the power stations and then we have traffic from Markham moor side of the A638 using eaton as a cut through for Ranby prison and also for employment in Worksop. This is currently the fastest route for Ordsall residents to access the A1 southbound rather than the Elkesley Bridge or Apleyhead junctions. Why go the long way, on a road that is badly pot holed and no street lighting , when a direct route is available . This will be exacerbated if a further 800 dwellings were to be built to the south of Ordsall, not only with regard to the number of people with cars travelling to and from the development, but also the volume of deliveries to residents. The road and bridge are too narrow to accommodate the current levels of traffic, we have parking issues due to volumes of people using the river for dog walking and general recreational purposes and the issue is made worse given that there is no path through the main part of the village meaning that pedestrians have to walk along the road. Already worried about this have serious concerns we have a serious accident waiting to happen, and a parish council that does not appear to see how big an issue this is, and that the problems will get far worse if the development is approved.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Transport Assessment for Retford which looks at the existing traffic issues and provides recommendations to improve the road network through new development. This includes both onsite and offsite road improvements to Ordsall and Eaton.</p>
REF039	Resident	<p>800 homes at Ordsall South is a very large housing development which will have a great and permanent impact on the neighbourhood, local environment and amenities etc. It is disappointing to learn projects of such size are even being considered let alone proposed in modern times and believe the effects of such will only be negative for the area and environment. It is concerning how such large scale changes to areas and peoples lives can be made by the decisions of relatively few people.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw area has seen much growth in recent years, with many new housing developments already built in and around Retford and Worksop. These continue rapidly in some areas such as Gateford and Shireoaks and clearly many more planned. There is a clear approach to increased urbanisation with little thought to the long term consequence of current policy.</p> <p>Live in unprecedented times with great changes ahead with regard to how we live, work and travel. The need for traditional urban areas for shopping and office space is declining rapidly as the need for open natural space increases which will likely create opportunities for repurposing and potential for much more decent quality residential areas to replace some urban areas, with all facilities close by. This will be more apparent in larger towns and cities countrywide.</p> <p>Am an Ordsall resident and am concerned the traffic on Main St is already busy at peak times and any planned alterations (traffic calming etc) will only be negative for residents. There are at least 4 long term empty homes close to ours and question how many more in the Bassetlaw area. What is being done to reduce these empty properties and look at other resourcefully efficient ways to increase homes in the area without further building on open land. Question the need for such rapid growth (highlighted by some official comments) and believe this to be more about commercial/political progress than a genuine need for housing. A measured approach of multiple, small scale plans spread across the region, would surely have a lesser and fairer impact. Any future development on open farmland should always be kept to a minimum with much greater emphasis on the natural environment and the look and feel of the area. This has to become a priority with undeniable evidence of natural and environmental decline worldwide (there were Skylarks in these fields last summer, now in rapid decline due to habitat loss like so many other species). There are a number of open footpaths on the site with far-reaching views which, even if retained would become closed urban stile alleys and loose most of there appeal for people and nature. This again, will only be negative. Other developments nearby do not sit well in the landscape, especially when viewed from the southern approach to Retford. A much larger tree planting scheme should become the norm, which should effectively cloak the development and in time contribute to woodland and biodiversity to have a positive impact on the area, rather than another bland very large housing plan which will likely do the opposite.</p>	<p>The Bassetlaw Local plan has been progressing for a few years and has been evolving over that time. The Council has to considered a series of options across the District and then provide a strategy on how the growth is to be delivered.</p> <p>Additional growth is a requirement by National Planning Policy and it is the Councils responsibility to distribute that growth accordingly across the District.</p> <p>For Retford the strategy involves allocating both brownfield and Greenfield Land. This largely because there isn't enough brownfield land to accommodate Retford's need.</p> <p>These sites have been considered alongside other options but provide the most sustainable option for the plan.</p> <p>In addition, assessments on local infrastructure capacity have also taken place to determine whether additional provision is needed as part of the developments.</p>

REF070	Resident	<p>As a resident who has lived adjacent to open country side for 36 years fear for the wildlife that could be lost due to this development. Appreciate the need for housing also feel the need for our bio diversity in the form of many species of birds, hedgehogs, frogs , toads, butterflies, bees and may other species that are reliant on the established hedgerows that adorn the proposed area. Would like to see that a green corridor of a considerable size is made available for the protection of our wildlife along the hedgerows that lead from ollerton road up past the houses that already back on to the fields and who already have many species of wildlife in the hedgerows and gardens feel in the 21st century with the emphasis being on climate change and bio diversity that this should be an intrinsic need in the planning of such a big area. propose at least a 20 metre green corridor alongside the gardens off glen eagles way</p>	<p>A development of this scale must provide a net-gain in biodiversity. The development will incorporate a significant level of green infrastructure which will provide habitats for local wildlife and recreational benefits for the community.</p> <p>These will be supported by a network of new green corridors and walking and cycling opportunities that will help connect the green spaces and areas of the site together.</p>
REF072	Resident	<p>As a resident and a Parish Councillor of Eaton extremely concerned about this proposed development NOW even though it is not due to commence until 2027. Appreciate that Bassetlaw District Council is being encouraged by the Government to provide an enormous amount of new housing in the next 16 years. However consider that this rate is almost double what is required using the Government’s recommended method of calculation. This is supposedly justified by employment growth which is expected to result in substantially increased inwards migration. Have reservations about the scale of the increase in employment planned for and consider that it is enormously over-ambitious. The scale of house-building proposed in the Ordsall South proposal seems excessive and suggest that this proposed site should be totally abandoned. Have considerable reservations about this development in terms of: - Additional traffic would produce an enormous amount of additional traffic putting local roads under even more stress than at present. There is limited scope to improve the existing road system and progressively to accommodate the upgrading of these routes. There are 2 old bridges at Ordsall and Eaton which are very narrow and cannot cope with the amount of traffic passing through each village/settlement in 2021. Recently Notts Highways/Via have been involved in devising and enhancing existing traffic measures in Eaton following instances of speeding and antisocial behaviour. Even with recent improvements introduced this has only had a negligible impact in terms of controlling the speed and volume of vehicles using the village as a ‘cut-through’ from major ‘A’ roads. The mini-roundabouts at the north end of Ordsall and at Whitehouses are even now exceptionally congested with no opportunity to make alternative new/enhanced roadways for the proposed Ordsall South development. - Cyclist and pedestrian usage Improvements for cycle traffic may be difficult to achieve without restricting much-needed kerbside parking. As there is only a very small area with a pavement, anybody walking in or through Eaton has to negotiate an increasing number of dangerously driven vehicles cannot walk in the village. There is no way that this situation could be improved as the existing road through the village is so narrow. - Additional facilities If the Ordsall development goes ahead, there must be arrangements in place to secure the funding and provision of all the additional retail, health and community facilities. understand that the proposed school as mentioned in the Plan has been abandoned thus putting much pressure on existing school provision becoming overloaded and disrupted whilst further expansion takes place. Usually the health, educational, infrastructural facilities appertaining to a new residential site are not built until the housing programme is well-developed so yet again existing residents would have to suffer with over-used facilities and services until Bassetlaw Council provides the supporting services. Over a period from 2027 to 2038 this could result in absolute chaos. - Protection of Rural countryside Strikes me that Bassetlaw Council is more prepared to satisfy Government targets than to ensure that the residents of Ordsall and such villages as Eaton and Gamston enjoy healthy and pleasant lives in areas of open countryside and agricultural land. If the scale of house-building in the Retford and District part of the Draft Plan was reduced, perhaps there would be no need for the 800 houses to be added to Ordsall. This development would not become a blot on the surrounding countryside causing immeasurable challenges to local road networks, services and most importantly the indigenous population. Appreciate that some local communities have to suffer in order for major residential developments as suggested in this Draft Plan. Would be MORE SENSIBLE for the Council to increase the number of houses to be built in the Bassetlaw Garden Village as the infrastructure would already exist and could be tied in with the proposed development. This would be preferable to tagging a huge residential development on to the southern area of Retford where there are insufficient services and an unviable road infrastructure. It brings to mind the saying that the Ordsall South development would be ‘Like a carbuncle on the face of an old friend!’</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment for Retford which identifies existing traffic issues and provides recommendations for development in terms of mitigation required.</p> <p>For Eaton, there are traffic calming and preventative measures as part of the mitigation package.</p> <p>The site will provide new infrastructure in terms of homes, local services, public transport and green spaces. The green spaces will provide significant opportunities for wildlife and recreation.</p> <p>Flood Management proposals are also being incorporated.</p> <p>Existing education and health provision can accommodate the proposed development. However, an area of land has been safeguarded on site for social infrastructure such as health and education facilities if they’re required in the future.</p>

REF082	Resident	<p>Having participated in the on line event regarding Ordsall South yesterday evening it was apparent that there is very little detail forthcoming. No doubt this is because the plans are not yet drawn/submitted by developers. What was apparent the lack of an up to date understanding of this part of Ordsall/Retford. General questions submitted were not answered in my opinion and the impression from the facilitator was that this development is a fait accompli regardless of what local residents concerns and objections are. Hope that this is not the case and BDC are not wasting mine and others' time. It was disappointing not to have been able to view the introduction to the on line event. This was apparently due to a technical hitch. Sure we were told it would be sent on to us. Nothing ever arrived. Received an email response in regards to the questions asked on the online consultations. Many questions again were not answered sufficiently and merely deferred to further further transport studies etc. This information would be imperative from the outset. What has also become apparent is that many local residents are completely unaware of these plans. Fastening notices to the odd lamppost is not a particularly effective way of drawing attention to this development taking into account we have been in some kind of lockdown for months. Not many people are out and about to see the odd notice that's been put up. Not everyone uses social media nor read the local magazine which contained a short article. Maybe a more effective way would be to write to each household in Ordsall and inform residents seeing as this plan will affect most if not all of them in one way or another. Either you want a consultation in the true sense and engage with the local residents or you don't.</p>	<p>The consultation in January introduced the principle of development at this site. As the Local plan process proceeds, more detail will become available. The proposed consultation over the summer, will provide residents with up to date information about the proposed layout and evidence base such as infrastructure, transport and flooding.</p> <p>The Council is hoping that through the easing of lockdown measure, it can hold a series of public events in the community.</p>
REF082	Resident	<p>Live in a road overlooking the fields planned for this 800 house development and to say am disappointed with the plan to build here is an understatement. Moved here five years ago after 30+ years living on the outskirts of London. My intention being to retire to my rural roots. You can call this Nimbyism if you wish but do not personally wish to be swamped by a massive housing estate and all of the issues that will bring to this area. TRAFFIC/HIGHWAYS - the proposed site has one road in and one road out along Ollerton Road/West Hill Road. One direction towards Ordsall and Retford (an alternative route via a narrow and already busy High Street/All Hallows Street/Goosemoor Bridge) the other towards the A1 and Elkesley. This is a country road and doubt would manage an increase in through traffic which will be generated by an 800 house development. There is already an issue with speeding motorists coming into Ordsall along this route despite there being clearly displayed 30mph signs and a warning matrix on the way into Ordsall. The same for the route over Goosemoore Bridge. When asked how traffic would be managed safely, the response was that the mini roundabout at Babworth would be updated and possibly a oneway system through the High Street! A high street that is narrow with dangerously narrow pavements already and used as a cut through/race track by local boy/girl racers. So one suggestion (a one way system) will create a nice circuit for these idiots to use. Without any doubt Eaton village would be another cut through. A small village with a small country road leading to it and through it. This will cause significant issues running through the village. The ridge in Eaton has been hit a number of times and was faulty recently repaired. There has already been one fatality in recent months. Any increase in traffic will undoubtedly increase the risk of more. Both Ordsall and Eaton have small bridges that will struggle to cope with a rise in traffic volume. Both areas flood regularly and often render the roads impassable and are therefore closed to traffic. Closures of the A1/M1 north and southbound result in traffic being diverted through Retford on a regular basis. This causes complete gridlock. What are the contingencies for this? Ordsall is often the only route in and out! This will only get worse with an increased volume of traffic from the new development. More traffic also equates to poor environment through exhaust emissions etc. Again not good for local residents to have to endure. More danger to residents in terms of accidents causing serious injury or fatality. FLOODING - it is well known that Ordsall is prone to flooding in particular the High Street and Goosemoor Lane both of which are often closed to traffic for days or weeks on end due to flood water. In fact on old maps these areas are described as marshes so clearly have flooded for centuries. The fields/ditches to the east side of Bank Side have flooded three times in the last five years. They have in the last week flooded again and it's only December. This has encroached on the footpath bisecting the gardens on Bank Side along with the adjacent field making it impassable for much of the footpath. This has prevented it from being used or those having the will to trudge through the shin deep water have been forced into the adjacent fields. There are natural springs running down the fields adjacent Bank Side which already cause saturated ground in that area, draining into the ditches. Where will this water be diverted when the fields (marshland/flood plain) is already saturated/flooded? No amount of pipe work or drainage is going to deal with the additional run off water. There is nowhere else for it to go other than already saturated ground. Come and have a look at the fields adjacent to Bank Side at present if you need any convincing. Concrete, tarmac and paving this area will only compound the issue. Suggest that you have a look at the fields between Bank Side and the River Idle and the extent of the flooding at present. We</p>	<p>The Council is required, by National Planning Policy, to plan for more homes across the District. To do this in a sustainable and reasonable manner, the Council has undertaken a series of detailed evidence base. Firstly, it is looked at the amount and type of housing and employment development that is needed over the plan period. This is then distributed around the District in accordance with local need and infrastructure constraints. For Retford, as the District's second largest settlement, it is important it takes its fair share – particularly as there is high-demand for housing within the town.</p> <p>As part of the process, the Council looks at the availability and suitability of land around the town. There are some areas where existing natural or infrastructure constraints are too significant to warrant development. These tend to be within areas where there are historical, environmental or flooding issues. The Council prioritises the use of brownfield land where possible and there are recent examples of this in Retford such as the developments on former industrial areas at Thrumpton Lane. However, there isn't enough suitable brownfield land within Retford to take the required housing growth. Therefore greenfield land is required. Ordsall South is located directly adjoining the existing built form of Retford and provides an opportunity to deliver a sustainable urban extension which includes land for new homes, affordable housing, shops and services, sport facilities and a new country park to provide recreational and environmental benefit. Existing employment area of the town have been protected for such uses and some are expanding such as Randall Way off North Road.</p> <p>Retford has a good train service to other destinations and therefore provides the opportunity for residents to travel further afield for employment in a sustainable manner.</p>

		<p>are only in the middle of January. Imagine what this area will be like in March! This is becoming an increasingly frequent occurrence. No amount of drainage is going to be able to deal with this volume of water. It has nowhere to go!</p> <p>WILDLIFE/ENVIRONMENT - there is a good variety of flora and fauna supported by the fields, remaining woodland, hedges and River Idle. Have ducks, swans, frogs, toads, newt, a wide variety of garden and farmland birds, herons, egrets, red kites, buzzards, sparrow hawks, kestrels, bats (need proof feel free to pay me a visit on summer evenings), badgers, deer, foxes, rabbits etc are all supported by our current environment. Stealing more land will severely effect their ability to survive going forward. Creating a “country park” and a “wetlands area” is no replacement for natural environments. Gradually eroding our nature by developing in these areas by removing hedges, fields and trees. We already have a wetlands area due to the significant flooding. It is of note that during the first COVID lockdown and more recently lockdown 3, there was an increase in footfall utilising the footpaths in and around this area. This caused a significant amount of damage to footpaths, farmers’ fields and river banks with discarded litter being an issue too. An increase in the local population is going to compound this issue. The amount of plastic bottles, food wrappers, plastic bags, clothing and dog muck was beyond a joke. This is without doubt going to increase in the years to come. Don’t want to live on the edge of such an area. Lost count of the number of times cleared up litter that has been left by inconsiderate individuals. Currently the footpaths in the area are under water due to the flooding. Something that happens with in reading regularity. CURRENT RESIDENTIAL AREAS - living on the Bank Side/Farm View estate have a safe area to live and peace and quiet. There is a good mixture of older and younger residents. Access/egress is via Farm View. Any increase in traffic would devastate this small estate. There is a suggestion that access to the new development would be via Bank Side. How do you intend to compensate residents for the damage and reduction in property value this will cause? SERVICES - A development of 800 dwellings will draw a population of some 2,000 to 3,000 people. Services in BDC, NHS, NCC etc are already stretched. Judging by the potholes in the road your stretched services will be even more stretched. How do you intend to provide for this extra capacity without reducing services for current residents? No such services will be included in this new development. What services will be made available or improved upon for current residents? It is my understanding that this area had been put forward for development as it is a 20 minute walk into Retford. Now unless you are intending to have 50k Olympic race walkers moving into this new development then there is no way on this earth that anyone will be able to make that distance in 20 minutes. This is a fallacy. Also how many people do you think are going you be encouraged on to a bicycle? Think you need a bit of a reality check. Have the other housing estates encouraged a greater uptake of cycling? Like to see the statistics! A few questions would like answered 1. What safeguards are in place to ensure that developers complete the estate that authority is given for. Developers promise the earth and rarely deliver what are in the plans eg The Brambles estate in Retford. Allegedly large sums of money change hands to allow developers to get out of clauses! 2. What services are going to be provided/improved to current Ordsall residents? 3. What will be the increase in council tax to pay for this? 4. How will you compensate me for loss of value on my property and disruption to my environment in terms of pollutants and noise? 5. How will BDC ensure current services are not stretched further? 6. What employment/businesses have been brought into Retford from the numerous estates that have been built over the last five years? 7. How many dwellings one recently built are currently vacant? 8. How will you pay for an increase in the need for policing? Notts Police are already stretched. 9. What consultation has taken place with the Environment Agency and NRA? A development of this size will devastate this area and it will not be an improvement. There are numerous housing estates that have been built around Retford and only one actually fits in with the town itself. That being Blossom Grove. The remainder stand out like a sore thumb. Stand alone housing estates do not create a harmonious community. Retford is at serious risk of becoming a soulless commuter town for workers travelling to the big cities for their employment. A housing estate of this size will severely effect the countryside and its plants and animals. It will be hugely detrimental to the plants and animals. It will place a huge pressure on local roads and infrastructure in this whole area. These roads are country roads, not London Road or North Road. They will not cope with the huge increase in traffic</p>	<p>The development will incorporate a significant level of new and improved green spaces and walking and cycling infrastructure that will provide space for wildlife and for recreation by the community.</p> <p>Where development requires improvements to infrastructure such as Transport or flooding, then these will form part of the development requirement within the relevant policy. These are also identified within the Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
REF100	Resident	<p>As a resident of Eaton can only envisage more and more traffic coming - at speed - through the village if this building work goes ahead, even in the short term if fewer houses are built than the 800 envisaged. The main road through Eaton is already a rat run for commuters, putting extra strain on the historic bridge over the River Idle.</p>	<p>Traffic calming and preventative measures for Eaton village have been identified within the Retford Transport Assessment.</p>

REF110	Resident	<p>Resident of Eaton and am strongly against the size of development laid out in this Draft for the extension to Ordsall however accept that some more restrictive development must be allowed. The complete lack of consideration to the effects this would have on the village of Eaton is inexcusable at this stage. The fact that a key policy on transport has not been included does not sit well with myself as it has been stated more than one infrastructure is the key to land allocation so how can this be omitted.</p>	<p>The Local Plan provides a strategic plan for the District. It recognises the importance of individual settlements through the provision of design and character. Eaton is considered a rural settlement and its character will be preserved through various policies within the Plan.</p>
REF110	Resident	<p>Item 2 it states (a) Deliver at least 800 dwellings during the plan period to 2037 My question is why is the words “at least” included? While accepting there is a justification for some development in the Retford area and the site at Ordsall south would be an obvious choice for a gradual and contained level of development 800 is way in excess for the time scale of this plan. 100 - 250 over the time would be more in keeping and would enable the integration and improvements to all infrastructures including waste, roads, schools and retail. The plan make reference to maintaining sightlines to the hamlet of Eaton but there is nothing in the plan that indicates Eaton would be protected from the development of Ordsall South. Would a large area be allocated for parking with in the area for visitors to the country park at Whisker Hill as you indicated you would like this to be a destination point with Bassetlaw ? and has consideration been given to the effects of the incoming traffic on the local roads. Item 3 point 4 Would it not be a better buffer if you consider moving the country park on HS13 to wrap round both the West and South Boundaries ensuring a softer break between agricultural land and Development ? Item 3 point 5 Have addressed parking for non residential development however following the complete lack of sufficient parking per household the development at Bridon which has caused issues with emergency services being unable to get can you ensure this is included in the masterplan. Item 5 point 2 How come there is no note of financial contribution to any traffic calming / management in the village of Eaton be it traffic lights at the narrow bridge or development of calming measures along the length of Main St. The fact this has been omitted cannot be down to the lack of the Transport Assessment as none of the point shown in this point should appear! Item 5 There is no reference to the bridges crossing the River Idle am sure with your local knowledge are not built to cope with either your plans of improved walking and cycling routes let alone the huge increase in traffic. Can you explore the possibilities, If this development was to go in its current format a feasibility study as to the merits of building a new road down Marsh lane and across to either Goosemore or London roads to ensure your wish of a safe route to Retford town centre could be made by all users. Item 7.14.13 At what time in the process of this plan would you expect to see plans being put forward to improve the traffic using Ordsall High St along side pedestrians and cyclists it my concern</p>	<p>The term ‘at least’ applies to all allocated sites as issues to do with viability and delivery may change of the plan period. Ordsall South is a long term site due to its scale and the delivery of this site will be phased over the plan period.</p> <p>The development applies to the directly to the south of Ordsall up towards the Golf Corse. Vehicular access to the site will be via Ollerton Road which will form part of its improvements.</p> <p>Traffic and other impacts to infrastructure have been assessed and a number of recommended mitigation measures have been identified, including traffic calming and traffic preventative measures within Eaton village.</p> <p>Wider improvements to the network are also proposed along with improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure.</p>
REF161	Residents	<p>Concerned about the extent and positioning of the Ordsall South proposal: 1. The effect on surface water run off from the development on the River Idle and the flood plain. Doubts that the full extent of the impact on the local drainage and flooding will be appreciated. The River Idle has been in flood for some time and is already problematic threatening housing and transport on Goosemoor Lane. Climate change will certainly add to this and it is unlikely that the system will cope with further run off. The eastern area of the development bordering the dyke is currently again under flood; the flood plain and fields bordering Goosemoor Lane have not drained nearly all year following high rain levels last year and the ground remains saturated with expectation of further flooding. The culvert draining the dyke water into the river has been blocked for some time adding to the extent of the flooding. The information suggests that a flood management plan will be developed including best ways to manage surface water run off. Would have expected that before development plan approved that a robust flood management plan be in place. 2. The transport routes to the new development. Understand that the transport assessment (Bassetlaw Transport Study)concluded that there is no need for a new road to feed the development from the east and central Retford. The main centres to the east of Retford are and will be major areas for employment. Central Retford will still provide employment, entertainment, schooling and shopping. The transport will result in excessive traffic on Goosemoor Lane or through Eaton. Neither of these routes are suitable for additional usage. They are already dangerous roads with cars spreading and difficulties negotiating the bridges. It is inconceivable that this was not identified by the study.</p>	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that there are surface water runoff issues within the area. It recommends that the development incorporate sustainable urban drainage infrastructure as well as onsite water storage capacity which will be design to hold water and prevent it from simply running off into the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Retford Transport Assessment assessed the existing issues and traffic capacity on the road network and has provided a series of recommended highway mitigation measures as part of the development of the site. These include both onsite and offsite measures.</p>

REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>It is recognised that the council has an obligation to build housing stock and that it makes sense to develop on a wide space of land, as opposed to several smaller areas. It is encouraging that much thought has gone into this development, with the aims that it should be a sustainable living environment with green space, including a country park, although further detail on who would be responsible for maintenance of the park is needed. There has been consideration to walking and cycling, which should be integrated within a wider network. Better cycling infrastructure is welcomed, however many residents in Ordsall need to use street parking (for example, Brecks Road) and this should be taken in account. Ordsall was once a small village which has grown over the years. An additional 800 houses, which would see upward of 2000+ new residents, needs to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is in place. A convenience shop and a recycling centre has been included on the plan; detailing of what a health centre means (for example, a new surgery, a satellite doctor surgery, pharmacy) should be clarified. A risk assessment on what this could mean for the police, ambulance and fire services should also be carried out, for instance, will funding for an additional community police officer be required? It should be ensured that there are enough school places for families who may settle in the area. 800 new houses will also see more stress on roads, which would already benefit from improvements, and it is encouraging that contributions to improve the roundabouts have been noted. However, there are already bottlenecks at the river bridge at Goosemoor Lane and the railway bridge at West Carr Road. Additionally, Goosemoor Lane is also subject to flooding which also restricts an access point. Flooding has become an increasingly serious problem in Bassetlaw, including parts of Ordsall. Although there are no plans to build in flood zones 2 and 3 on the site, leaving these for green space with dwellings located in flood zone 1 as the preferential area, floods can still cause disruption to residents, even if their homes are not flooded. An example would be if Goosemoor Lane was to flood and block an access point, which in turn adds more stress to other areas. Been suggested that the housing allocation is twice that recommended by the government to allocate housing need. With this in mind, is a development of quite this size and scale required for Ordsall? If this development is to go ahead, work should not begin until arrangements are in place to ensure the future of the needed infrastructure and community facilities are secured.</p>	<p>The maintenance of green spaces will form part of planning agreements.</p> <p>A significant level of green infrastructure will be incorporated into the development. Part of this will include a network of new and improved walking and cycling infrastructure that will help connect green spaces and places together. It'll help encourage residents to walk to facilities and to nearby areas. Connection to the wider countryside and local services and facilities will also be improved.</p> <p>The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the current traffic issues and road capacity within the area. It has provided a series of recommendations for mitigation measures to help improve the road infrastructure within the area. These include both onsite and offsite measures.</p> <p>In addition, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified that there are surface water runoff issues within the area and it has provided recommendations for new drainage and water storage infrastructure on site. These will help to reduce the threat of surface water runoff into Ordsall or the new development.</p> <p>Existing education and health infrastructure can accommodate the projected development at this site. However, the allocation has safeguarded land for additional social infrastructure such as health and education facilities if they're required in the future.</p>
--------	--	--	--

REF183	Resident	<p>You enthuse over this site but the words could apply to almost any proposed developments – “sustainable”, “well integrated”, “open spaces and community use”, etc. What you seem to ignore is the impact of flooding – including on residents gardens – as well as having no firm proposals for traffic management. For context: Retford is a town with two main water routes: River Idle crossed by road bridges at Goosemoor Lane, Albert Road, Bridgegate and Amcott Way; Chesterfield Canal with road bridges at Hospital Road, Carolgate, Arlington Way, Grove Street, Leverton Road and Welham Road.</p> <p>The town is also crossed by the East Coast railway line with road bridges at Babworth Road and London Road and three crossing points for non-motor vehicles. The railway line from Sheffield to Lincoln is crossed by road bridges at Ordsall Road, Ollerton Road, London Road with level crossings at Thrumpton Lane and Grove Lane. Any development in Retford has to take into account the traffic capacity of these crossings. Transport and Movement all you say is “Development should be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan”. This should have been done before this site is proposed for development. A meeting I attended, in my time as a Councillor, with the Council Leader on 10 October 2012 indicated his preference for developing land on Ollerton Road, Ordsall so there has been more than enough time for detailed work to have been done. Residents can have no faith in BDC based on past performance. When the council was looking to develop land at Newlands it commissioned a traffic study which recommended traffic lights at the Ordsall Road/Babworth Road junction – a condition eventually agreed at Planning Committee but later overturned on developer application. This traffic study did not look at the impact this development would have as regards traffic through “Old Ordsall” – High Street, All Hallows Street, Goosemoor Lane River Bridge or Ollerton and Welbeck Roads where the shops are. There are errors – there is no North Road/Babworth Road roundabout; there is no Goosemoor London Road mini roundabout. There is a roundabout where Hospital Road meets North Road; there is a mini roundabout at the London Road /Whitehouses Road junction. More information needs to be provided as to how you will get a marked cycle lane along the whole of Brecks Road. Need to be clearer on what is meant by “a traffic management scheme in Ordsall Old Village” – is this a euphemism for a one way system? It will not be much use looking at “a subsidised high frequency bus service” if a traffic management scheme means people living further away from bus stops. When work to High Street and a diversion using All Hallows Street and Ollerton Road was in place people found it more difficult to use the bus as stops were further away. This was a particular difficulty for people if they had mobility issues. That diversion also put more traffic along Ollerton Road which as you are probably aware is particularly congested at the Welbeck Road junction. It also added to the length of a journey (0.7 mile) which does not help a green agenda. So how much traffic do you think High Street, All Hallows Street, Ollerton Road and the Goosemoor Lane River Bridge can take? This needs to be addressed before you decide to allocate more land for housing in Ordsall. Affordable Homes the council needs to be much clearer and open. Developers often receive permission to build and then come back with an argument that sites are not viable with the provision of affordable housing. These need to be published for transparency. In my time as a councillor was asked about a development at Whitehouses where the developer sought to lift the condition for 8 affordable houses. Asked for that to go to Planning Committee so that there was accountability but it would be much better if all such requests were done in public. Flooding At 7.14.10 you recognise how close the River Idle is to your proposed site. It is not clear that you are aware of current and past flooding at the eastern edge of your proposed site allocation. The Ordsall to Eaton footpath crosses several private gardens which have again been flooded and on occasion the footpath has been unavailable to most unless in the possession of wading equipment. Unless they have already done so it may be a good idea for elected members and officers to walk this route now to see the impact of water running off your proposed site - know that Cllr. Clarkson is aware of flooding issues as recently met him on the flooded footpath. “A Flood Risk Assessment will be required” should be done before allocating not when planning applications are made. Residents have seen an increase in flooding and while some of this may be as a result of climate change the growth of housing and hard landscaping that has taken place in Ordsall must be a contributory factor.</p>	<p>The development of this site will be locally distinctive. A masterplan for the site is being prepared and this will detail the layout and scale of development. This site is particularly sensitive as it an edge of settlement development and therefore its impact on the environment and the proposed Green Gap will need to be carefully considered through the design of the site.</p> <p>The development of the Local Plan has included an evidence base which looks at the impact on the environment, the capacity of infrastructure and the type of housing that is needed and where.</p> <p>The evidence base and the recommendations that come as a result of it provide the detail to inform the proposed policy for the site and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure has been assessed through the Retford Transport Assessment and this details what measures are required to the existing network in order to accommodate the scheme. This assessment provides up to date information that has been agreed by the County Council.</p> <p>Similarly, the Flood Risk Assessment provides a series of measures to reduce the impact of surface water flooding to the community.</p> <p>The benefit of planning for growth is that infrastructure improvements will form part of the sites requirements through policy. Due to the out of date Core Strategy and the lack of allocated sites for development means that the District has been subject to speculative developments where not all infrastructure has occurred with development.</p>
--------	----------	---	--

REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Our client owns a substantial proportion of land to the western side of the allocation (to the west of Ollerton Road). The remaining land within the allocation, including those to the east of Ollerton Road, are owned by two other landowners. All three landowners are in a collaboration agreement to promote the land for development which is being led by our client who has a demonstrated experience in promoting land through the planning process as with its land at Harworth. Landownership is straightforward for this proposed allocation with a clear commitment from all parties to ensure delivery. The Site was put forward as part of the Local Plan 'Call for Sites' and has been promoted through the Council's previous Local Plan consultations. It benefits from excellent connectivity to Retford, which itself benefits from two rail links and existing public transport. Retford has a strong housing market and the site allows for ease of 'out-commuting' to the A1 and higher order employment locations, without all traffic travelling through the Town Centre of Retford. As such, Ordsall South represents a highly logical site for residential-led development. Noting the context, our comments on the draft Local Plan correspond with the headings and relevant sections of the Draft Local Plan. Appended are: • Development Framework Document (Barton Willmore December 2020); • Transport and Access Strategy (Development Transport Planning Ltd); and • Landscape baseline assessment (Barton Willmore). These form the baseline for development at Ordsall South, alongside these submissions. Reiterate our client's desire to collaborate with the Council, Members and stakeholders at Ordsall South to deliver a high quality residential development that the District can be proud of.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF117	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Welcome Policy ST29 and HS13 "Ordsall South". The land to the south of Retford is a sustainable and attractive location for housing development and will underpin the success of the housing market within the District. 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. Committed to working with the Council to deliver this project. The baseline documents form the case for development at Ordsall South, alongside these planning submissions. The documents provided demonstrate that the allocation can accommodate the number of homes required by the Council's spatial strategy and that there are no 'show-stoppers' to delivery. The accompanying Development Framework provides a conceptual design for land uses, a streets hierarchy and landscape strategy, including identifying a number of high-level design principles which the landowners are committing to ensure that Ordsall South is a high-quality development. The Landscape Assessment sets out how the allocation does not impact upon the wider countryside. There are no national or local landscape designation affected and the report concludes that development would be framed within the existing built form of Retford. The Site is suitable for development as it is largely devoid of any significant landscape features and the land is largely flat. The report also sets a strategy of planting and landscape features which will be used to add a rich variety and demarked southern boundary to Retford. The network of PROWs will be enhanced, and a new community country park provided. Transport and Access Strategy addresses movement for vehicles, cycling and pedestrians. It considers the opportunity of the site to link with existing bus routes that serve Ordsall and access the existing mainline railway stations. The report identifies possible access points into the site. It demonstrates that development of the site can be brought forward in a sustainable way, without resulting in unnecessary traffic movements through Retford Town Centre. Turning to the Policy working wish to make the following comments: Part 1 a): recognise the Council's comments about a Retford – Eaton 'Green Gap'. Address this in the landscape report. Do not agree that a Green Gap policy is justified (see our comments on ST40), recognise that Eaton is a separate hamlet and that good design would not wish to 'swallow' such a settlement. In the case of Eaton, there is a considerable distance between, the hamlet and the allocation plus a river. Allocation at HS13 does not affect the character of that place. Part 1 a) ii): do not support delivery of 15-20 dwellings per hectares. This is an extremely low net ratio and would result in the inefficient use of land. 30 dwellings per hectare is more normal without comprising the requirement for large areas of public open space and a country park in this location. The criterion also conflicts with Policy 32 which requires 30 dph in Retford. Part 1 c): The site is largely Flood Zone 1 and an FRA will be provided as part of the Council's validation requirements. There is no need to have this criterion. Part 2 a): support the delivery of at least 800 homes by 2037. This is achievable for a site in an established housing market. Part 2 b): support the stated mix of accommodation. Part 3 a): support the identified Green Infrastructure strategy of the site including the 23Ha country park and woodland areas. This is a significant planning benefit and will allow for biodiversity net gain. It is also a good opportunity to involve the community and other stakeholders to deliver a significant benefit for Retford. Part 4 a): The Local Centre and</p>	These comments have been addressed, where relevant through the focussed consultation document, specifically Policy 29 Part 1 a) ii); Part 4 a) and Part 4 b).

		<p>sentiment that this is only of small scale is accepted. The convenience store must be Use Class E, as F2a can only be provided where it is more than 1km away from another facility. That could not be achieved given existing facilities in Ordsall. Part 4b): should be deleted. There is no justification for s106 monies to go to public realm at Ordsall Local Centre from a housing allocation, especially when the allocation already requires facilities on site as well. Part 5: object to part 5 as it is a shopping list of funding requests for projects elsewhere. Highways report identifies that there is a need for connectivity to existing infrastructure and for some local highway improvements. This is accepted and discussions will advance with Nottinghamshire County Council as Highways Authority. Parts a) iii) 4 suggest unspecified off-site public realm improvements which are not reasonably related to the site. Part B): Welcome further discussion with the Council regarding the Ordsall South Masterplan Framework, including who is responsible for producing this and the Council's internal approval process of such a document.</p>	
--	--	--	--

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
1643764	Resident	Traffic?? Tuxford village centre is already dangerous, planners NEED to visit Tuxford during rush hour periods, Village centre sits between 90 new homes and the A1.	An appropriate access will need to be created along Ollerton Road to accommodate the development. Offsite mitigation may be required subject to the design and layout of the scheme. There will be a cycle and pedestrian access from the site on to Long Lane so residents can access the local facilities in a sustainable way.
REF056	Resident	<p>In the introduction to the Bassetlaw Local Plan item 1.2.2 states: The Local Plan explains how many new homes and businesses are needed, where they should be located and how and when they will be delivered. It sets out how the town centres will be supported and improved and identifies any additional infrastructure (such as new roads and schools) which is needed to support development and explains how this infrastructure will be delivered. The plan is clear, laudable, and comprehensive, but sadly our first experiences of the plan being put into action in Tuxford suggests a lack of knowledge about this community. As a consequence, new housing developments are located on greenfield sites when other options are available. Tuxford's major problems include: A large area of sub-standard housing stock</p> <p>A lack of greenfield playing space Collapsing infrastructure – especially drains Derelict and damaged heritage buildings</p> <p>A town centre blighted by high (probably illegal) levels of air pollution from HGV traffic</p> <p>Fortunately, the actions necessary to resolve these problems contribute to delivering the strategic objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. In the early 1960s a large housing estate was built between the top of Gilbert and Faraday Avenues to accommodate miners coming to work on the local coalfields. The houses were hastily erected using pre-cast concrete sections and had a 30-year design life. Today, almost 60 years later, they are still there, some in private hands and some in BDC ownership. Most of the houses have large gardens, and the central rows of concrete and asbestos garages have been mostly removed leaving a very large area of land with a very low-density housing load. Given that the houses do not meet modern housing standards and given that the basic infrastructure of drainage, water and power are already there, does it not make sense to re-develop this area of the town first rather than building on greenfield sites? The area is very close to the only local playing field and is within a short, safe walk of Tuxford Academy. Redevelopment of this area would also obviate the need to build on the Gilbert Avenue playing field – the only area for greenfield sports in Tuxford. It is the intention of the new owners of the large site on Eldon Street presently occupied by Platts Harris to make this site available for housing development in the near future. The new owners intend to register this intent with BDC before the 20th of January. Between the capacity of the Platts Harris site and the redevelopment area mentioned above there is more than enough space to satisfy the requirements of the Local Plan without building on green land and depriving the community of its only playing field.</p>	<p>There are not enough available or suitable brownfield sites within Tuxford to accommodate the level of growth required. The Council are now only taking one of the proposed sites forward in the Local Plan and this is the one off Ollerton Road, not the one to the South of Gilbert Avenue. This sports facility is protected under the Local Plan. Planning permissions granted since 1st April 2018 will contribute towards the 250 requirement for Tuxford. The proposed allocation at Ollerton Road will contribute a further 75 new homes leaving a need for 45 new homes. When other sites become available such as brownfield sites, these could make up the remaining housing requirement for the community. In addition, the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan could also allocate sites to make up any remaining housing requirement.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF060	Notts County Council	The Policy should provide a route sufficiently wide to accommodate a future bus route to the southern boundary of the site to safeguard the potential of future development to the south.	Noted. This has been added to the Policy Criteria
1664659	Resident	Could you please let me know with so many housings being built is the possibility of adding a skate park for the youth?	The site will provide some public open space. Tuxford already has a Skate Park at the former village hall site and it has capacity for additional usage.
1665937	Tuxford Town Council	<p>The Local Plan on the face of it, delivers a comprehensive outline of what Bassetlaw needs to implement to complete the growth necessary set out by the Government. Unfortunately, little thought has gone into the allocation of the extra houses, that the plan feels Tuxford should deliver. It has allocated a growth of 20% as opposed to a growth of only 5% in the surrounding villages. When challenged BDC explain that the 20% allocation is due to the fact that Tuxford already has the services necessary to absorb this growth. Tuxford Town Council would like to state that currently Tuxford has major problems regarding its infrastructure and until this is rectified it would be economical suicide to put the Town under more pressure. The Drainage system is outdated and not capable of serving the existing community. There have been three major road closures in the last year, cutting off one part of the town from the shops and services. This problem has still not been resolved and sewerage seeps from the drains, along with the appalling smell. There have been two major water leaks, flooding part of the town. Again, due to outdated infrastructure. Both schools and doctors surgery are at their capacity for pupils and patients.</p> <p>Tuxford has a lack of community facilities and a minimum of greenfield playing space. Traffic density and major pollution problems blight the town Centre and its approach roads. This has a detrimental affect not only connected to health and wellbeing of the residents, but to the adverse effects these vehicles have on the many historic buildings. Recent surveys have been carried out to count the volume of traffic Tuxford experienced over an 11-hour period. This showed that 625 Heavy Vehicles passed through the town Centre and even more alarmingly 325 vehicles per hour were counted. The Highways Department at Nottinghamshire County Council have been alerted to these problems and been informed that because of this high movement of vehicles, Tuxford now has the worst Pollution levels in the whole of Bassetlaw (reported by Bassetlaw District Council). Have suggested a weight restriction, or a ring Road would ease the problems. To date we have not received a response. Understand that Bassetlaw District Council are obligated to deliver new housing, and of course Tuxford would benefit from this, but would urge you as a Council to first of all look at addressing the many problems outlined and instead of forging forward with building, look to first solve the many problems we have outlined. Currently, we do not have an active District Councillor to represent Tuxford and its residents. In the last consultation, which was held in Tuxford, it was documented that 30% of the residents who responded to the proposed sites, were in favour of site NP 10 for development (off Lincoln Road). Only 18% were in favour of NP 04 (Ollerton Road). We understand that NP 10 was not deliverable due to Nottinghamshire County Council Highways objections, yet they have approved the site on Ollerton Road, which will not only add to our existing problems of traffic and pollution but go against the preferred site that Tuxford voted for. It is also using a green field site when brown field sites are available. Building is already underway to give Tuxford 86 affordable/social housing on Ashvale Road, to forge ahead with another housing estate before addressing the problems, would in the Town Councils opinion, be detrimental to the town. Already have several planning applications for new housing within the town and feel this would be a better and more agreeable way of absorbing the extra need for housing, rather than yet another dense housing estate. This would be monitored, to be in keeping with this historic town which Tuxford Town Council and its residents are proud of.</p>	<p>Tuxford is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size, level of services and facilities and the role it provides as a service centre to nearby villages. The Council recognises that the land around Tuxford is heavily constrained, but this does not necessarily mean that development cannot take place. The Local Plan is being prepared alongside an evidence base which details the existing and future infrastructure needs and requirements. Relevant stakeholders and infrastructure providers have all been consulted on the proposals. This includes the utility companies. They confirm that the level of growth identified for Tuxford can be accommodated, with mitigation where necessary. Where mitigation is identified this will form part of the policy requirement and be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. National legislation states that development can only contribute to infrastructure needs generated by the impact of that development. It is not possible to secure improvements to existing issues. The Town Council are correct in liaising with the County Council with regard to existing highways matters. Community consultation is just one factor that should be taken into account when considering development. It is important that sites are also suitable, available and deliverable. Some sites the public previously favoured are considered unsuitable due to their particular impact i.e. highways or are contrary to national/local policy. If a site has gained public support, but then it is later demonstrated that it is not suitable to accommodate development, then it cannot be taken forward. The Council will continue to work with the Town Council through the Neighbourhood Plan review process so that it can seek to accommodate any of the remaining growth requirement moving forward.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF067	Resident	Have great concerns over the additional water drainage from the proposed housing plan for the area behind Lodge lane Industrial estate . My property runs alongside the old A1 now the B1164. Prior to the early 1980s. , a culvert running under the railway embankment onto my garden must have been closed off as never had a drop of water down it . Starting in the early 80s, waste foul water , bags of rubbishy and raw sewage started to pour out . Eventually the sewage was stopped due to the work of a young lady from Burton on Trent who insisted on the estate treating its sewage correctly. Around 2020 tons of fine clippings came down the culvert apparently from a new road being made, following this the next rainfall produced a massive volume of water through the culvert ,far too much for the pipe which goes under the B1164 to cope with resulting in my garden being flooded then pouring like a river onto the road flooding down to Sutton on Trent . Believe the cause of the sudden increase in volume is due in part to the drainage gulleys which used to run down either side of Lodge lane getting blocked as we used to see these fill up . Have reported the situation many times always getting incident nos. and promise of a visit within 14 days , not once has there been any visit . Due to the floodwater we have had a serious accident when a car drove int it and finished up on its roof. Hope you can help with this problem and possible worse future situation . Will send separately photo / video of the current situation during rainfall	Part of this area of Tuxford has received planning permission for affordable dwellings. This land is accessed off Ashvale Road. The proposed development site to the rear of this and off Gilbert Avenue is no longer an allocation within the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan. The only site identified within the Local Plan for residential development is land off Ollerton Road for 75 dwellings.
REF075	Resident	Great concerns over the inevitable additional water drainage from the proposed housing plan for the area behind Lodge Lane industrial estate. My property runs alongside the old A1, now the B1164. Prior to the early 1980's a culvert running beneath the railway embankment onto my garden must have been closed off since there was never a drop of water from it. Starting in the early 80's waste water, bags of rubbish and raw sewage started to pour out, eventually the sewage was stopped due to the work of a young lady from Burton-on-Trent who insisted on the estate managing their sewage treatment. Around 2020 tons of fine stone chippings came down apparently from a road being made, following this following heavy rainfall the culvert pipe shot out with tremendous force storm water, far too much for the pipe which goes under the B1164 to cope with resulting in my garden flooding and the water going onto the road, flooding the northern side of the carriageway down to Sutton-on-Trent. Believe the cause of the massive of water is due to one or both of the drainage gulley's alongside Lodge Lane having been closed off since there used to be an overflow from there. Have registered many times the problems getting incident No's and promises of a visit within 14 days, now over 20 years. Never had a single visit. Have had a serious accident already where a car travelling towards Tuxford from Sutton on the dry side, rounded a bend, hit the flood and finished up on its roof. Hope you can help with this and possible worse future situations. Will try and send an email with videos of the flooding.	Part of this area of Tuxford has received planning permission for affordable dwellings. This land is accessed off Ashvale Road. The proposed development site to the rear of this and off Gilbert Avenue is no longer an allocation within the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan. The only site identified within the Local Plan for residential development is land off Ollerton Road for 75 dwellings.
REF076	Resident	Your plan using prime agricultural land should not go ahead without due reference to the fact that we are no longer part of Europe and will possible need this land for food production in the coming years. Proposal for 250 dwellings before 2037 does not take account of the environmental impact on Tuxford particularly Newcastle Street and Eldon Street which are already at full capacity with parked vehicles during the daytime. People do not walk to the shops anymore and a development here would add to the congestion. The amenities, are already stretched i.e. doctor's surgery in particular. Do not have information regarding the schools but Tuxford Academy students are bussed in from surrounding areas which adds to the traffic congestion from 8.30am to 9am and again mid-afternoon. Say no additions or improvements are identified in the plan, surely this must be the first consideration before any building is commenced. If building is to go ahead, your alternative dispersal plan would be better providing this is not using agricultural land but small plots which cannot be used for any other purpose.	National policy does not prevent the use of agricultural land for development. Instead it requires that if considered necessary lower quality agricultural land is used. Tuxford is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size, level of services and facilities and the role it provides as a service centre to nearby villages. The 250 homes is consistent with other Large Rural Settlements. Planning permissions granted since 1 st April 2018 will contribute towards the 250 requirement for Tuxford. The proposed allocation at Ollerton Road will contribute a further 75 new homes leaving a need for 45 new homes. When other sites become available such as brownfield sites, these could make up the remaining housing requirement for the community. The Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal has assessed the site, alongside others that were put forward for consideration, and this is considered one of the most sustainable due to its location near Ollerton Road and its close proximity to the Town Centre and its facilities. With a new

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			dedicated cycle and footpath connection from the site into Long Lane, then this will provide a clear and safe path for residents to use the nearby services such as the school and shops. There are not enough brownfield sites available to deliver the number of homes needed in Bassetlaw. As such, it has been necessary to allocate greenfield land. The Council recognise the infrastructure concerns and the revised Policy includes securing financial contributions to improve health facilities and schools. These will mitigate any impact resulting from the development.
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Summary of Representation</p> <p>a) For the reasoning we set out in the detailed representation below we consider that the proposed allocation NP04 would have an unacceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>b) Consequently, the proposed allocation and Policy 30 and Policy ST16 would fail the tests of soundness as we explain in detail in the following sections and it would not constitute sustainable development.</p> <p>c) For the reasoning we also set out in the detailed representation below we consider that the Local Plan fails to justify the strategic approach in Policy ST1 to justify the level of housing proposed for both the District as a whole and to Tuxford as a 'Large Rural Settlement'.</p> <p>d) Allocation of this site in isolation, leaving the Neighbourhood Plan to find additional sites has also resulted in a fundamentally unsound approach to site assessment where all reasonable alternatives have not been considered. It also prejudices and unduly constrains the preparation process of the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan which is not in the best interests of planning. A continued community led approach to site allocation in Tuxford should be undertaken in common with the approach pursued in the other 'Large Rural Settlements'.</p> <p>e) Unfortunately, there is a lack of clarity regarding a number of fundamental matters relating to the proposed allocation NP04. We explain this in detail later, however this has seriously undermined public confidence in the Local Plan process and has hindered effective public consultation. The LPA has unfortunately also failed to provide a detailed rationale to all respondents on the points they raised as part of the earlier consultation phase. This has also undermined public confidence and understanding of the Local Plan process. f) We support the concerns set out by Tuxford Town Council in their representation in objection to the Local Plan. Including their concerns about the suitability for Tuxford to accommodate additional growth at the level proposed; the failure to consider a wider range of small allocations throughout Tuxford; and the lack of recognition for the findings of the public consultation on the sites put forward in the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has been designed from the outset to reflect and sustain the invaluable role that neighbourhood plans play in the spatial strategy for the District. The intention is to provide a District-wide framework, that will effectively support the development of neighbourhood plans (which provide local-level detail), but will also provide effective policies in the absence of a neighbourhood plan, whether a community has opted not to produce one, or where development is still in progress.</p> <p>Crucially, neighbourhood plans need to be community-led. The District Council acknowledges that there is apparent local interest in reviewing the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan, but also that progress to this effect has been sporadic since discussions about a review commenced in mid-2018. This is not a criticism, as there is no requirement to undertake a review. However, the lack of progress to this effect could leave Tuxford vulnerable to a speculative development once the 20% housing requirement proposed in the Bassetlaw Local Plan is enforceable. Work to progress the Bassetlaw Local Plan has sought to address this potential vulnerability by proposing housing allocations in Tuxford, and by drawing-upon insights acquired through our work to support the review of the Neighbourhood Plan, alongside other technical assessments. We appreciated that our strategy would be of significant local interest, and may still be in need of refinement, and so ensured that opportunities for the public to view, query, and comment on the proposals were maximised.</p> <p>Relatedly, we have consistently noted that, as a Draft, potential challenges to the proposals in the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan are welcomed. Moreover, particularly in the case of Tuxford, we</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>were clear that alternative proposals for housing sites could be explored as part of a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to these being progressed in a timely manner, ahead of the Local Plan being formalised. Again, whilst we are aware that interest in doing so has been voiced, on numerous occasions, this has not yet gained traction. We remain committed to supporting the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan, and would welcome further dialogue with the Town Council as to how they wish to proceed.</p> <p>Housing Numbers and Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The methodology for calculating local housing need is set out in Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 2a-007-20190220 of the Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>The standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. Therefore, there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates.</p> <p>Circumstances where this may be appropriate include, but are not limited to situations where increases in housing need are likely to exceed past trends because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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); • strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or • an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground. <p>In the case of Bassetlaw the minimum calculated need is 288.</p> <p>The Council commissioned GL Hearn with Icen Projects Ltd and Justin Gardner Consulting to undertake a Housing Needs Assessments and Economic Development Needs Assessment (update to 2019 report) for the district. The purpose of this now combined Housing and Economic Development Need Assessment (HEDNA) Study was to assess future development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and employment land across Bassetlaw District.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>The assessment was published in November 2020 and now forms part of the evidence base which the Council will use in preparing and updating the Local Plan.</p> <p>Evidence from the 2020 HEDNA indicates that there is a need to increase the housing requirement to support economic growth.</p> <p>The 2020 Bassetlaw HEDNA focusses on a supply led approach rather than a demand led approach. The supply led approach provides a range for net additional jobs: 9,735 – 11, 236 jobs. It concludes that up to 591 dwellings per annum would support the level of economic growth proposed.</p> <p>This approach is considered to be realistic and reflects the active position on the ground.</p> <p>Over the past five years, since 1 April 2016, 2919 dwellings have been delivered, averaging 584 per annum within the Bassetlaw. Delivery over the last two years has been significantly higher.</p> <p>Most of the requirement for the rural areas will be met from existing commitments with planning permissions, and from sites already allocated in made neighbourhood plans (see rural settlement study update paper)</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that “in order to promote sustainable development rural housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. New rural housing and other development should also support the broader sustainability of villages, and that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas. Planning policies 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.”</p> <p>On that basis and following consultation with local community, Policy ST2 identifies a percentage growth rate based on the existing Parish dwelling number (as of 13th August 2018 - when the data was collected). The growth percentage for the Large Rural Settlements is set at 20%, whereas the Small Rural Settlements at 5%.</p> <p>All of the large settlements have met or exceeded the requirement through existing commitments and from sites already allocated in made neighbourhood plans (see rural settlement study update paper)</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>At 20% Tuxford's need works out at 250 dwellings during the Plan period. As of 1 April 2021 there are 108 commitment on sites with planning permission in Tuxford. Over the past 3 years there has been just 3 homes delivered in Tuxford.</p> <p>There are no new allocations proposed in the Large Settlements except for the site proposed south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford which will meet the identified specific growth requirements of that large village. This will provide the opportunity for Tuxford to grow and thrive, and will support local services.</p> <p>Land off Ollerton Road, Tuxford is situated on the western edge of Tuxford and is considered to be a suitable site which would extend the built up area up to a logical boundary. The Land Availability Assessment 2020 identified the site as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford. The site is identified as available and deliverable from 2027.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>The SA will be updated to reflect that the minimum number of dwellings required is 75. The SA uses a GIS system to calculate the distance between the site and services. As explained in paragraph 2.44 of the November 2020 SA Report (and previous SA Reports), distances are measured in straight lines from the boundary of a site. This ensures consistency between appraisals, given that it cannot be known which route people will take to work, school or leisure destinations and this is likely to vary depending on the starting point of each individual's journey. This analysis shows that the site is wholly within 800m of Tuxford Clinic.</p> <p>The Council has consulted and is in direct communication with the Education Authority on school capacity and what, if any, additional provision is required. This is likely to be dealt with as a financial contribution from a development to the Education Authority.</p> <p>The assessment is in line with the site appraisal criteria set out in Table A5.2 (Appendix 5) of the November 2020 SA Report and previous SA Reports. This ensures consistency between appraisals of site options. Other than access to a GP surgery (see response above), the specific issues raised are outside the scope of site assessments, as they are not part of the site appraisal criteria. Air quality is considered under SA objective 10 and access to a primary school is considered under SA objective 4. However, we do not hold data on 'areas of poorer air quality'</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>(given that there are no AQMAs in Bassetlaw), ‘noise corridors’ or primary school capacity and therefore cannot assess these consistently across the District. These can be more clearly stated as data limitations in the next iteration of the SA Report and through discussions with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Heritage</p> <p>The Heritage Assessment includes an assessment of the site and all other reasonable alternatives. No insurmountable issues have been identified. BDC Heritage has made recommendations regarding site assessments which should be undertaken to inform the development management/decision making process. As part of a planning application, the applicant will need to provide evidence of any potential heritage impact through a heritage Assessment.</p> <p>Landscape and Amenity</p> <p>Natural England has been consulted on the SA Methodology and on Bassetlaw Local Plan. No objections have been raised about the SA methodology or about the proposed allocation of the site at Ollerton Road, Tuxford.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Landscape Assessment and this looked at the whole site in terms of its potential impact, including its edge of settlement location. This was done for all other sites within the Local Plan. In addition, the Council’s Conservation Team’s comments were also factored into the landscape issues. The feedback was then used to help inform what sites, or part of sites, were suitable for allocation. Where landscape issues remain, these can be dealt with through the sensitive design of the edge of settlement site.</p> <p>The Landscape Assessment document and its recommendations has been subject to public and stakeholder consultation any relevant feedback has been incorporated into an updated report.</p> <p>The Council’s Environmental Health Team have not raised objections or concerns about the impact of the nearby wind turbines.</p> <p>Transport and Accessibility</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment, which looks at the impact of the proposed growth within the Local Plan on the existing highway network, has not identified any significant impacts to Tuxford. The Highways Authority has also not raised any</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
			<p>particular concerns over the principle of development on this site. They have stated that a new and suitable access to the site is needed from Ollerton Road along with improvements to the footpaths.</p> <p>The applicant will need to demonstrate, through a transport assessment and travel plan, that the proposal will not lead to unreasonable impacts to the highway network. Where unreasonable impacts are demonstrated, then the transport assessment will need to detail what mitigation is needed to offset these impacts raised through the transport assessment. These will need to be agreed by the highways authority.</p> <p>Flood Risk and Drainage The development is not located within any higher risk flood zones. The Council not nearby drainage capacity issues and are in discussions with Severn Trent Water about these and District wide problems. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides recommendations for development. The development will be required to address surface water flooding and demonstrate that the development will not lead to an increase of flooding nearby - as per National Planning Policy - through a full and detailed Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Summary of Change Requested</p> <p>g) Delete the proposed site NP04 and allow the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan to consider other reasonable alternatives as part of a comprehensive analysis and consideration of all other potential sites around Tuxford including both potential Brownfield and Greenfield sites.</p> <p>h) Within Tuxford there are a number of potential previously developed sites or sites where existing uses perhaps no longer represent the most beneficial use. These sites may more appropriately used for residential development with their existing use relocated for example to modern premises on an industrial estate. Such sites could include land to the rear of 10 Newcastle Street; Former Goods Yard on Lincoln Road; the Platts Harris site; and Land around Eastfield Farm.</p> <p>i) In our view other potential sites Brownfield and Greenfield around Tuxford would have a better relationship to existing built form.</p> <p>Detailed Representation</p> <p>1. We continue to object to the proposed allocation of Site NP04 (Ollerton Road, Tuxford) contained in Policy 30 of the Regulation 18 version of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2018-2037. I note that on the Policies Map the site is actually referred to as HS14 and the covering policy is listed as ST30. For the avoidance of any doubt, we will refer to the site as NP04 as per Policy 30. We consider that it fails the tests of soundness as follows:</p> <p>Tests of Soundness Positively Prepared Justified Effective In general conformity with national policy</p> <p>Lack of Clarity</p> <p>2. It is also noted that policy ST16 lists the site NP04 as having an area of 1.5Ha and a capacity of a minimum of 90 dwellings. Whereas the introductory text to Policy 30 in paragraph 7.15.2 lists the site area as 3.9Ha. It claims that this site size is drawn from the Land Availability Assessment (LAA), however we find this claim confusing as Appendix F of the LAA (2020) assessed site LAA476 which was a much larger site of 39.4Ha. Table 12 in the LAA main document itself does not list any site area. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan also identifies the site as being 3.9Ha. Consequently, there is confusion within the various policies and documents as to what size of site the Local Plan is actually seeking to promote.</p> <p>3. These inconsistencies are extremely unfortunate and may have resulted in confusion amongst the public. Changing site references during the Local Plan preparation process was described by an Inspector at a public examination where we were present as ‘a highly regrettable mistake that had led to public confusion and had undermined the Local Plan preparation process by the necessary audit trail through evidence being less than transparent.’</p> <p>4. Further inconsistencies exist then with the site being referred to as HS14 in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, as such anyone searching for reference to site NP04 in the IDP would find no information.</p> <p>5. As the Policies Map Inset for Tuxford does not indicate any scale; we are therefore unable to accurately measure the site from the Policies Map itself. However, we have overlain the Policies Map Inset onto a scaled plan on Nottinghamshire Insight Mapping. Using the measuring tools on that mapping system indicates the site to be 2.90Ha.</p> <p>6. This casts doubt on whether the site is actually 1.5Ha or 3.9Ha as the Local Plan suggests. As you will be aware having an accurate site measurement is fundamental to determining an appropriate site capacity figure. If the site is 3.9Ha as the Local Plan suggests then the gross density would be 23.07 dwellings per hectare; whereas if it is only 2.9Ha as our measurement seems to suggest then at the same density the capacity would be 67 dwellings; or at 90 dwellings the gross density would be 31.03 dwellings per hectare. As the figure of 90 dwellings is indicated to be a minimum, this would increase the gross density even further if more than 90 dwellings were actually delivered.</p> <p>7. Policy ST32 of the Local Plan states that: “Within the Large and Small Rural Settlements densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs, unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan.” Given the lack of clarity over the precise site area the density cannot be assessed with any certainty and as such how it reflects the character of the settlement as required by Policy ST2 is uncertain.</p> <p>8. There are also further inconsistencies in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which we highlight later on when we address that document. Notably the in paragraph 6.247 the SA indicates that site NP04 is allocated for 75 dwellings.</p> <p>Previous Consultation</p> <p>9. Although it is recognised that there is no legal obligation for the Council to respond to every point made by</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>respondents in consultation it is disappointing that the LPA has not chosen to respond to the lack of evidence and the inconsistencies we raised in the previous consultation. In addition, local residents are very disappointed that the LPA seems to have copied a standard response for most of the detailed submissions they made.</p> <p>Housing Need</p> <p>10. The Bassetlaw Local Plan is now proposed to be based on an even higher annual housing provision of 589 dwellings per annum in Policy ST1 (up from 478 in the previous version). This is more than double the 288 indicative local housing need published in December 2020 using the MHCLG revised methodology. As you will be aware this data table sets out the housing need for each local planning authority using the method that the Government has produced following a backlash to a consultation in the Summer of 2020. Widespread concern was that the standardised methodology did not focus on major urban areas sufficiently but instead resulted in too much development in rural districts. It is notable that the indicative figure for Bassetlaw has reduced from 307 per annum to 288.</p> <p>11. It would seem somewhat perverse that at a time when the Government considers that Bassetlaw should find even less housing; the Local Plan proposes to find even more land for housing. The rationale behind the revised MHCLG methodology was set out in the press release that stated:</p> <p>12. “A housing need formula is currently used to provide a starting point in the process of local planning for new homes. An updated method will now be introduced to help councils to enable the delivery of 300,000 homes a year by the mid-2020s, while prioritising brownfield sites and urban areas.</p> <p>13. Under the proposals, cities will be encouraged to plan for more family homes – which are the right size and type for families to live in – and to make the most of vacant buildings and underused land to protect green spaces. The plans will encourage more homes to be built in England’s 20 largest cities and urban centres, boosting local economies by supporting jobs in the building sector, and revitalising high streets with the footfall new residents bring.”</p> <p>14. Whilst the Local Plan might want to pursue a growth strategy based on a higher annualised 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.</p> <p>15. The Local Plan Policy ST1 proposes ‘about 1,400’ dwellings for the ‘Large Rural Settlements’ which includes Blyth; Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe; Langold; Misterton; and Tuxford. In Policy ST2 a total of 250 dwellings are indicated to be proposed for Tuxford.</p> <p>16. The Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan (2016) indicates that Tuxford has 1,213 dwellings, Policy ST2 indicates that ‘Large Rural Settlements’ should not exceed the number of dwellings in these settlements by more than 20%. Taking the Neighbourhood Plan base figure, the 20% maximum would therefore be 242 dwellings, a little lower than stated in Policy ST2. The Spatial Strategy Background Paper indicates a 2018 base number of dwellings in Tuxford as 1,252 dwellings; if this figure is taken then a 20% increase maximum would be 250 dwellings. However, these figures suggest that there was already growth of 3.2% between the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan figure and the 2018 figure in the Spatial Strategy Background Paper.</p> <p>17. According to the Bassetlaw Rural Monitoring Table (December 2020) indicates that some 102 dwellings are committed already in Tuxford. These commitments already contribute to the housing requirement of 250 dwellings identified for the plan period. This leaves a further 148 dwellings to be found for the remaining 17 years when assessed against the Policy ST2 figure.</p> <p>18. The monitoring includes all residential planning permissions and completions at a settlement level since 1st April 2018. For Large and Small Rural Settlements, the baseline date for the proposed housing requirements per settlement is also set from 1st April 2018. Therefore, residential planning permissions granted after that date will contribute towards the required growth figure for the respective settlement.</p> <p>19. Put another way in the first two years of the plan period Tuxford has some 41% of its proposed housing requirement already committed. Given this there is no requirement for the Local Plan to find it necessary to allocate a site in order to be delivered early in the plan period. The existing commitments in Tuxford will see growth of 8.4% in the number of dwellings within a short period of time. Accordingly, it would not be unreasonable for any additional</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>allocations to be delivered in the later phases of the plan period.</p> <p>20. Indeed, if the overall housing figure for the district were revised down from 589 dwellings per annum to only 288 dwellings per annum as the MHCLG methodology suggests. Then the Tuxford pro-rata figure would reduce from 250 dwellings to 122 dwellings across the plan period. In which case the remaining housing to be found in Tuxford would only be 20 dwellings. In this respect the overall housing figure to be found for Bassetlaw is directly relevant as to whether in fact any additional housing allocations need to be found at all for Tuxford.</p> <p>21. 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 Settlements' or the choice of distribution for the site allocations in the Local Plan between the 5 settlements in this category. Of these 5 'Large Rural Villages' only Tuxford has had allocations identified. It is noted for example that Misterton has no allocations or committed housing sites identified in the Local Plan.</p> <p>22. 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 Settlements'.</p> <p>23. It would appear that the proposed 1,400 dwellings for the 'Large Rural Settlements' actually differs to the individual figures in Policy ST2; which in fact only adds up to 1,297 which is quite different.</p> <p>24. 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 more than double the annual housing provision in the latest MHCLG standardised housing requirement. In addition, there are other reasonable alternative sites elsewhere in Tuxford that would be more appropriate.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Relationship to Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>25. Paragraph 5.1.51 of the Local Plan indicates that ‘growth will be met primarily through Neighbourhood Plan allocations, by appropriate planning applications and a Local Plan allocation for Tuxford. Growth should not exceed the number of dwellings in these settlements by more than 20%, unless identified by a Neighbourhood Plan.’</p> <p>26. It is unclear as to why only Tuxford has been chosen by the Local Plan to have a hybrid approach of having one site allocation with the remainder to be found by the Neighbourhood Plan. This approach undermines the work on the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan and does not allow either the Local Plan or the Neighbourhood Plan to consider all reasonable alternatives. Indeed, the LPA refers in the Site Selection Methodology in relation to all other possible sites in Tuxford to “Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan is in the process of being reviewed and all potentially suitable sites in the LAA can be considered for allocation through this process.” Consequently, the Local Plan hides behind the review of the Neighbourhood Plan as a reason not to allocate every other possible site in Tuxford.</p> <p>27. This approach is manifestly unreasonable and lacks the fairness and open & transparent process that must underpin any Local Plan production process.</p> <p>28. As indicated already Tuxford has some 41% of its proposed housing requirement already committed. Given this there is no requirement for the Local Plan to find it necessary to allocate a site in order to be delivered early in the plan period. The existing commitments in Tuxford will see growth of 8.4% in the number of dwellings within a short period of time. Accordingly, it would not be unreasonable for any additional allocations to be delivered in the later phases of the plan period. Accordingly, the rationale the Local Plan seeks to put forward for including one allocation has no sound basis.</p> <p>29. 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 in September 2019 and the fact that an allocation has 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 inclusion of two sites in the previous draft Local Plan; and one site in this version of the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>30. The Neighbourhood Plan consultation responses were returned to Bassetlaw DC which does not help with confusion between the two separate plans.</p> <p>31. The Town Council has recently received an update on the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan on the 7th January 2021. We are aware that the day after (8th January 2021) the Town Council also had a meeting with Bassetlaw District Council to discuss moving forward the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. Progress on the Neighbourhood Plan has become stalled due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, it is clear that the Town Council and the LPA remain committed to moving forward the review of the Neighbourhood Plan. Accordingly, this remains the most appropriate forum through which to consider land allocations across Tuxford building upon the progress on site allocation options already undertaken in the early work on the Neighbourhood Plan review.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <p>32. As we raised previously 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. In the updated evidence to support the latest version of the draft Local Plan this fact has still not been addressed.</p> <p>33. The Local Plan has failed to properly assess all reasonable alternatives in terms of site assessment options. This appears to be as a consequence of the incomprehensible decision to treat Tuxford differently to all other ‘Large Rural Settlements’ by looking to allocate a site in the Local Plan rather than have all site allocations considered in the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>34. Potential reasonable alternatives such as site NP10 (east side of Tuxford off Lincoln Road) or NP11 (south of Tuxford east of Ashvale Road); warrant serious consideration. Site NP11 could for example provide scope within it for a relocated and expanded Primary School linked to the Secondary School. Also, the recent granting of planning permission for the relocation of the Co-op convenience store on Ashvale Road will move more of the core services and facilities of Tuxford to the east of the A1 closer to other sites such as NP10 or NP11.</p> <p>Landscape Impact</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>35. The proposed site allocation NP04 was not assessed within the 'Site Allocations: Landscape Study' document (dated November 2019). As we stated in our previous representation the proposed allocation was not supported by sufficient robust evidence to justify its allocation. Its omission from proper assessment in key evidence documents rendered the proposed allocation and the entire Local Plan unsound. 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, in the original Landscape Study, the failure to assess sites in Tuxford appeared 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.</p> <p>36. Site NP04 has now been assessed in the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' (October 2020). Rather confusingly this assessment uses the site reference LAA476; which in other documents is the reference used for the much larger site. In this document the assessment has however looked at the allocation currently proposed. However, even with this Addendum Report there is still a fundamental omission in that there has been no landscape assessment of the other reasonable site options in Tuxford.</p> <p>37. It is notable that the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' is damming in its conclusions on the landscape impact of the site. On visual connectivity it says: "The site is clearly visible from the West, along Ollerton Road looking East. It is also clearly visible from the rear gardens of The Pastures and the houses off Long Lane. The public right of way, running along the eastern edge of the site provides clear views West over countryside. In addition, the site is highly visible from further West along Long Lane, a byway/farm track."</p> <p>38. It describes the site as: "Although there are clear site boundaries to the North, East and South, the western boundary is completely undefined within an open extensively farmed landscape, as part of a very large field."</p> <p>39. The Report concludes: "The site adjoins the built-up area however, it clearly extends into open countryside and occupies a prominent position in the local landscape. It is a medium-sized site which could make a reasonable contribution to the overall dwelling requirement. However, the harm to open countryside and landscape interests that would result from development is likely to outweigh the benefits of new housing."</p> <p>40. On the basis of this evidence the site allocation is not justified and given the clear and demonstrable harm that the LPA acknowledge; the site should be removed.</p> <p>41. The proposed allocation of site NP04 conflicts with the made Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan; which states on landscape matters in paragraph 59: "Where the site is on the edge of the town, it is important that the setting of the town and the visual connections with the countryside are maintained. Tuxford nestles in attractive rolling countryside; the topography of the town is discussed in the Tuxford Place Analysis and the rolling hills that surround the town afford views out to the countryside that are highly valued by local people."</p> <p>42. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan also requires: "The proposal positively responds to the design principles as identified in Policy ST37, and any relevant characterisations studies as part of a neighbourhood plan." The proposed allocation conflicts with the above Neighbourhood Plan analysis, consequently it therefore also fails to meet the requirements of Policy ST2.</p> <p>43. The Local Plan in paragraph 7.15.4 states: "The site is within a semi-rural location. Careful, sensitive design must respond appropriately to the characteristics of the site identified by the Site Allocations Landscape Assessment (2019), ensuring it has a positive impact on the setting of the landscape and the impact on views, particularly from the north and west."</p> <p>44. The Local Plan has failed to refer to the conclusions of harm that would arise to the landscape in the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report'. The LPA is seeking to ignore this evidence which does not support its position.</p> <p>45. Policy ST37 of the Local Plan requires development to appropriately protect and enhance existing landscape features, natural and heritage assets as an integral part of the development. The landscape harm that the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' confirms means that the proposed site allocation would conflict with Policy ST37.</p> <p>46. Policy ST39 requires development to respond to the visual relationship and environment around settlements and their landscape settings; and maintain significant views of sensitive skylines, river corridors, key landscapes and heritage features, and be supported by a landscape and visual impact assessment. The proposed allocation of NP04 is not supported by the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report'; accordingly, it fails to accord with Policy ST39.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>Factors such as the increased light pollution arising from a development of 90+ dwellings on a key entrance to Tuxford would increase the landscape impact.</p> <p>Heritage</p> <p>47. The 'Bassetlaw Heritage Methodology' (November 2020) which undertakes site assessments with regard to the historic environment fails to assess site NP04 or indeed any other reasonable alternative site in Tuxford. Once again this is a serious omission, particularly given that this is the only settlement proposed for site allocations which has not been assessed in heritage terms. This seems to be a particularly surprising omission given that the site NP04 lies on the opposite side of the road to the Tuxford Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset.</p> <p>48. The lack of site assessment in this latest methodology means that the proposed site allocation has not been properly assessed as required by Policy ST37. The SA identifies a major negative impact on heritage assets, as such the proposed allocation would conflict with Policy ST37. It would also conflict with Policy ST44 and Policy 45 which both look to protect the historic environment and heritage assets respectively.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>49. 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.</p> <p>50. 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.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>51. As we highlighted in the previous consultation the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) contains contradictory information in relation to the assessment of site NP04. The same contradictions are contained in the November 2020 SA. As such this document remains fundamentally flawed and undermines confidence in whether the site has been properly assessed. The site is assessed in Table 6.5 (SA Findings for Living Communities (Policies ST16-36)) and in the Table A6 - 45: Land south of Ollerton Road, Tuxford (NP04).</p> <p>52. The differences between the SA tables are as follows: see PDF</p> <p>53. These differences involve more than a third of the SA assessment criterion, as such this is a substantial level of difference.</p> <p>54. The SA also rather confusingly in paragraph 6.247 indicates that site NP04 is allocated for 75 dwellings; whereas in paragraph 6.248 the SA indicates that site NP04 is allocated for 90 dwellings. As this part of the SA remains dated January 2020 in the page footer it would suggest that the SA itself for Policy 30 has not been updated to take into account more recent evidence. In particular the SA fails to have taken into account the finding of harm in the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' (October 2020).</p> <p>55. We have taken the SA assessment in the Table A6-45 in the appendices as our starting point as this relates to the site NP04. This table is also dated November 2020 and as such would appear to represent the most up-to-date assessment. 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. It also concludes that there would be a negative effect on the SA objective of 'landscape and townscape'. We consider this underplays the harm identified in the 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' (October 2020).</p> <p>56. However, in addition in our judgement the SA appears to incorrectly assess other aspects of the site, the differences between the SA table A6-45 and our assessment are as follows: See PDF 57. 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.</p> <p>58. The proposed development would result in harm to primary school capacity as we explain in detail later. Policy 30 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.</p> <p>59. 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.</p> <p>60. 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.</p> <p>61. 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 that new development could result in the need to cease use of</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>the wind turbine. Therefore, we consider that the assessment should be ‘uncertain’ what effect the site would have on the climate change criterion.</p> <p>62. 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 and 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.</p> <p>63. As identified earlier the ‘Landscape Assessment Addendum Report’ (October 2020) concluded: “The site adjoins the built-up area however, it clearly extends into open countryside and occupies a prominent position in the local landscape. It is a medium-sized site which could make a reasonable contribution to the overall dwelling requirement. However, the harm to open countryside and landscape interests that would result from development is likely to outweigh the benefits of new housing.” This harm is in our view underplayed in the SA document.</p> <p>64. 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.</p> <p>65. 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.</p> <p>66. Given the previously stated conclusions of the LPA in the ‘Landscape Assessment Addendum Report’; 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.</p> <p>67. In our view the SA continues to fail 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 requirements. 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).”</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Landscape & Townscape and Heritage Assets</p> <p>68. 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. As already identified the 'Bassetlaw Heritage Methodology' (November 2020) has not assessed site NP04, this further undermines the robustness of the SA conclusions on heritage.</p> <p>69. Harm to these SA objectives 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.</p> <p>70. The proposed site in our view would represent a stark bolt-on to the sensitive edge of Tuxford. In this regard it conflicts with Policy ST2 that requires: "The location and size of the proposal does not conflict with the character and built form of that part of the settlement." Policy ST39 also requires development on the edge of settlements to: "Create a soft edge between the existing built form and the countryside." The proposal would create a harsh edge to the built form and would therefore conflict with Policy ST39.</p> <p>71. 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.</p> <p>72. 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.</p> <p>73. 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.</p> <p>74. 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 (such as increased densities);"</p> <p>75. The open rural character of this gateway to Tuxford was considered in Appeal APP/A3010/W/18/3197118 which was for the site on the opposite side of the A6075. In that appeal the Inspector stated: "The significance of the appeal site as part of the conservation area is derived from its openness which reflects the historic context of the rural settlement and its relationship with the surrounding agricultural land. Whilst the site has not been in agricultural use for some time it has remained free from development and, in its village edge location, preserves the rural character context and setting of the built environment." Although for the site opposite the Inspector was clear that the land on Ollerton Road made an important contribution to the 'village's countryside setting'. The proposed allocation NP04 would be far greater in size; would be more prominent in landscape views than that previous appeal site. Consequently, it would result in even greater levels of harm than the Inspector concluded was appropriate to justify dismissal of the appeal opposite.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>Environmental Constraints 76. 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’. Policy ST1 looks to minimise the use of the most versatile Grade 1-3 agricultural land, where practicable. As such the allocation of site NP04 conflicts with Policy ST1. 77. 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.” 78. 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. 79. 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.</p> <p>80. 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.</p> <p>81. 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. 1</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land#agricultural-land-classification-alc 82. 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 sustainable development 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.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF088	Resident represented by Town-Planning.co.uk	<p>Accessibility and Highway Impact</p> <p>83. 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.</p> <p>84. 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 30 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.</p> <p>85. 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.</p> <p>86. 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.</p> <p>87. 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.</p> <p>88. The Highway Authority has recently objected to application 20/01644/FUL opposite the proposed site NP04. Their concerns include the fact that: "The site is currently located within the Ollerton Road 50mph speed restriction. The existing 30mph speed limit will therefore require extending to a point southwest of the southwestern most access. The Ollerton Road street lighting will also require extending accordingly as will the village gateway signing and road markings. Nevertheless, the site would remain at the edge of the 50mph limit. Vehicle speeds will therefore be expected to be reasonably high."</p> <p>89. 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.</p> <p>90. 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. This would not achieve the requirements of Policy ST37 of the Local Plan to prioritise safe, easy and direct pedestrian, cycle and public transport movement, and ensure the safe, convenient movement of all highway users.</p> <p>91. In relation to Long Lane the LPA has failed to take into account the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Lane adjacent to the proposed site cannot be used as part of the size/area calculation as it is not privately owned and is a common lane; • No assessment has been made on the usage of Long Lane by additional pedestrians and cyclists from the proposed site; specifically, with regard to the risk to their safety particularly for the elderly/children/cyclists due to width of Long Lane only being 4.5 metres with no ability to widen the lane; • Long Lane has existing poor surface water drainage issue because there are no drains, surface water along the lane includes water run- off from the adjoining fields and the introduction of development has the potential to exacerbate 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>surface water run-off;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long Lane already has 12 existing residential properties which generates a number of vehicle movements, including service vehicles; this is a greater number of dwellings that would normally be permitted on a shared private road. This increased number of vehicle movements on the lane where vehicles cannot be segregated from pedestrians and cyclists using the public footpath already poses a risk to highway and pedestrian safety which would be unnecessarily increased by the proposed allocation; The above conflict is already increased by the use of the lane by large agricultural vehicles, HGV's and trailers servicing the fields up to and including Westwood Farm. Further vans and HGV's also use the lane to service the wind turbine and single-track railway on the south side of Ollerton Road; and Legal searches during land/property purchasing by existing residents of Long Lane, have indicated that there is no proof of private ownership of Long Lane; consequently, a number of the residents have indemnity insurance in place to cover legal costs in the event of an ownership/usage challenge coming forward from a third party. NCC Highways have confirmed that NCC have no interest in the maintenance and upkeep of Long Lane according to the documents they hold. <p>92. The proposed site will be unduly reliant upon the A6075 to provide pedestrian and cycle linkages to the services and facilities of Tuxford. Much of the length of footway between the proposed site and the junction of Ollerton Road with Eldon Street is a narrow footway less than 1m in width immediately adjacent to a carriageway frequented by HGVs. As such the proposed site allocation will struggle to be in a position to take the opportunity to improve the scope for access on foot; to provide a street layout that allow for easy pedestrian connections within and between neighbourhoods; to provide a layout that encourage walking, take up opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes; to provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users, to give priority to pedestrians both within the scheme and neighbouring area; address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; and to create a place that is safe that minimises conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. This would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and a failure to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. Accordingly, the proposed allocation would be contrary to the objectives of paragraph 84, 91, 108, 110, 122, and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>93. The Highway Authority has recently objected to two proposed developments opposite the proposed allocation (20/01644/FUL & 20/01654/FUL). In the latter of these the Highway Authority specifically identify the need to consider the existing 'dip' in the carriageway with regard to visibility. They stated: "The applicant should provide accurate survey data to demonstrate that appropriate visibility splays are achievable from each proposed access, taking into account the vertical and horizontal alignment of Ollerton Road, plus the site gradients. A speed survey may potentially be required to establish vehicle speeds on Ollerton Road. Visibility in the vertical plane should normally be measured from a driver's eye height of 1.05m above the road surface (at the 2.4m 'x' distance) to a height of 0.26m. It would be unacceptable to 'lose' the headlights of an approaching vehicle in a dip within a visibility splay. All of the land within the splays must be within the applicant's control." The LPA has not demonstrated that a safe access can be secured into the proposed site allocation having regard to both the vertical and horizontal alignment of Ollerton Road. As such the Local Plan fails to demonstrate the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed satisfactorily as required by paragraph 102 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Infrastructure Demand</p> <p>94. 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.</p> <p>95. 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.</p> <p>96. Tuxford Primary Academy has a capacity of 240 pupils, but the school is currently oversubscribed by having 333 pupils. The 2021-22 Nottinghamshire school admission statistics anticipates the roll to be 339 pupils. This represents</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>an anticipated roll of 99 pupils in excess of capacity, which is 41% over capacity before any additional development occurs. 97. The allocation of Site NP04 and the other committed housing of 102 units will collectively generate additional demand for a further 43 pupils (NP04 – 20; commitments - 23). This will result in an anticipated roll of 142 pupils in excess of capacity, which would then be 59% over capacity. 98. Tuxford Academy has a capacity of 1,462 with current numbers standing at 1,554. The 2021-22 Nottinghamshire school 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. 99. The allocation of Site NP04 together with the committed 102 other dwellings collectively generate additional demand for a further 32 pupils (NP04 – 15; other commitments 17). This will result in an anticipated roll of 120 pupils in excess of capacity, which would then be 8% over capacity. (Note – this figure would be increased by development proposed outside Tuxford but within the catchment area which covers other large settlements such as East Markham and also extends beyond Bassetlaw into Newark & Sherwood) 100. 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. 101. 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 382 pupils. The 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. Other Matters 102. 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 with the existing built form. Conclusion and Change Requested</p> <p>103. For the reasoning set out above we consider that the proposed allocation would have an unacceptable impact on a number of specific matter as we summarise in the ‘Summary of Representation’ section at the beginning of this document. The changes we request to the Local Plan are also set out in the ‘Changes Requested’ section at the beginning of this document.</p>	
REF113	Resident	<p>I am objecting to the proposed site NS14 / NP04 on behalf of the six residents in my household.</p> <p>Confusion and inadequate responses to opposition</p> <p>My previous opposition to what was originally referred to as NP04 and now for some reason (perhaps to further cause confusion) is referred to as HS14 that was submitted appeared to have a ‘cut and paste’ response, with a number of items being completely ignored as shown in the below link: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5962/st23-ollerton-road-tuxford.pdf</p> <p>I also note that the same ‘cut and paste’ replies were used for most comments / oppositions made and it appears from this that there was an entirely negative response to this site from local residents, myself included. I will therefore reiterate my points again below so they are not ignored for the next phase and I would like to expect a full response to all points both original and new:</p> <p>Original Opposition to NP04 Now referred to as HS14</p> <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</p>	<p>The number of homes on the site has been reduced to 75. This takes into account the size of the site and the level of land required for infrastructure. A safe and suitable access to and from the site is required from Ollerton Road.</p> <p>Any adverse traffic impacts will need to be mitigated where appropriate and this will be detailed within a traffic assessment as part of any planning application.</p> <p>The education authority has not raised any objections to this site. However, contributions may be necessary from the development to support local educational provision.</p> <p>There is not enough suitable or available brownfield land to accommodate the level of growth for Tuxford. Some land outside of the development boundary has been considered, but</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>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.</p> <p>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>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. Additional opposition and comments</p> <p>We also have a number of additional points to raise as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan doesn't appear to factor in current development taking place within Tuxford. Currently there are 86 houses in development and several other planning applications within the town. It appears that a bolt on approach to meeting the housing requirement has been taken with very little consideration towards policy, the Neighbourhood plan or residents' comments. • I appreciate the need to increase housing numbers nationally but some rural places are better suited to accommodate growth than others. Specifically when looking at services (water/draining etc) and existing overstretched road infrastructure. • Why was NP10 rejected when the flow of traffic would be more suitable, i.e. access to A1, A57, Secondary School. • Ref 119 & Ref 454 in the link: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/5962/st23-ollerton-road-tuxford.pdf - Points made by WH Betts are worrying, as they specifically reference future expansion of the site. BDC also refer in their responses to reducing the initial site size as part of the very first round of consultations, it appears that if this is agreed, there is a very real risk they could revert back to the larger site size at a later date, outside of the Local Plan. This appears to be a very obvious gateway approach to a larger expansion. • Long lane is an unadopted highway and has no known ownership. Residents have indemnity policies should anyone claim ownership. As such how can this be used for pedestrian access to the village under its current state of repair. How would the council improve this? • The 'Landscape Assessment Addendum Report' clearly concluded, "the harm to open countryside and landscape interests that would result from the development is likely to outweigh the benefits of new housing". <p>I have copied the following from the Draft plan and it seems the Ollerton Road site does not meet all items listed:</p> <p>"Proposals in the Large Rural Settlements; through site allocations in this Plan, through made neighbourhood plans, or through appropriate development within their development boundaries will be supported where all of the following are met:</p> <p>1) Proposals should not exceed the number of dwellings in the eligible settlement(s) in their Parish, by more than 20% individually or in combination with other housing developments with planning permission or through site allocations in respective neighbourhood plans or this Local Plan; 2) Each proposal should not exceed 1 hectare in size, unless it forms part of a site allocation in respective neighbourhood plans or this Local Plan;</p> <p>3) The location and size of the proposal does not conflict with the character and built form of that part of the</p>	<p>there are other factors that determine whether a site is considered suitable or not for development.</p> <p>Any adverse impact from noise will need to be mitigated through the design of the development.</p> <p>The plan has taken account of any planning permission granted since the 1st April 2018 and these will contribute towards the 250 homes that are required for Tuxford.</p> <p>Long Lane will only have access to and from the site for pedestrians and cyclists as its a formal public right of way. No vehicular will be made to the site from Long Lane.</p> <p>The landscape report looked at the wider landscape issues and the site area had been reduced to reflect those concerns. The boundary towards the open countryside to west will be to be designed to account for its rural setting.</p> <p>Policy ST2 has since been revised and the criteria for Large Rural Settlements has been updated. The reference to 1 hectare or less has been removed.</p> <p>The site is 3 hectares and this is suitable for 75 dwellings which is a smaller number than 90 which was proposed previously. This removes the discrepancies between different parts of the plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>settlement;</p> <p>4) The proposal positively responds to the design principles as identified in Policy ST37, and any relevant characterisations studies as part of a neighbourhood plan.”</p> <p>The published notice posted on the local Tuxford street lamps states the following:</p> <p>Proposal: 90 dwellings and supporting infrastructure</p> <p>Location: Ollerton Road, Tuxford, Newark, NG22 ONJ</p> <p>The allocated site boundaries are highlighted in red on the plan as part of the notice, with specific site boundary locations identified in relation to adjacent topography including road positions, adjoining land boundaries and existing housing. (note: the plan shows Long Lane as incorporated within the proposed site, this Lane does not have established legal ownership, existing residents have indemnity insurance in place to protect their interests against a future claim being made by a third party on the ownership and usage). No actual site size is published on the plan. The identified site using the boundaries on the published plan measures 28560 sq. metres (2.865 hectares) to the south western boundary location (this also enables distance to the nearest wind turbine and industrial estate to be calculated, although both are not shown on the published plan). This represents 73.23% of the 3.9 hectares listed below:</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2 (Nov 20) page 60 states the following:</p> <p>HS 14 Ollerton Road Tuxford</p> <p>Site Area 3.9 hectares</p> <p>Number of Dwellings Minimum of 90 units</p> <p>The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2018-2037 p78 refers to the site as NP04, identifying 1.5ha available with a minimum number of dwellings as 90. Page 106 of the same document item 7.15.3 refers to 3.9 hectares and 7.15.5 refers to at least 90 homes.</p> <p>As is shown from the above information there is a discrepancy between the information in the documents published by Bassetlaw District Council which is misleading to the general public. In light of the discrepancy identified please also confirm which size of land has been used to calculate the proposed housing density for the site and is the proposed number 90 or a minimum of 90?</p> <p>Facilities Distance</p> <p>One of the reasons that the NP10 site was rejected was that it was too far away from the facilities of the village. The measurements below are from the closest point on the relevant site and do not take into account where the new road access would be or any hazard in that location. 6 of the 8 facilities are further away with NP04/HS14 with many more hazards than with the dismissed NP10 site. Also, the flow of traffic to 6 of the 8 facilities would be through the centre of the village which is where the main congestion is.</p>	
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	<p>2. Policies 17 to 30 (Site Allocations)</p> <p>Each site has been consulted on in relation to archaeology and where potential has been identified, I welcome the inclusion of the advice provided.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>POLICY 30: Site NP04: Ollerton Road, Tuxford (page 107) - SUPPORT</p> <p>Anglian Water is the water undertaker for Tuxford and has no objection to the principle of residential development on this site.</p>	Thank you for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF192	Resident	<p>I object to the siting and size of this proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <p>7.15.6 on page 106 states vehicular access will be from Ollerton Road. Although “Further detailed assessment of vehicular traffic upon the highways network will be evidenced through a Travel Plan & 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.) 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. Please see Appendix i – a recent unofficial Traffic Survey undertaken by myself and Y Cooper recording traffic using A6075 West in both directions during these peak times. Please note this was during COVID restrictions and therefore can be assumed to be lower than usual.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It has been suggested at the open Consultation Events that Highways may consider locating a roundabout near the Industrial Estate entrance to help ease traffic congestion. This would not help, as observation (not yet evidenced) shows the majority of traffic travelling to and from the Ollerton Road / Eldon Road junction carries on along the A6075 and past the Industrial Estate. HGV vehicles are using this route to access the Clipper site and others at the Boughton Industrial Estates due to the low bridge at Boughton.</p> <p>In addition, as the greatest number of vehicles recorded by the recent Traffic Survey (Appendix i) are cars, it can be presumed that many use the A6075 as a route from the A1 to Ollerton, Edwinstowe, Worksop, Mansfield & beyond. It is, in effect a “Rat Run” which needs attention, not more traffic trying to access it from a new development site.</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 a minimum two years or more.</p> <p>Transport & Accessibility p107</p> <p>5.v Proposes improvement of pedestrian access into town via Long Lane. I would respectfully suggest that the Bassetlaw Plan is naïve in thinking that residents on the new development will use this to any great extent and will therefore add to the problematic parking / traffic issues Tuxford residents already experience when using the local shops. It can be observed at any time that the majority of shop users arrive in vehicles, as do many taking children to school, probably because they are on their way to and from work in other areas.</p> <p>There are apparently plans for the Co-op to move to a site on Ashvale Road, therefore even less incentive for residents on the new development to walk along an improved footpath on Long Lane.</p> <p>POLICY ST46: Promoting Healthy, Active Lifestyles on page144 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. 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.</p>	<p>The Council has consulted the Highway authority – Nottinghamshire County Council on the principle of up to 90 dwellings at the site. They raised no objection in principle subject to a detailed transport assessment and Travel Plan through any future planning application.</p> <p>The proposed policy identifies the need for a single access point off Ollerton Road for vehicles and pedestrians and the need to provide new or improved footway connections from the site into the town centre.</p> <p>Off site highway mitigation is unknown until detailed plans are submitted to the Council.</p> <p>An improved footway from the site via Long Lane will provide a convenient connection to the shops and school. Due to the limited parking in the town centre, it will help encourage more people to walk or cycle from the site to access those services and facilities.</p> <p>Where the development causes an impact to local infrastructure, then contributions will be sought from the developer to mitigate any adverse impacts. This could be Open Space, Health, Education or highways.</p> <p>The reason for the air quality in parts of the town to be lower than average is the fact the A1 runs through the centre. In times of heavy traffic is when the air quality is at its poorest. The site on Ollerton Road is located away from the A1 so it should not lead to a further reduction in air quality.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<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. The proposed development of site NP04 would increase the level of pollutants even further due to the increase in traffic flow at that junction and throughout Tuxford – an increased health risk to residents on The Pastures (where several over 65’s already have respiratory health issues) and all Tuxford residents.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Plan presentation at the open Consultation Events stated that future development should be “where the infrastructure can cope”, and “should have a negative effect on the residents”.</p> <p>The infrastructure in Tuxford is at breaking point – GP surgery & primary school at maximum, the sewerage system in the centre of town needing emergency repair twice within 12 months, the highways over used and causing major traffic congestion for residents. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious traffic incident with potential loss of life.</p> <p>Tuxford has already had 102 dwellings built or committed for development since 2018, and is struggling to cope with that so far. Development of a further 90+ dwellings will be the straw that broke the camels back. Even a few small developments within Tuxford without an improved infrastructure could be catastrophic. The traffic congestion within Tuxford has been overlooked for too long, and needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency, before any further development is considered.</p> <p>Please see attachment Appendix i</p>	
REF192	Resident	<p>In the BLP on p106 it says the site NP04 is "identified as deliverable from 2027"</p> <p>Does this mean completed or started?</p>	This state that the site is likely to commence from 2027 onwards.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent would recommend that Water Efficiency design and Water re-use is outlined within policy 30 to ensure that development is carried out in a sustainable way, making the most of the resources available. We would also recommend that the 110 l/h/d water efficiency standard is incorporated to ensure that developers understand that what is expected from them from the outset.</p> <p>We would also recommend that the policy incorporates references to the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS to ensure that development is undertaken in a sustainable way. There are known constraints on the downstream sewer network, therefore there is an increased likelihood that development could increase downstream flood risk, by implementing the Drainage Hierarchy and SuDS design this risk could be reduced. There is a surface water system in close proximity to the development therefore no surface water will be permitted to connect to the foul sewer network.</p>	Water efficiency and water reuse is identified through Local Plan Policy. Flood and drainage issues such as the inclusion of SUDS will be included within the strategic water and drainage policies as previously agreed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF049	Resident	<p>We would like to add our comments again to the proposed Bassetlaw Plan, specifically that part which affects our local community in Tuxford. Tuxford is deemed as being able to accommodate a significant increase in dwellings without any reference to any additions, improvements or additional funding in infrastructure, schools or doctors. We would suggest that these dwellings would put an additional, serious strain on these services. Even during the pandemic crisis the traffic situation at peak times is dangerous -particularly between the junction of Ollerton Road and Eldon Street. The environmental impact on pedestrians has not been taken into consideration which has been exacerbated during the pandemic as people are queuing outside shops and the post office. HGV's meeting each other in the centre of the village often brings all vehicles to a standstill and endangers other road users and pedestrians alike. The impact of the additional dwellings between Ollerton Road and Long Lane is particularly problematical. Newcastle Street is bottlenecked at peak times with cars going to the school, vehicles coming off the A1 northbound, and vehicles and pedestrians accessing the Coop supermarket with street parking on both sides of the road. This would be increased by the number of new vehicles that additional dwellings would bring. We understand that the plan for the extra dwellings in Tuxford does not take into account the existing residential development that has been ongoing since 2018 as part of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. This should be looked at as part of the Bassetlaw Plan. May we also ask why our previously submitted opinions and comments cannot be considered at this juncture?</p>	<p>The Council has consulted the Highway authority – Nottinghamshire County Council on the principle of up to 90 dwellings at the site. They raised no objection in principle subject to a detailed transport assessment and Travel Plan through any future planning application.</p> <p>The proposed policy identifies the need for a single access point off Ollerton Road for vehicles and pedestrians and the need to provide new or improved footway connections from the site into the town centre.</p> <p>Off site highway mitigation is unknown until detailed plans are submitted to the Council.</p>
REF051	Resident	<p>This plan was proposed, discussed and consulted on less than 12 months ago. All of the previous objections should still be valid. The council appears to be focused on forcing through this scheme by hoping that objectors will be weary of the process. For a rural community to be considering using prime agricultural land, directly adjacent to pensioners housing, to build a minimum of 90 houses is fundamentally wrong.. Brown field sites should be the priority, followed by non agricultural land.. This whole plan smacks of taking the easiest option for developers profit margins and nothing at all to do with maintaining the countryside and rich agricultural heritage of Tuxford.</p>	<p>The site is considered a sustainable and suitable location form some residential development. The original area put forward at the start of the process has been reduced and now the number of dwellings proposed is 75 units.</p> <p>There are not enough available or suitable brownfield sites in Tuxford to accommodate the level of required development.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF123	Resident	<p>There is little evidence to show that the residents of Tuxford are being consulted on this and other proposals. Tuxford is a small town with little on offer in the way of employment. It is therefore highly likely that any development would increase the number motor vehicles travelling through Tuxford to their place of work. The building of at least 90 houses would have a very clear impact to traffic and the town infrastructure. Specifically the intersection of Ollerton Road (A6075) and Eldon Street (B1164), the intersection of Newark road/Newcastle street to Lincoln road (A6075) and the impact on the heritage area of Eldon Street. The only traffic survey to date was completed by concerned residents in October. This highlighted the issues that had been raised repeatedly and presented for consideration at the previous Bassetlaw planning meeting. Tuxford is in the unenviable position of having the worst pollution in Bassetlaw. Development of this size can only exacerbate the problem. There are also the issues of the impact on the existing services in Tuxford. Currently the secondary school has a capacity of 1462 pupils and has at least 100 pupils over this number on roll. The primary school is has a capacity of 240 pupils with more than 30% more than this on roll. The primary school is already beyond the recommended area required for the number of pupils and has little room for expansion. Similarly there would be an impact on health provision.</p> <p>The land is Grade 2 agricultural land which, according to the National Plan, should not be developed. Within the compass of the town there are a variety of brown field and green field sites that could provide for reasoned and planned development. The site is on one of the highest points in the town and would have a major visual impact from all southern aspects. The only sites that received any form of support from a very concerned populace were on the Lincoln Road beyond the railway line, sites NP09 and NP10. These were rejected by the planning group because they were deemed too far away from local services. With the redevelopment of the Co-op to a new site on Ashvale Road the town will have 3 small supermarket outlets, 2 of which will be closer to the Lincoln Road sites without having an impact on pedestrian crossings, the busiest road junctions and the narrow heritage Eldon Street. The same applies to the secondary school, the playing fields, the doctor's surgery, the playground, access to Lincoln and access to Newark. The Ollerton Road/ Eldon Street area has an infrastructure that was developed during the last century and before. There have been repeated failures of both the water and sewage systems in recent times causing complete road closures. The volume of proposed housing and its location on the highest area of the town should give cause for concern.</p>	<p>There have been several consultation events over the last couple of years regarding development within Tuxford and for this proposed site. The Council has also met with the Town Council and community at a number of these events since 2019.</p> <p>Land around Tuxford is heavily constrained whether it heritage, landscape, traffic, flooding or the environment so careful consideration on the location of growth has been undertaken through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.</p> <p>The site, although constrained, offers the most sustainable option for accommodating some residential development, whilst limiting the impact on nearby areas or other constraints.</p> <p>Where the development causes an impact to local infrastructure, then contributions will be sought from the developer to mitigate any adverse impacts. This could be Open Space, Health, Education or highways.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF124	Resident	<p>It is clear that this plan has been put forward without any real form of consultation with the residents of Tuxford. When the original sites were put forward in 2019 as part of the Bassetlaw Plan the only areas that received any level of support were NP09 and NP10. This is basically because the residents are aware of the issues with traffic flow throughout the town. Of particular concern is the oldest, busiest and narrowest part of the town, Eldon Street, and the junctions to the Ollerton Road and Egmanton Road.</p> <p>Both of these sites were rejected by the planners as being too far from the amenities on offer.</p> <p>With the proposed development of a newly sited Co-op the town will have three super markets, two of which would be closer to sites NP09 and NP10 than NP04. The same applies to the doctor's surgery, the secondary school, the playing fields, the play ground, access to Lincoln and to Newark. None would have to negotiate the busiest junctions, the narrowest main road or any of the pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>There does not appear to have been any traffic survey carried out by Bassetlaw Planning. The only one has come from concerned resident volunteers. The results of this survey, carried out on a normal weekday, with Covid restrictions for business premises in place, highlight the volume and the movement of cars and heavy lorries through the heritage areas of the town. An examination of Google maps, a picture taken on a quieter non school day, shows the essence of the problem quite clearly.</p> <p>The proposed development is on prime agricultural land, located at one of the highest points in the town. It would have a major visual impact on the aspect of the heritage areas of the town from all views from the south. There have been regular repairs to the services in the centre of the town, both sewage and water mains needing major work, resulting in total road closures. A development of at least 90 houses would only exacerbate these problems. Tuxford is the most polluted area in the whole of Bassetlaw. Development on the proposed scale would do nothing to alleviate this. All community services- doctors, primary school, secondary school are currently well beyond their capacity. Further development would have a major impact. In particular to the primary school that has no room for further growth.</p> <p>Any future expansion needs very careful planning involving full consultation with the people to whom this will have the greatest impact- the residents of Tuxford.</p>	<p>There have been several consultation events over the last couple of years regarding development within Tuxford and for this proposed site. The Council has also met with the Town Council and community at a number of these events since 2019.</p> <p>Land around Tuxford is heavily constrained whether it heritage, landscape, traffic, flooding or the environment so careful consideration on the location of growth has been undertaken through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.</p> <p>The site, although constrained, offers the most sustainable option for accommodating some residential development, whilst limiting the impact on nearby areas or other constraints.</p> <p>Where the development causes an impact to local infrastructure, then contributions will be sought from the developer to mitigate any adverse impacts. This could be Open Space, Health, Education or highways.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF028	Resident	<p>We support the development of the site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tuxford has had little development recently and there is a need for new housing. Building new houses in Tuxford will give more opportunity for people to live in the rural area rather than lack of housing forcing them to live in Retford or Worksop. It is important for young people, who have grown up in Tuxford and the local area, to have the option to live in Tuxford. 2. Tuxford is an ideal site for development because it has facilities such as good schools, shops, library, community centre and a doctors surgery. The village has good road links with the A1 and A57 close by. 3. The site has no flood risk. 4. The site is only a short walk to shops, café, the library and the primary school. 5. Access to the site from Ollerton road is good. 6. Houses only border the site on one side, the other sides are farmland, and therefore only a small number of people will border the development. 7. The site could expand beyond the area currently marked should further housing be required in Tuxford. 8. We support the development of the site. The site only forms a small part of the land we farm and we will be able to continue to farm when the site is developed. <p>We live close to Tuxford and farm all around the town with two farm yards in the centre of the town. We have many friends and family members who live and run businesses in the town. As local people we are appreciative of the beautiful and historical area and welcome the opportunity to help to ensure that the development enhances Tuxford.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF143	Resident	<p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development on arguably the highest quality of land in the district. Grade 2 soil that is suitable for growing vegetables as well as cereals. 2. Green belt land is a specially designated area of countryside protected from development. Protection from urban sprawl and to encourage development within settlements of which Tuxford has many. 3. Traffic. I suggest any bassetlaw planning official observe the Eldon Street/Ollerton Road junction and the Newcastle Street/Eldon Street junction between 7.30- 9.30 am and 15.00-17.00. <p>Tuxford is more or less gridlocked on a school day and to expect another 100 dwellings to embark on the junction to Eldon Street is extremely naive to the problems. Opinions from a resident of Newcastle Street and council tax payer of 12 years.</p>	<p>Land around Tuxford is heavily constrained whether it heritage, landscape, traffic, flooding or the environment so careful consideration on the location of growth has been undertaken through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection process.</p> <p>The site, although constrained, offers the most sustainable option for accommodating some residential development, whilst limiting the impact on nearby areas or other constraints.</p> <p>There is no Green-Belt land in Bassetlaw – Green Belt is a Planning Policy Designation that affords the highest protection from in appropriate development.</p> <p>The Council has consulted the Highway authority – Nottinghamshire County Council on the principle of up to 90 dwellings at the site. They raised no objection in principle subject to a detailed transport assessment and Travel Plan through any future planning application.</p> <p>The proposed policy identifies the need for a single access point off Ollerton Road for vehicles and pedestrians and the need to provide new or improved footway connections from the site into the town centre.</p> <p>Off site highway mitigation is unknown until detailed plans are submitted to the Council</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
REF145	Resident	Policy no. 7.15.7 – “my concern is the service of Long Lane. No doubt those going to work in the morning will use Ollerton Road entrance. Those at home will use cars on Long Lane. Will Long Lane be resurfaced. This road is bad enough now without any extra traffic”.	There will be no vehicular access to the proposed site via Long Lane. The only access will be for pedestrians and cyclists similar to that at the Pastures.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>It is disappointing to note that this particular site NP04 has been included as opposed to the site off Lexington Gardens and St John’s College Farm, previously annotated as NP16 in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Although the site had a planning refusal in August 2018 and the subsequent appeal dismissed, it was clear from the Inspector’s decision that this was due to several technical issues of overlooking, orientation and the general mix of house types but certainly not due to any policy or locational issues. Indeed the site had an Officer’s recommendation for approval and Conservation had no issue.</p> <p>The existing range of agricultural buildings regarded as contributing positively to the character of the area have all be carefully and thoughtfully restored, renovated and converted to dwellings and along with the now carefully restored listed St John’s Farmhouse provide and retain much of the original character.</p> <p>Within the previous Neighbourhood Plan allocation NP16 refers to this site. Having read this several times I cannot find a single negative point, only positive statements and positive guidance on taking a scheme forward, all of which were included and considered previously. The sustainability appraisal scores a significant positive for housing delivery, health and well being and only a minor positive with regards to economy skills, regeneration and social inclusion and transport but it is still a positive. It is suggested there would be a significant negative on land use (grade 2 soil) and cultural heritage although, as a matter of record, the previous application and appeal confirmed this scheme to have no adverse impact on the heritage assets. This issue can therefore be satisfied. When NP16 is compared to the site on Ollerton Road, Tuxford, Policy NP04, it is difficult to understand how NP04 should progress over NP16, the latter having been subject to close scrutiny and, as stated before, technical issues prevented an approval being granted. 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. No such issue or constraints apply to NP16. It is in many respects a typical “infill” site. All issues regarding highways, drainage, services, contributions etc have been resolved and none found wanting. All in all, NP04 has less positive effects than the previously allocation off Lexington Gardens/St John’s College Farm (NP16). On this appraisal basis, NP16 should have been included over NP04. However, with the obvious shortfall the Lexington Gardens site should now be reinstated. With a desire to see 250 homes in Tuxford it is clear that this conurbation has capacity and could provide more homes even beyond the proposed figure of 250 and could easily accommodate housing allocations removed from the Apleyhead proposal.</p> <p>Tuxford has all of the infrastructure, services and social provision to accommodate major growth and further expansion in the homes provision would ensure that all of the services etc are retained and with developer contributions many could be expanded including the much needed village hall.</p> <p>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. Throughout the LAA process, NP16 was appraised and recommended to be taken forward (LAA202).NP16 was also identified within the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan. Throughout all of the above mentioned documents including, of course, Bassetlaw’s Draft Local Plan I cannot identify a single strong negative reason or indeed any reason at all as to why this site should not be taken forward. As such my objection is based on the omission of NP16 from the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan and the clear lack of justification for doing so. The section relating to Tuxford is therefore incorrect, inaccurate and unacceptable.</p>	<p>All land around Tuxford is heavily constrained and the Sustainability Appraisal has looked at these areas in detail. The Council maintains its SA recommendations and criteria for Tuxford.</p> <p>Land at Lexington Gardens has been refused planning permission partly due to the impact of traffic and landscape. The site on Ollerton Road provides an appropriate location to accommodate some growth whilst minimising the impact to the surrounding area and infrastructure. The site will need a detailed transport Assessment to identify what, if any, impacts there will be to the existing road network and whether mitigation is required. From a strategic point of view, the Highways Authority hasn’t raised concern over the impact of this site.</p> <p>The sites density has been reduced so it’ll now only include around 75 dwellings rather than 90 which means it will include a density of around 30dph which is a similar density to that of the adjoining Pastures development. Appropriate landscaping are also required to protect the wider landscape quality and preserve private amenity of nearby residents.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 30: Site NP04: OLLERTON ROAD, TUXFORD			
		<p>Policy 30: Site NP04 suggests a density of 90 dwellings on this particular site. I feel 90 is excessive and would result in a very cramped appearance. However, even with 90 there is a massive shortfall in this small town, 250 required and 90 allocated. Even if one includes the recently approved and commenced site adjacent to Ashvale Road there would still be an identified shortfall of over 100 houses.</p> <p>The site adjacent to Ashvale Road has been granted planning permission for a mix of social housing including some rent to buy (24), social rented (22) and 40 shared ownership, 2 and 3 beds, all of which would be classified as affordable housing. This does not provide a mix as required by current local policies and some of the aims put forward within the previous Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>However, it does address a shortfall of affordable housing within the district.</p> <p>The appraisal in the Neighbourhood Plan of the Lexington Gardens/St John's College Farm site carried out by LUC (identified as NP16) scored:-</p> <p>2 significant positive effects.</p> <p>3 minor positive effects.</p> <p>2 significant negative effects and</p> <p>1 minor negative effect.</p> <p>Given that one of the significant negative effects relates to Archaeology and Conservation with the latter already having been satisfied and the former, ie Archaeology, can be mitigated for and protected against, it would appear that this negative aspect is grossly overstated. The statement that the site includes historical agricultural buildings is incorrect, these buildings are outside this allocation and have already been converted to dwellings with the approval of both Planning and Conservation Officers.</p> <p>NP04, Ollerton Road site, scored only 1 significant positive effect with the site being close to the play area, cemetery, surgery etc. It scored 4 minor positive effects.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 110, Policy ST31 Should a 'local connection' requirement be included so that affordable housing is available as a priority to those who have grown up in the village?	Bassetlaw has local connection criteria when it comes to the Council's housing waiting list. This list is also used to nominate applicants for Housing Associations, as most use the Council's choice based lettings to receive applicants and they also advertise through it. With regard to Discounted Market Sale and First Homes, the Council uses a local connection as part of the 106 agreement. It should be noted that local connection is Bassetlaw wide, not settlement specific. The Council has no control of this because it is a legal requirement. However, Housing associations do tend to give consideration to households from a specific village when it comes to allocating, and they have final say on who they put in their properties.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<i>In reference to the January 2020 DLP</i> East Markham Parish Council fully endorses this policy and requests that it is enforced.	Support welcome and noted.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 110, Para 7.16.17 – It is welcomed that again Neighbourhood Plans are accepted as part of the planning and development process. However, it is acknowledged that most of Affordable Housing will be financed and created from significant developments, Neighbourhood Plans do try to play their part where possible by not following these parameters.	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Plan needs to recognise that the affordability of housing is critical to the success of housing growth. If it fails to do so, the Plan will not address local issues of housing affordability, and merely open Retford up as an extended suburb of larger cities, including London. Retfordians want houses for local people, with jobs which support the local economy. Residents across Bassetlaw are pressured by rising house prices unaffordable deposits for first time buyers and private rental rates which discourage saving. More than 11 million people in the UK rent from a private landlord and many of them are at the sharp end of the housing crisis. The Bassetlaw Local Plan is an opportunity to reverse this by bringing truly affordable homes to the District - and those which are affordable both to purchase and running. Running costs means insisting, through planning, on the highest environmental standards, future proofing homes with EV charging ready circuits, fibre broadband to the home, and of course affordable rental values. Would expect to see Bassetlaw District Council take a lead on this with a new social house building programme to meet the identified need of 3,500 homes over the life of the Plan, with council housing at its heart. By the end of the first 5 years, need to see an annual rate of at least 200 council and social homes, with at least half of these built by Bassetlaw District Council for social rent. Expect to see Bassetlaw District Council Plan design and build these homes in the district, using our Special Purpose Vehicle companies like Bersahill with funding and with backing from the national government. The current Plan figures appear to aim for the construction of less than 40 social rent dwellings per year - we expect a five-fold increase to match the projected needs set out in the Plan and also to change the bogus definition of 'affordable', set as high as 80% of market rents, and replace it with a definition linked to local incomes. Bassetlaw District Council must choose to adopt both the bogus and affordable metric in parallel to assess new homes in the area. Wants the Plan to help address the forced conversion of social rented homes to so-called 'affordable rent'. It may be necessary to look at the amount of housing debt the Council currently holds and give Councils the powers and funding to buy back homes from private landlords - this would be particularly impactful post COVID-19 where financial pressure on landlords will result in higher rent and/or lower quality of maintenance to tenants across our District. Would wish to see the Plan allow Tenants a stronger say in the management of their homes and stop social cleansing by making sure regeneration only goes ahead when it has the consent of residents, and that all residents are offered a new property on the same site and terms. Note the success of the first Decent Homes programme as a potential model for Retford and the District. Would expect the Plan to bring an end to the scandal of leasehold for the millions who have bought their home but do not feel like they own it. Ask Bassetlaw Council to include a specific note that they will seek to avoid all "new leasehold properties", abolish unfair fees and conditions, and give leaseholders the right to buy their freehold at a price they can afford. Suggested changes to the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Through local planning rules, insist in the Plan that developers always present an assessment of measures to reduce the long-term costs for home occupants. Suggest that Developers are always forced to assess the following measures, and Bassetlaw District Council be given provision to update the list of measures on an annual basis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The highest buildings and environmental standards, including solar panels, to minimise energy bills ○ Provision for EV charging as a minimum through installing suitable electrical circuits (circuit breakers, high current circuits to the exterior of a property) ○ Ground source heat pumps and district heating schemes. ○ Fibre broadband to the home (not just the cabinet) ● A new social housing programme of 3,600 homes across Bassetlaw, constructed to the highest standards and held to the highest planning rules. ● Bassetlaw District Council adopts both the (bogus) national definition of affordable and also adopts a measure against local property values. ● The affordability of rent looks to be getting more acute as the gap between rich/poor ever widens. The impacts of COVID-19 on landlord finances risks increasing rents and decreasing maintenance. Large numbers of rental homes may come to market as landlords seek capital to address income shortages. In response, the Bassetlaw District Plan should include an "assessment at District Council level of the ability to procure rented accommodation". If the law does not permit the Council to buy homes, we still insist the Council look at the commercial feasibility and social case for doing so. Bassetlaw residents need not enter a housing crisis of spiralling rent and falling standards. ● Planning applications which include leasehold properties should always be looked on less favourably and the District Plan must explicitly say so. 	<p>The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of affordable housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. But delivering affordable housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. The Council and its partners will need to continue to identify other mechanisms for delivering affordable housing. Para 7.16.7 states how the Council will work in partnership with other agencies and partners to deliver affordable housing. This could include through Bersahill. The definition of affordable housing is set by the National Planning Policy Framework, this is a matter the Council has to incorporate in local policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
REF160	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Wish to make comments on the level of affordable housing proposed in version 2 of the draft Local Plan. Realise that the authority faces an uphill task to meet the identified need of affordable housing units (AH) for reasons very much outside of their control. But for this plan , over four years in the making, to have identified only 688 out of the 10, 000 homes to be built is very disappointing; set aside the identified need of 3600 units it falls woefully short of something to be proud about.</p> <p>The Local Plan sets out a vision of what Bassetlaw should be like to live in by 2037. Without a substantial increase in AH the improvements in leisure, recreation and public space will not be enjoyed to the full by people who are having to live in more expensive accommodation than is comfortable with their income. Much is made of aspiring to create high paid jobs in the District. That is laudable, but not all jobs are going to be such. This week the Council proudly announced that Burger King are coming to town ; on a site next to ASDA, which the Council also lauded, whose 200 staff are mostly paid only slightly above the National Living Wage. The Council made much of the development at Symmetry Park but two years on the current jobs and those coming are again at or slightly above the NLW. The agent marketing the large warehouse development there listed as one of the sites benefits as being in a low wage area with a large supply of people looking for work. There are existing large employers in the area paying low wages already. Presumably these will continue to do so and continue to employ hundreds of local workers. The Plan at 7.18.16 says it has secured 688 AH units though gather the actual figure is 740. The 740 comprises 561 units from private builders, 54 from site HS6 and 125 from two council owned sites at HS 6 and 8. Note that the Plan recognises that the planning system is only one mechanism to deliver AH (7.18.17) and goes on to list other actions to secure AH. The evidence suggests, unfortunately, that most of these will only provide small numbers of AH.</p> <p>The first and second actions – finding council owned sites for development- is surely of limited value because otherwise they would have been identified as part of the call for sites. Moreover, in a recent cabinet paper the portfolio holder for Housing talked only of identifying former garage sites and other unused space on council estates. A useful initiative but not likely to generate many AH units. Related to site identification one has to address the capacity of the Council to project manage and fund such initiatives. Refer to the former Gateway site at Carlton. In 2015 local members and the parish council enthusiastically supported A1s proposal to build housing on the site; six years on and there is no development. The third action – fill empty housing. Fully support but in 19/20 just one house was filled and to date just two in 20/21. Action 4- no comment. Action 5 – purchase housing on the open market. The Cabinet lead tells me that we currently have a budget that would secure 3 or 4 houses per annum. Action 6 - neighbourhood plans to provide AH. Bassetlaw excels in its number of Neighbourhood Plans. How many AH units are provided for through this route? flicked through several Plans and have never seen this included as a policy. Therefore in my submission most of the means identified in 7.18.17 fail to address the problem in terms of scale and deliverability. Note that it is planned to produce a Position Paper for final inclusion into the submitted Plan. This is to be welcomed. Urge this to be in the style of an Action Plan and not a policy paper that expertly but pointlessly justifies our low delivery intention. Recommend the approach of Newark and Sherwood Council in their 2016 Council Housing Development Programme 5 year plan. Of course you may know of better styles to follow. The style we report in must include targets, means to deliver and a reporting system.</p> <p>Finish by making four specific suggestions. 1. I’ve heard it said that the Council is against AH units in the rural villages. This seems to be based on a poor experience some many years ago at Mattersey Thorpe and because tenants don’t own cars. From my knowledge of MT the failure was more of an allocations policy rather than that of rural AH. Have more recent experience of AH at Gringley and now Beckingham to draw on. As for not owning cars, before accepting that argument we should examine the evidence of car ownership amongst the council waiting list. 2. If my argument is accepted that developing council sites in house or with partners is held back by a capacity issue then could we explore the possibility of sharing resource with other Councils. Legal, architect, project management skills are in short supply; sharing them across boundaries might improve the capacity to deliver. 3. in a strong position when discussing private development options. Have a very healthy land supply and nearly all our sites are built out within a reasonable timescale. Should apply this strength in the case of future sites. Instead of a blanket 10% or 20% AH quotient for all such sites, let’s make it a minimum of 10 or 20, with the possibility of additional AH units on more profitable sites. Recently Harworth Estates found an extra £1 m in S106 payments when NCC objected to their ‘ final</p>	<p>The 688 only relates to the site allocations in the Local Plan. This is based on whole plan viability and the need to deliver a range of infrastructure to make development acceptable in planning terms. There are also affordable homes in the current supply; there are in excess of 3000 dwellings (housing commitments) yet to be built.</p> <p>1. Local Plan evidence identifies a need for affordable housing in Bassetlaw’s villages. However, these are often difficult to deliver due to the size of development (the NPPF indicates that LPAs can only seek affordable housing on sites of 10 or more dwellings). Housing Associations also tend to resist taking on affordable homes in rural areas due to the fact that villages have less service provision e.g. schools, convenience shops etc. The cost of living tends to be higher for families living in rural areas due to the need to access transport. This can have an adverse effect on households on low incomes.</p> <p>2. and 3. and 4. The Council will need to continue to explore all opportunities for delivering affordable housing, including those methods suggested in this representation, many of which are already being undertaken.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
		offer'. Likewise Keepmoat are now entertaining the possibility of providing AH through a RP on their Firbeck site when the S106 exempted them from such housing. Significantly both these schemes had been independently viability assessed as needing to be exempt from the contributions the developers agreed to. Assume sites HS 2 and 4 are County Council owned sites. To that end could not the proposed finically package reflect the need for AH and other socially beneficial units whilst at the same time proving types of housing that assist County and District to house the most needy and vulnerable in accommodation not normally provided by the market.	
1669638	Norton Cuckney Parish Council	More clarity is needed for options other than Registered providers to provide affordable housing. There is a desire in our Neighbourhood plan to have a small number and a range of affordable houses for local people. However, the present system appears to factor against this. Would it be possible to make this more flexible?	The Policy has now been amended and includes an opportunity to bring forward rural affordable housing exceptions sites. This will be subject to the criteria in the policy, which includes full engagement with Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Plan Groups.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Councillor	Page 110, Policy ST31 Should a 'local connection' requirement be included so that affordable housing is available as a priority to those who have grown up in the village?	Bassetlaw has local connection criteria when it comes to the Council's housing waiting list. This list is also used to nominate applicants for Housing Associations, as most use the Council's choice based lettings to receive applicants and they also advertise through it. With regard to Discounted Market Sale and First Homes, the Council uses a local connection as part of the 106 agreement. It should be noted that local connection is Bassetlaw wide, not settlement specific. The Council has no control of this because it is a legal requirement. However, Housing associations do tend to give consideration to households from a specific village when it comes to allocating, and ultimately they have final say on who they put in their properties.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This proposal is generally acceptable. However, there has, for several years now, been a problem for some developers to obtain the interest of a social housing landlord and as such unless this has changed, and I do not have any evidence it has, then this exception needs to be included. In reality, the best social landlord would be the Council and the demise of Council housing stock is something we should all be ashamed of. A partnership between developer and the local authority could work and indeed should be investigated. It has worked well in the past and it can work well again.	The loss of stock through the Right to Buy scheme is out of the Council's control. There is very little funding available to replace Council owned properties that have been sold off. The Council does work with developers to ensure that the required level of affordable housing is delivered through the planning system. There is also work being undertaken by the Housing Strategy Team to bring forward 100% affordable housing schemes (such as the scheme of 120 dwellings at Radford Street, Worksop).
REF195	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management (Peaks Hill Farm)	Affordable Housing is broadly supported but there are concerns that it lacks flexibility and to some extent misinterprets National Planning Policy in respect of affordable home ownership. Sub paragraphs B.1. and 2. set fixed provisions for affordable housing as a proportion of the dwellings to be provided on brown field and green field sites. It is considered that this should be expressed as a target figure to allow some flexibility where the viability of the sites is challenging. It is noted that para. ST31D makes reference to amendments to planning permissions resulting in a reduction in affordable housing from the original permission on the basis of viability and it is considered that this approach should be adopted in the consideration of the original planning application where viability is challenging. Sub-para. 2.2 to Policy ST31 identifies that a proportion of affordable housing will be for affordable home ownership. It is unclear whether the 20% figure for affordable housing and the reference to 10% of which being for affordable home ownership, is intended to be 10% of the affordable housing provision or 10% of the total site. Although para. 7.16.3 of the draft plan makes reference to National Policy in this regard it appears to misinterpret the provisions of para. 64 of the NPPF. This states that "where major development is proposed planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes (our emphasis) to be available for affordable home ownership". The footnote to this paragraph confirms that this is to be part of the overall affordable housing contribution from the site. In our view, this should be properly interpreted as meaning that 10% of the total number of dwellings provided on a site should be provided as affordable home ownership and that this contributes towards the overall affordable housing	Paragraph 59 of the NPPF indicates: 'To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, <u>that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed</u> and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay'. In order to address the needs of households requiring affordable housing, it is necessary to set a requirement figure. This will be tested through the Local Plan examination process. A target figure would not provide certainty that the number of affordable homes required would be met. This approach is supported by the results of the Bassetlaw Local Plan Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF indicates: ' <u>Where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development,</u>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
		requirement. In other words, if the requirement for affordable housing overall is 20% then half of that would be provided by way of affordable home ownership. We consider that Policy ST31 should be amended to clarify this and to bring it in line with National Planning Policy.	<p>planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force. All viability assessments, including any undertaken at the plan-making stage, should reflect the recommended approach in national planning guidance, including standardised inputs, and should be made publicly available.'</p> <p>A. In all cases where affordable housing is provided it will be expected to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make provision for a minimum of 10% of dwellings to be for affordable home ownership; 2. On brownfield sites: Make provision for 15% affordable housing. On greenfield sites: Make provision for 25% affordable housing.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	Draft Policy ST31 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. In the January draft Plan, Bassetlaw District Council stated that the broader definition of affordable housing was in the glossary of the Plan, however we believe Policy 31 should reflect this broader definition of affordable housing by allowing provision outside home ownership or affordable rent categorisation, especially the role of community homes for rent within the policy which is especially relevant for homes in rural Bassetlaw under the jurisdiction of the Estate.	<p>The policy has been amended to include a reference to national policy:</p> <p>B. In all cases where affordable housing is provided it will be expected to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Make provision for a minimum of 10% of dwellings to be for affordable home ownership; 4. On brownfield sites: Make provision for 15% affordable housing. On greenfield sites: Make provision for 25% affordable housing. <p>Of this, 25% will be for First Homes; a minimum of 25% will be for other types of affordable home ownership which accords with national planning policy; and any remaining percentage requirement will be social housing or affordable housing for rent;</p>
REF198-Bevercotes Colliery	Gladman Developments Ltd, promoting former Bevercotes Colliery site	The above policy sets out that on major developments, housing sites of over 0.5 hectares and rural exceptions sites 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 10% will be for affordable home ownership and the rest 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. 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. The latest iteration of the plan includes a new policy requirement which attempts to ensure that affordable home ownership dwellings are sold at a discount of at least 20% below local market value; and that eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. While reference is given to affordable housing discounts within the Bassetlaw District Council Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment (October 2019), no specific reference is given to aforementioned figure and the implications of applying such a discount for affordable housing is unclear. While this Gladman propose that this requirement must be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence	The Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) has assessed the need for discount market sales and provides an indication of the percentage that should be applied. A minimum 20% discount accords with the recommendations of the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020). The Council has taken into consideration the new requirements for First Homes through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The policy has been amended to include this requirement.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST31 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
		<p>which justifies its inclusion accounts for market signal. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment briefly considers the Government's consultation on Changes to the current planning system however proposes to change national policy such that policy compliant planning applications would be expected to deliver a minimum of 25% affordable housing as First Homes. This consultation states that the minimum discount for First Homes should be 30% from market price. It is our understanding that the Government will be responding to proposals on the mechanism to secure First Homes through developer contributions in the short term in the early part of 2021. Therefore, it is vital that the Council takes further consideration of this proposed changes and monitors any updates regarding this to ensure that a flexible approach is implemented.</p>	
1671323	William Davis	<p>The approach to affordable housing is broadly supported. 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 57 and NPPG para: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509) any requirement should be robustly justified and flexible. Our previous comments identified that the Future Housing Standards have not been incorporated into the Viability Appraisal. While it is accepted that these are not yet part of the regulatory framework, any deviation from the policy should be due to exceptional circumstances; the Future Homes Standard will affect all new houses and may be introduced before adoption of the Local Plan. As such it is considered that it is appropriate to consider their potential impact up front to understand the potential impact on viability and the delivery of affordable housing in Bassetlaw. It is also noted that the response to our comments indicates that the viability assessment has been the subject of "discussions with stakeholders". However, the Viability Assessment provides no details of these discussions and is therefore not consistent with the NPPG (para 006 Reference ID: 10-006-20190509).</p>	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has been updated and includes all relevant policy requirements. Land owners and agents of sites included as site allocations have been engaged in the Whole Viability Assessment process. This will be confirmed in the Statement of Common Ground for each site allocation.
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>5) Policy 31 (Policy ST31 in Text) should be modified to state that static caravans are recognised by the Council as legitimate affordable housing. A new subsection 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."</p>	Park Homes are not included in the definition of 'affordable housing' in the NPPF. As such, the Council does not propose to include Park Homes within the policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	<p>Page 111, section 7.17 In Misterton, the District Council owns a pocket of land, which has been designated in the village's Neighbourhood Plan for housing. Bassetlaw DC should proceed at pace to develop such land with affordable housing, replacing that lost in the 'Right to Buy' scheme.</p> <p>Page 112, Policy 32 The Parish Council supports the view that housing must of the right mix, type, and density to sit comfortably within rural communities. Recent rural development has seen too many 4/5-bed dwellings, which are beyond the financial reach of the 'next generation'. This means that young people have to leave the village to find affordable housing and, all too often, incomers (the only ones that can afford such dwellings) play no part in village life. This turns communities into 'dormitory villages'.</p>	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF128 (Comments also made under reference number 1669799) - Pictures attached	Resident	<p>Previously commented on Planning Application 17/00152/NMA for houses to be built on Harworth pit site to be known as Simpson Park. Those comments were not taken on board if indeed they were even considered. The above housing development is of massive proportions & will have a big impact on our existing village/town but it would appear that there is little regard given by the developers & planners to what the people of Harworth & Bircotes really need as has been happening consistently over previous years. Several years ago attended a presentation in the parish hall at which plans for around 1000 houses on the old pit site were unveiled. Of those 1000 or so houses there was not one single bungalow on the plans. This was pointed out at the time to Harworth Estates & Bassetlaw District Council probably, but there was no perceived uptake of the point at the time. Eight years on this development is now in progress with a proposed 996 houses to be built. There are no bungalows built to date & from enquiries it would appear there are still no proposals to include bungalows in the remaining number. The development off Bawtry road has several hundred houses to be built but no bungalows to date & none planned. There is a real shortage of bungalows in the village/town for the elderly & the infirm residents, both council & private. Others, of which I am one, would like to move into a bungalow before I fall into either one or both of the above categories. But I don't want to be cramped in a small 2 bedroom one, want one that reflects my needs, space & no stairs. There are of course those people who would simply prefer to live in a bungalow anyway, given the choice & availability. As these new estates are being built the ratio of bungalows to houses in Harworth is gradually reducing from an already low number & at the same time the number of the elderly & infirm is increasing. This is obviously reducing availability & choice to the ever increasing population. In this plan point 3.23 states that effectively Harworth & Bircotes will double in size over the coming years. It is therefore stark staringly obvious that the number of available bungalows per head of population will half. What kind of council allows that? Bassetlaw does! Have some good small bungalows for pensioners in the village/town but they are in very short supply. With regard to private bungalows they are also very few & far between & there are no plans to build any. Surely out of 996 properties there ought to be a sensible & fair mixture of housing to suit all ages & needs not just 3 & 4 bedroomed houses because they generate maximum payback for the developers. The village/town is in desperate need for 2 & 3 (or even 4) bedroomed bungalows & both the town & district councils have an obligation on behalf of residents to insist on a good mix of quality properties to be built that reflects the needs of the community & so far they have failed miserably in that obligation. Apparently, by law, developers must provide a percentage of social housing but what about the elderly & infirm who struggle with or cannot manage stairs? I firmly believe that the people of Harworth & Bircotes have been badly let down by Bassetlaw council with their total lack of foresight with planning applications regardless of all their statements in previous Neighbourhood plans, see attachments, & the current proposed plan. Tommy Simpson, local hero & legend would be 83 years old today had he lived. With all the pulverising & punishing work his legs & body had done I doubt he would be able to manage stairs now & would probably be looking to purchase a nice, spacious, quality bungalow on the development bearing his name. Wouldn't he be disappointed? If Bassetlaw keeps making all the right noises about providing housing to meet the needs of the community perhaps one day they may actually listen & do exactly what they say & insist that developers build a certain percentage of good quality bungalows, of varying sizes, as a condition of planning being granted. The same applies to any future housing that Bassetlaw plans to undertake for themselves. Please stop this downward spiral of ever decreasing availability of bungalows that are drastically needed to meet the needs of our community.</p>	<p>Policy 31 Housing Mix requires a suitable mix of housing to be delivered on residential sites. The Council's evidence in relation to housing mix (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020) has assessed the need for different types of housing in Bassetlaw. Whilst it provides recommendations regarding housing mix, it does also emphasise the need for a flexible approach because different areas of the district will have different needs.</p> <p>Bassetlaw District Council's Housing Strategy team work closely with the planning team to assess and consider housing mix on a case by case basis. Developers are also asked to consult with the public on larger scale proposals prior to submitting a planning application. This provides an opportunity for the community to engage with developers on design and housing need/mix.</p>
1671323	William Davis	It is noted that the response to our previous comments refers to the 'Local Housing Need Assessment 2020'. However, this document does not form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.	This is a typo it should say 'Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020' not 'Local Housing Needs Assessment'.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<i>In reference to the January 2020 Draft Local Plan</i> East Markham Parish Council 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.	At present the adopted Core Strategy is considered to be out of date and has more limited weight when considering planning applications. An up to date Local Plan will have full weight in the planning process so the provisions of new policies should be seen in the district.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF163	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Harworth Group	Confirms that density within Bassetlaw Garden Village, Peaks Hill Farm and Ordsall South will deliver a range of densities informed by the site's masterplan framework. It would be appropriate for Cottam Power Station to also be included, as a proposed regeneration area allocation, to ensure that site density is informed by the masterplan framework, making efficient use of land whilst respecting the character of the area. Policy 32 should be amended to reflect this. Policy 32 3. d) – Suggested Amendment: 3. Ensuring density reflects place: a) The density on sites in and adjoining town centres and transport hubs should be maximised; b) Within the Main Towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes development densities should be a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare (net) unless it would result in an adverse effect on the character of the area, including the setting of a heritage asset; c) Within the Large and Small Rural Settlements densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs, unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan; d) The density of, Bassetlaw Garden Village, HS1: Peaks Hill Farm, HS13: Ordsall South and ST7: Cottam Power Station will be expected to deliver a range of housing densities across each site informed by the site's masterplan framework.	The former Cottam Power Station site is identified as a broad location for growth in the next plan period, and not as a site allocation. It is therefore not considered appropriate to include Cottam Power Station in this policy as the details of the site allocation including uses have not been agreed. Further evidence based work is required to determine the most appropriate/suitable mix of uses for the site.
1669799	Resident	(7.17.1, 7.17.2, & 7.17.3) Ensuring that the right mix of housing to meet the needs of local people is critical to health & wellbeing. Couldn't agree more but what has Bassetlaw been doing about that for the past 10 years at least. National policy states that local authorities should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes - well Bassetlaw has failed miserably there in Harworth & Bircotes, there may be some high quality homes but definitely not a wide choice in my opinion because bungalows do not come into the equation. (7.17.6) This is just a joke. Developers have either been allowed to do whatever they wish or Bassetlaw has told them not to consider bungalows in Harworth & Bircotes, what other explanation could there be? No such planning conditions have been used to ensure bungalows were built. (7.17.7) This is the crux of my argument. What does Bassetlaw expect from it's residents? Wait until they can no longer manage in a house they have lived in for 20, 30 or more years before providing somewhere they can manage in but is not their choice. Surely if sufficient bungalows were available in Harworth & Bircotes residents would tend to migrate into those after their family grew up & got homes of their own freeing up family housing. It isn't all about age it's also about choice or preference.	At present the adopted Core Strategy is considered to be out of date and has more limited weight when considering planning applications. An up to date Local Plan will have full weight in the planning process so the provisions of new policies should be seen in the district.
REF030	Resident	Appreciate that houses need to be built and some on brownfield sites but hasn't this last year shown the value of good places and environments to live in. So whilst development needs to take place more emphasis needs to be placed on the effect on the existing residents and reducing the impact that such developments have. This isn't Nimbyism as appreciate development must take place and am thinking of the residents to come and the future residents of any new development. Some recent developments in Retford I have seen, have houses so large for the plot and the gardens so small that ALL the development really provides is just a house. This cannot be good for the long term mental state of the owner, and the effect of such large houses on the lives of the existing residents that surround the new development will also be detrimental. But the development obviously was allowed to happen.	Comments noted. The Local Plan has a strong emphasis on promoting the health and wellbeing of communities. This includes an Amenity Policy which seeks to protect residential amenity. The Council is satisfied that policies in the Local Plan are sufficient to address this issue.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 111, section 7.17 In the Misterton Ward (off the Grange estate, Misterton), the District Council owns a pocket of land, which has been designated in the village's Neighbourhood Plan for housing. Bassetlaw DC should proceed at pace to develop such land with affordable housing, replacing that lost in the 'Right to Buy' scheme. Page 112, Policy 32 The Parish Council supports the view that housing must of the right mix, type, and density to sit comfortably within rural communities. Recent rural development has seen too many 4/5-bed dwellings, which are beyond the financial reach of the 'next generation'. This means that young people have to leave the village to find affordable housing and, all too often, incomers (the only ones that can afford such dwellings) play no part in village life. This turns communities into 'dormitory villages'.	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Aimed at Councillors and relates to the provision of self build properties. This section of the market is now well established and usually promotes much better individual design over an estate of dwellings erected for the market. The bold statement at Part B of this policy that “The Council will support proposals for self build etc” has to be taken on board by Councillors. In a Planning Committee meeting approximately 2 years ago the majority of those Councillors present on that Committee stated, when considering a small development of 15 self build plots, that “self build does not generally produce dwellings, takes an eternity to build and finish off and appears to be a way round avoiding CIL”. If the Council state that they support self build, as the government has and have instructed them to do so, then Councillors have to support such a method of providing new homes. It should not be in a document and not put into practice when making decisions.	Comments noted.
REF181	Rural Solutions on behalf of Foljambe	States that “within the Large and Small Rural Settlements densities should reflect the character of the settlement and local housing needs, unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan”. It also requires an appropriate mix and type of market and affordable housing and specialist housing for older people. Note that the draft policy has changed since the January 2020 version of the Local Plan was issued for comment. In the previous version of this policy support was provided for new housing development which adequately addressed the housing needs of the District by making efficient use of land while respecting the character of the area and providing a mix of market and affordable housing and specialist housing for older people and disabled persons. The policy as it is worded now expects any needs to be met rather than providing support for meeting such needs. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update indicates that in 2015 21% of Bassetlaw residents were over 65, which is higher than the average for England. This is expected to rise by 43.1% over the plan period and of these, the population aged over 80 will rise significantly by over 83% (ONS 2019), one of the highest in the Housing Market Area. This indicates a demand for specialist accommodation, such as level access accommodation or accessible housing. It is our view that a developer should be incentivised through a carefully worded policy to meet local housing needs, where the profit margins may be lower. For example, to meet the needs of the elderly single storey accommodation may be beneficial to the District but they consume a larger area of land, at a substantial cost to the developer. The wording of Policy ST32 is unsound. We request that the policy wording is revised to provide more support again (as the January 2020 version of the Local Plan did) for proposals which meet identified local housing needs and that it is simply not a requirement of each proposal.	The Bassetlaw Local Plan Whole Plan Viability Assessment has tested the policy requirements and concludes that the requirement for adaptable specialist housing is the viable and deliverable option for the Local Plan. As such, no amendments are proposed to the policy.
REF195-Peaks Hill Farm	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management (Peaks Hill Farm)	Makes reference to “an appropriate mix of dwellings” identifies a requirement in para.1 for flexible internal layouts to meet changing needs over a lifetime and reduce fuel poverty. It is unclear how this will be implemented and what is required by this Policy. There would seem to be some conflict with Policy 33: Specialist Housing which requires specific provision for particular groups with specialist needs. Given the requirement for 20% of Market Housing to be designed to meet requirements for accessible and acceptable dwellings in Policy 33 (see further comments below) there is no need for repetition of this in Policy 32 sub paragraph.1. Further, the reference to fuel poverty is not understood or explained in the plan. In terms of sub-para. 4. To Policy 32 it is considered that identifying an appropriate mix and type of market and affordable dwellings will need to be established through evidence of need and market demand. Para. 4 should therefore be amended to reflect this and to ensure that the Policy is compliant with para. 11 of the NPPF in being adaptable to rapid change.	The policy is requiring developers to design properties that provide for the needs of occupiers over their lifetime. This approach accords with national policy and guidance – paragraph 127: ‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development’. More detail will be provided through an update to the Design SPD. Reference to reducing fuel poverty has been removed. Evidence of housing need has already been established by the Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has tested the policy requirements to ensure that they are deliverable. The Council is satisfied that the policy accords with the NPPF.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF099- Peaks Hill Farm	K Wallis, Trustees of H.S. Wallis	<p><i>These comments were made in reference to Policy ST27 "Housing Mix, Type and Density" in the January 2020 Draft Local Plan</i> 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. Draft Policy ST27 is yet another example of the disconnected approach. 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. 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.." 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>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>	The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy sufficiently addresses housing mix across the District. It provides a flexible approach to enable the Council to work with Developers on a case by case basis, whilst also providing an indication of housing mix requirements from evidence in the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020. The Local Plan provides the overarching strategic policy framework for development across the District, including the rural area. The Council encourages appropriate development within the rural area through the Local Plan, neighbourhood plans and other relevant channels.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	Policy ST32 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. Would instead recommend a policy which simply promotes self-building in larger developments, and also the role of custom and self-build homes as examples of limited forms of development that would be suitable in the countryside, as opposed to a percentage which may inhibit housing from coming forward.	National guidance on Self Build has been updated since Bolsover, and Mansfield's Local Plans were examined. There is now a strong emphasis on the need to deliver self-build plots. It now states (Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 57-025-20210508): 'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).' As such, no amendments are proposed to the policy.
REF198- Bevercotes Colliery	Gladman Developments promoting former Bevercotes Colliery site	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. 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. The second element Policy ST27 outlines the Council's proposed policy approach towards self and custom build housing. Gladman are broadly supportive of this policy area, it is recommended 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. Welcome the flexibility provided by this policy which recognises that plots which do not sell within 12 months of initial promotion, are able to be developed for housing other than self-build homes.	With regard to Neighbourhood Plans, there may be instances where a more localised approach would be appropriate, particularly regarding Conservation Areas. As such, no amendments are proposed to the policy. National guidance on Self Build has recently been updated. There is now a strong emphasis on the need to deliver self-build plots. It now states (Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 57-025-20210508): 'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).' No amendments proposed to the self-build element of the policy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF180 Trinity Farm	Fisher German on behalf of Avant Homes	<p>Criterion A3 of Policy 32 which seeks to ensure that new developments in the more sustainable locations achieve an appropriate density, in excess of 30 dwellings per hectare, is supported. This accords with Chapter 11 of the Framework, which seeks to ensure an effective use of development land. Criterion C of Policy 32 which seeks the delivery of 2% of the developable plots to be set aside for self-build and custom housebuilding is not however supported nor considered sound. It is well established that such criteria are largely unworkable on modern housing developments and do not serve to provide additional units. In reality, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without delivering the necessary housing units. Self-builders generally do not want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing estate. Our experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Yet to see evidence that this method of delivery has been successful. Just because individuals are registered on the self-build register does not mean that they will all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and 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. 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 more complex than suggested within the Policy. The Policy assumes such plots could simply just be built out by the developer; the nature of the plots may not however lend themselves to being built by the developer and as such 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. 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 across the Plan 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. 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>National guidance on Self Build has recently been updated. There is now a strong emphasis on the need to deliver self-build plots. It now states (Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 57-025-20210508): 'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).' As such, no amendments are proposed. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has recently been updated and now includes self build policy requirements.</p>
1671323	William Davis	<p>The approach to mix, density and type set out in Part A is broadly supported including the change to the wording in part 4 of the Policy. A pragmatic approach will need to be taken to reflect the likely post-Covid demand for larger houses with private garden space. However, the approach to Custom and Self Build set out in Part B is not supported. It is not considered necessary or practical to provide self-build on residential schemes. There are a number of practical issues related to the provision on market housing sites including health & safety, payment of developer contributions and phasing. Other similar policies (including that proposed by Mansfield District Council) 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>National guidance on Self Build has recently been updated. There is now a strong emphasis on the need to deliver self-build plots. It now states (Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 57-025-20210508): 'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).' As such, no amendments are proposed to the policy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>The Local Plan does not allocate land for growth in the Park Home Sector static caravan sector to meet the needs of the group in the community aspiring to live in a static caravan. This response focuses on the unmet needs of the group in the community aspiring to live in a static caravan on a competently run Park Home site and the unmet needs for allocated land of the developers wishing to provide for this group but the comments made apply equally to the unmet needs of that group in the community aspiring to live in a houseboat. The failure of the DBLP to allocate land to meet the needs of this group in the community denies fair and equal treatment to this group and should be rectified to make the Local Plan legal and sound. The Evidence base does not capture the needs of this group and is therefore incomplete. This incompleteness in the evidence base leads to policies that are discriminatory. Consequently, the Equality Impact Assessment is incorrect to state: i) that the DBLP has a positive impact in regard to Age and Socio-Economics and Human Rights (including the right not to be subject to unlawful discrimination and the right not to be overlooked in the advancement of freedom of opportunity) because despite clear government mandates to the contrary the DBLP does not increase housing choice for a group in the community that includes older people who aspire to a Park Home lifestyle and ii) that the evidence base underpinning the DBLP lacks significant gaps because neither the Council nor the SHMA-OAN 2017 captures the needs of this group in the community or the needs of developers who want to provide for its needs and iii) no action need be taken to put matters right in the DBLP having been alerted to an issue of discrimination by this response. B) Solutions to the Problem 1) The Council should supplement its Evidence Base by assessing the needs of the group in the community aspiring to living in a Park Home static caravan. The statement below in Subsection C offers both primary and secondary research data that the Council might use for this purpose without investing disproportionate resources. 2) Policy ST1 should be modified by adding new paragraph F as follows: f) No less than 60 pitches will be allocated for static caravan development 3) Policy ST2 should be similarly modified and include new sub -section F as follows: "F 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." 4) Policy ST16 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. 5) Policy 31 (Policy ST31 in Text) 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." 6) Policy 32 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." 7) Policy 33 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."</p> <p>8) Policy ST37 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 9 should be added as follows: "9 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</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy can sufficiently deliver the right type and mix of housing in Bassetlaw. It is based on robust evidence (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020). It provides a level of flexibility that will enable developers to work with the Council to determine a suitable mix of housing. It is not considered necessary to separately assess the need for Park Homes. The Local Plan contains sufficient policies to address the needs of static caravan sites should an application be submitted. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2020) assesses the need for market homes, affordable homes, and specialist homes. Park Homes is a type of housing product and would be covered by these categories. The approach taken supports all age groups, the HEDNA considers the needs of a range of households, including older and disabled people, families, single people, and younger people, taking into consideration the needs of people wanting to get on to the property ladder. It does not discriminate. Park homes are not considered to be a form of affordable housing as identified by the NPPF 2021.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>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." 9) Policy ST41 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;"10) Policy ST46 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." 11) Policies 50 and ST53 should be modified to prevent inappropriate development control of the layouts of Park Home static caravan site development proposals. Compliance by Park Home static caravan site operators with model standards published by central government and license conditions imposed by the Council sufficiently safeguard residential amenity inside Park Home static caravan sites. A new sub-section C (Policy 50) and D (policy ST53) should be added as follows: Policy 50: "C In the unique case of Park Home static caravan development proposals the Council will be satisfied that residential amenity inside the Park Home site itself is safeguarded if license conditions imposed by the Council state that the layout shall conform to model standards published by Central Government" Policy ST53: "D In the unique case of Park Home static caravan development proposals the Council will be satisfied that residential amenity inside the Park Home site itself is safeguarded if license conditions imposed by the Council state that the layout shall conform to model standards published by Central Government" 12) Policy ST56 and ST57 should be modified to safeguard pedestrians against inappropriate cyclist speeds on shared networks by modifying the text of subsection BI (Policy ST56) and B7(Policy ST57) as follows:</p> <p>Policy ST56: "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" Policy ST57: "B 7 Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot including measures to calm cycle speeds where these might otherwise endanger pedestrians" C) The Reasons the Problem Exists 1) 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. This duty is found in the Housing Act 1985 and the National Planning Policy Framework: refers to The Housing Act 1985 Section 2The Housing Act 1985 Section 2 imposes duties upon the Council which have recently been expanded by S 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. 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. b) Refers to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 Paragraph 60 and Paragraph 61. The SHM A-EON 2017 and the Local Plan fail to capture the needs of people aspiring to live in static caravans or on a houseboat despite the fact that the SHM A-OAN 2017 recognises that the former group exists and even recognises some of their key aspirations (for two bedroom accommodation and equity release from existing homes - 7.33 SHMA-OAN) and one of the characteristics of some sites offering the housing type (reservation for older people on some sites - 6.12 SH MA-OAN 2017). This shortcoming in the evidence is reflected in the 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). The group who find an answer to their housing aspirations in Park Home sites living in static caravans is typically made up of older people with the following life-style aspirations: 1) To down-size to a smaller more easily managed single storey dwelling and 2) Release equity from their homes to spend on retirement leisure activities and 3) To live in a mutually-supportive community of</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>people with the same lifestyle aspirations and 4) To live in a detached property with two bedrooms (occasionally more) so that relatives and friends can stay overnight and 5) To have access to a site manager/ care-taker and 6) To have a smaller more manageable garden 7) To have on-plot car parking. 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 SH MA-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 (SHMA -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 SHM A-OAN identifies as having a monetised or design-related or DIV 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 provided for in the Evidence Base but are not. Consequently, informed housing Policy in the DBLP 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 DBLP to do so. Therefore, the Local Plan should make provision for proportionate growth in the Static Caravan Sector and in the different Houseboat Sector. 2) Identifying the Group in the Community and its Needs SHMA-OAN 2017 - 9.1 asserts that it is a comprehensive and inclusive assessment of housing need that can inform policy: "This section sets out the draft conclusion of the SHMA-OAN. It addresses overall need for homes, the mix of homes needed - both market and affordable - and the needs of different groups within the population and needs evidence to inform policies regarding the types of homes delivered". But the SH MA -OAN 2017 update is not comprehensive and housing policy based on it will not provide fair and equal treatment for the group in the community aspiring to a Park Home static caravan or houseboat lifestyle. The SHMA-OAN 2017 hints in sections 6.12 and 7.33 that there is another group of people in the community in need of homes to meet its aspirations (elderly people wanting 2 bed accommodation that will permit both equity release and overnight stays by family and friends) and yet is completely silent about the needs of the group in the community aspiring to live in static caravans (or those other people aspiring to live in houseboats). For the Custom build housing aspirants the SHM A-OAN 2017 at least suggests that windfall sites should meet the need; but the Park Home aspirant is not a self-</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>builder and the Park Home developer - who in our experience requires a site of accommodating at least 30 static caravans for the provision of essential care-taker services to be viable - will not serve the market on the basis of windfall sites accommodating less than 30 static caravans. Reliance on windfall is of course to abdicate control of outcomes. Instead of doing nothing or hoping that windfalls will solve the problem, the Council should formulate a positive and inclusive policy that captures the needs of groups in the community that are readily identifiable such as the group in question by making specific land allocation. Inevitably, therefore, as it currently stands, informed solely by the SHMA-OAN 2017, DBLP housing policy discriminates against an easily identified group in the community that aspires to live in a static caravan and this defect if carried forward would make the Local Plan illegal and unsound. The Council should therefore supplement its evidence base and make its own assessment of the needs of this group in the community. Some secondary evidence is readily available and primary evidence is also available with minimal investment of resources - to avoid violating PPG advice quoted as Paragraph 14 of PPG (2a-014) in SHMA-OAN 2017 5.2. The findings below are easily and quickly available to the researcher and are offered to the Council. i) National statistics reveal the existence and size of the group in the community who currently live in static caravans in Bassetlaw. The Council need undertake no primary research to identify the group. Table QS402EW Accommodation Type - Households on the Nomis Website contains the following information about this group across the SHMA in February 2020:</p> <p>Bassetlaw DC has 183 static caravans within 47,667 units of accommodation = 0.384% of the total (NB- using Council Tax data Table 10 of the SHM A-OAN 2017 identifies 51637 dwellings in the District) NED has 193 static caravans within 43,070 units of accommodation= 0.45% of the total Chesterfield BC has 93 static caravans within 46,796 units of accommodation = 0.198% of the total Bolsover DC has 28 static caravans within 32,801 units of accommodation = 0.08% of the total England has 80,964 static caravans within 22,063,368 units of accommodation= 0.367% of the total England and Wales have 84,966 static caravans within 23,366,044 units of accommodation = 0.363% of the total. These statistics indicate that the District includes an averaged sized group in the community of people living in static caravans.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>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 SHMA-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. ii) Primary Market Research. Some primary research is offered below to indicate the low investment in resource required to understand the facts about the Park Home sector in Bassetlaw. The following was ascertained in a 30 minute web-search of 2 bedroom detached single storey dwellings for sale in Bassetlaw on 17th February 2020. The search findings are below: Two Bedroom Detached Bungalows - £210 to £350K: 17 properties for sale Av. Price: £248,500 Two Bed Detached Park Home - £200K - 1 property for sale Av. Price £200K Two Bedroom Detached Bungalows - £130K to £200K: 12 properties for sale Av. Price : £171K Two Bedroom Park Homes - £63,350 - £125,995 : 7 Properties for Sale Av. Price: £92K (NB Average sale price of two bedroomed bungalows in Bassetlaw on 17th February 2020 over the 29 properties for sale is £145,743 which is far higher than the average £73000 sales price for cheaper two bedroomed property in Bassetlaw cited in Table 53 p.59 of the SHMA-OAN 2017. Assuming the ordinary operation of market forces demand for single storey two bedroom traditional bungalows self-evidently far outstrips supply.) Clearly for a person wishing to: 1) Sell a property at the average sales price of £135K (2016 as identified in the SHMA-OAN 2017) and release equity to enjoy extra money in retirement and 2) Live in single storey detached accommodation (Impossible in a two-bedroomed bungalow selling at the average price found on 17th February 2020 of £145,753 but certainly possible in a static caravan selling at an average price of £92K) and 3) Own a property with two bedrooms so that a couple can either sleep in separate bedrooms or entertain an overnight visitor and 4) Enjoy the "extra care" benefits of a mutually supportive community cited by BHHPA the bungalow option is ineffective because there is not only no equity release but a need to find extra money to complete the purchase. On the contrary, the Park Home option is much more attractive. On average there would have been £46K of equity release on 17th February 2020. 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. 3) The Need of Park Home Static Caravan Site Developers for Allocated Land in the Bassetlaw Local Plan It is common knowledge amongst the Park Home Sector that developers of the type cannot compete in the market for land with developers of traditional homes. In its response dated 19th February 2015 to the National Planning Policy consultation on affordable housing definitions the British Holiday and Home Parks Association Ltd (BHHPA) stated that "Our members are rarely able to compete with mainstream housing developers for sites designated for housing within local plans" The message is clear. Land should be allocated for Park Home development in the Local Plan to guarantee fair and equal treatment to this group in the community and the developers seeking to serve their needs. Unless land is allocated for Park Home development in Local Plans any increase in numbers within the sector is limited to those few</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy can sufficiently deliver the right type and mix of housing in Bassetlaw. It is based on robust evidence (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020). It provides a level of flexibility that will enable developers to work with the Council to determine a suitable mix of housing. It is not considered necessary to separately assess the need for Park Homes. The Local Plan contains sufficient policies to address the needs of static caravan sites should an application be submitted. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2020) assesses the need for market homes, affordable homes, and specialist homes. Park Homes is a type of housing product and would be covered by these categories. The approach taken supports all age groups, the HEDNA considers the needs of a range of households, including older and disabled people, families, single people, and younger people, taking into consideration the needs of people wanting to get on to the property ladder. It does not discriminate. Park homes are not considered to be a form of affordable housing as identified by the NPPF 2021.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>extra dwellings for which space within existing licensed sites can be found (if any!) and this unacceptably restricts customer choice of location and limits competition in the sector. The BHHPA submission sought breadth in the definition of affordable housing and this is a justifiable position; if the measure of affordability is whether the market frustrates satisfaction it can do this by imbalance in supply and demand in a number of ways; the group in question too commonly finds no provision for growth in this sector in Local Plans and therefore finds its choice progressively restricted by inadequate quantity of product. Far from recognising Park Homes as a form of affordable housing to be recorded and assessed and welcomed and supported and provided for the SHMA-OAN 2017 at 6.12 even goes so far as to urge caution in the interpretation of data related to assessment of the need for affordable homes in case such data captures information about single bedroom Park Homes! Far from this cautious aversion even to recording the housing type is Rt Hon Grant Shapps' written ministerial statement (cited in the BHHPA response) that "The Government 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, semi-rural and seaside locations". The BHHPA response cites another often overlooked benefit of the Park Home model viz. its value as low cost extra-care housing which the SHMA-OAN 2017 does indeed overlook: "(Park Home static caravans provide) affordable low cost market housing for older people in a caring and mutually supportive environment without making demands on local authority funding"(BHHPA response 2015). Again, the importance of meeting the needs of this group in the community alongside those of all other groups is expressly recognised in the ruling in Kings Lynn and West Norfolk vs SSCLG Elm Park Holdings Limited cited in SHMA-OAN 2017 at 5.40 p. 65 " ..the needs for types and tenures of housing should be addressed. That includes the assessment of the need for affordable housing as well as different forms of housing required to meet the needs of all parts of the community" (our emphasis) . SHMA-OAN 2017 at 6.12 recognises the existence of the sector in question but does not analyse its needs or make recommendations: "It should be noted that some caution should be exercised when considering the one-bedroom figures due to relatively small number of homes for sale and also potential inclusion of park homes and retirement properties that may not be available to all cohorts of the population (i.e. there may be age restrictions)" Consequently SHMA-OAN 2017 is incomplete as a basis for housing policy in the Local Plan and exclusive reliance placed upon it by housing policy makers renders the DBLP illegal and unsound. The principal reason that Park Home static caravans occupy such a small place in the national housing stock is a lack of allocated land set aside for it. When the sale prices of 2 bed bungalows and 2 bed Park Homes in Bassetlaw as recorded on 17th February 2020 and cited above are compared: £145,743 for the 2 bed detached bungalows (x 80% = £116,594) and £92000 for 2 bed detached Park Home static caravans (well below 20% lower in price) the reason why the sector needs the Council to step in to help is patently clear! Park Home static caravan site developers need the Council to intervene in the housing market by allocating land for their product to enable them to meet the needs of this group in the community. Without such provision, the DBLP is unsound and illegal. Attachment - Copy of BHHPA Response to National Planning Policy Consultation 19-02-2015 The British Holiday & Home Parks Association is the national trade body representing developers and operators of holiday, caravan and chalet parks and residential home parks in the UK. The residential park homes' sector accounts for around 85,000 units of residential accommodation (around 150,000 residents) in England on 2,000 residential home parks¹, sometimes known as 'Park Home Estates' or 'Mobile Home Parks'. BH&HPA members own and manage over 46,000 pitches for residential park homes in England. Residential mobile homes, more commonly referred to as park homes today, conform to the lawful definition of a caravan from the 1960 and 1968 Caravan Acts. They provide high quality sustainable homes, similar to bungalows, but at a much lower cost and market price. In providing single storey detached two bedroom homes with small manageable gardens at a low cost, they are popular with older people seeking to downsize and release capital from the sale of their former homes to provide a pension. A brief description of the sector is attached (appendix A). Park homes are therefore important in releasing larger houses for families, which in turn releases smaller starter homes. As such, our members are major users of the planning system in attempting to bring forward sustainable development for affordable low cost homes in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. However. they are severely thwarted in this purpose by local</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>planning policies and local interpretation of national planning policy. In particular, few local planning authorities recognise park homes as meeting the definition of affordable housing. 4. The Association therefore welcomes the Government's proposal to broaden the definition of affordable housing, provided it is clear that the definition extends to park homes. Park Homes as affordable and extra care housing for older people. In a Written Ministerial Statement, 14 July 2010, the then Minister for Housing and Local Government (The Rt Hon Grant Shapps) stated: "The Government 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, semi-rural and seaside locations." Minister's words "an affordable alternative to mainstream housing" make it clear that government sees park homes as lower cost dwellings with a valuable role within the nation's housing provision. Whilst much profile is given to the provision of affordable housing, the role of the park homes sector in providing such accommodation is too frequently overlooked. The current planning definition of affordable means that many local planning authorities fail to recognise the benefits that park home communities can deliver in providing affordable low cost market housing for older people in a caring and mutually supportive environment without making demands on local authority funding. For example, in an analysis undertaken in 2012 to inform a Site Allocations Development Plan Examination in Berkshire, evidence was given that a two bed park homes at a large popular home park were being let for an average £875 per month whilst the letting price of a two bed bungalow outside the park was £1,140. Two or three bed park homes for sale at the same park were available for between £178,950 and £290,000. Two to three bedroom home in the same (edge of town) area with a garden and garage were on the market for £300,000 to £650,000. It is clear that park homes are significantly cheaper than comparable bricks-and-mortar properties providing a garage and plot large enough for a proper garden in the same area. As single storey Park homes are able to provide most residents, if they so desire, with a home for the remainder of their life, regardless of the changes in their care needs. This can save social services departments the cost of housing elderly people in care homes until much later in their lives, if at all. Planning difficulty. As park homes do not meet the current planning definition of affordable housing, BH&HPA members find it extremely difficult to provide additional park homes to meet the demand from mainly older people for this type of accommodation. Our members are rarely able to compete with mainstream housing developers for sites designated for housing within local plans, as the low cost and low market price of the park home product, means that profit margins are lower and the price that can be offered for the land to secure a viable development fall below that that can be offered by the housing developer. This means that park home sites are traditionally found at the edge of settlements where the low intensity single storey nature provides an acceptable transition between town and country; benefiting from access to urban facilities, but within a generally peaceful rural environment. However, this means that existing park home sites, and any surrounding land to extend them onto, are almost always excluded from the settlement boundary and designated as being within the countryside (and Green Belt, if applicable), irrespective of the size of the existing residential community. This maybe for good planning reasons - to protect the park home estate from redevelopment for housing, however, it is a cause of major frustration that any application for new park homes is then treated as unsustainable development in the countryside, even though the council has implicitly accepted that park homes are already acceptable in the same location by excluding them from the settlement boundary! In rare cases where park home developers are able to obtain planning permission in principle, they are required to give away a large proportion of homes as 'affordable' homes within the planning definition which further undermines the viability of the park home proposal versus the bricks-and-mortar housing developer. It is a further source of frustration among our members that in providing affordable low-cost market housing, they are then asked to provide a proportion of that as affordable rented or shared ownership to a housing association. Even if they could bring such a scheme viably to the table, it is then almost impossible to persuade a housing association to take the homes, as the tenure and style of home does not fit with their normal business criteria. Responses to consultation questions. Q1. Do you have any comments or suggestions about the proposal to amend the definition of affordable housing in national planning policy to include a wider range of low cost homes? The Association notes that in paragraph 6 of the consultation that 'National planning policy requires local planning authorities to plan proactively to meet all housing needs in the area'. It is therefore frustrating to our members that their attempts to meet the needs of older people preferring park homes are resisted.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>Our members have not come across any councils which actively plan for this type of accommodation, by designating sites specifically for new park home development. Many council planning policies actively resist any new park homes. Paragraph 6 states that the current definition of affordable housing (set out in Annex 2 to the National Planning Policy Framework) provides for 'eligible households whose needs are not met in the market'. Would argue that the current definition of affordable housing, combined with the way park homes are treated by the planning system (see 'The Planning Difficulty' above) prevents the market from addressing the needs of older households seeking affordable low cost single storey park homes. Agree with the statement in paragraph 7 that 'It is important that the definition of affordable housing for planning purposes supports present and future innovation by housing providers in meeting the needs of a wide range of households who are unable to access market housing'. Park homes are a long-standing innovation that has evolved to provide a very high standard of sustainable living accommodation, meeting or exceeding modern standards for new sustainable homes, that is proven as extremely attractive to older people seeking to downsize and relocate from larger more urban accommodation but who cannot afford normal bricks-and-mortar bungalows at the edge of our towns and cities. The Association also agrees with the statement in paragraph 8 that the current affordable housing definition limits the current availability of home ownership options for households whose needs are not met by the market, with park homes being a case in point. Production methods for the construction of caravans means that park homes are much more affordable than equivalent bricks-and-mortar bungalows; however, as most councils consider that they fall outside the current definition of affordable housing, they are prevented from achieving planning permission. As such the definition limits the ability of the market to address the needs of older people looking for affordable home ownership to live out the rest of their lives. By their nature, park homes remain as affordable low cost homes 'in perpetuity'. However, they are rarely accepted as affordable by most local planning authorities because they are available in the open market and are not restricted to 'eligible households' on the council waiting list. Nevertheless, the most common purchaser of a park home is a retired couple whose children have left home, selling to downsize into a park home in order to release some capital for a pension. In paragraph 9, the Government states that 'We propose to amend the national planning policy definition of affordable housing so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership'. We would argue that this aspiration should be amended to include a fuller range of products that can support people to access 'and retain' home ownership. Again, at the end of this paragraph it is stated that the Government 'propose to make clearer in policy the requirement to plan for the housing needs of those who aspire to home ownership. Request that 'or who wish to live independently in their own homes for as long as possible' should be added to this sentence. Paragraph 9 also states that it is proposed that the (amended) definition of affordable housing should 'include products that are analogous to low cost market housing or intermediate rent, such as discount market sales or innovative rent to buy housing'. Urge the Government to add 'or caravan based residential mobile homes' to this sentence. Agree that these products should not be subject to in perpetuity restrictions or recycled subsidy; as we have explained, park homes remain affordable low cost market homes in perpetuity by their very nature, so such formal restrictions are unnecessary to retain this product in meeting the needs of older people seeking low-cost home ownership. The Association supports the Government's proposals to improve the delivery of starter homes set out in paragraphs 10 and 11. However, our members urge the Government to recognise in these paragraphs the importance of promoting affordable low cost homes for older people as these park homes generally free-up existing family homes for new families which in turn free-up existing starter homes. In adapting the proposed definition for starter homes in the Planning and Housing Bill to affordable low-cost homes for older people, it would obviously be necessary to switch the age restriction to new homes (park homes as caravans do not meet the legal definition of a 'dwelling') for people over 50 years of age. Our members would have no difficulty in meeting a requirement to sell their homes for at least 20% less than the market value of equivalent bricks and-mortar bungalows, or similar sized homes, in the area. It is likely that the park home market would be even lower than this. Do you consider that national planning policy should set out that local planning authorities should put in place a specific positive local policy for assessing applications for development on small sites not allocated in the Local Plan? support the Government's proposal that local planning authorities should put in place a specific positive local policy for assessing applications for development on small sites not allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>Many of our members submit applications for small infill proposals to site one or two park homes on the site of under-used garages, former maintenance yards, or otherwise under-used land within their existing park boundaries. However, these application are often refused as the proposed homes are simply considered unacceptable as the constitute development in the countryside, even though they are within an existing residential home park estate.</p>	
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>Q17. Should rural exception sites be used to deliver starter homes in rural areas? If so, should local planning authorities have the flexibility to require local connection tests? 30. We have no specific comment to make on whether rural exception sites should be used to deliver starter homes in rural areas. However, our members feel extremely strongly that there should be specific national planning policy to support the provision of park homes as an exception to normal countryside policies in sustainable locations adjacent or close to sustainab le settlement boundaries . 31. As we have said, most existing park home estates are already located in sustainable locations adjacent or close to settlement boundaries but are prevented from expansion to meet demand due to being excluded from the boundaries for such settlements. If they were included within the settlement boundary, then there would be a danger that the park home site could come under pressure to be redeveloped for housing. Therefore, the only way to develop additional park homes to address the demand for low cost single storey housing for older people is by acknowledging them as a form of affordable housing and allowing them as an exception to normal coun tryside constraint policies. 32. Our members would not be adverse to a local connection test in such circumstances, provided it allowed for new residents to relocate from within the same or adjoining Districts (there are oft en few opportunities to acquire park homes) and allowed for older residents from outside this area to move into the area to be closer to a younger relative who can assist with their care in older age. However , controls on subsequent sales by park home owners would be impracticable given the law gives complete freedom to private owners to sell their home on the open market, wiU1out the involvement of the park owner. Q19. Should local communities have the opportunity to allocate sites for small scale Starter Home developments in their Green Belt through neighbourhood plans? 33. We have no specific comment to make on whether local communities should have the opportunity to allocate small scale Starter Home developments in the Green Belt through neighbourhood plans. However, we consider that a similar opportunity should be extended to proposals for small scale extensions to existing residential home parks in sustainable locations within the Green Belt. Our members have found that many local communities are supportive of small scale extensions to their parks to provide additiona l homes for older people, even though the ma in planning author ity have felt unable to support the proposal as it lies in the Green Belt, just like the existing home park site. Q20 . Should planning policy be amended to allow redevelopment of brownfield sites for starter homes through a more flexible approach to assessing the impact on openness? 34. We have no specific comment to make on whether policy should be amended to allow the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the Green Belt for starter homes. However, our membelis feel a similar opportunity should be extended to proposa ls for the redevelopment of brownf ield sites in the Green Belt for residential park homes in sustainable locations. 35. Often, single-storey park homes may be a more appropriate alternative in the Green Belt countryside (where many park homes are already located and therefore accepted within a</p>	<p>The affordable housing will now contains a section of exceptions sites which includes first homes exceptions sites for first time buyers. The NPPF 202 does not identify Park Homes as an affordable housing product.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
		<p>Green Belt designation) compared to more 'urban' two-storey starter homes. The rural locati on may also be more popular with older people who are no longer at work, than with younger people seeking the jobs and night-life that come with urban living.</p> <p>36. We do not have any further comments to make in relation to other questions in the consultatio n although we sincerely hope that BH&HPA's representations will be taken into account. Pleas e contact us if we can provide additional information; further, we would be pleased to arrange a visit to a residential park if this would be useful to the Department. APPEDNIX A- Residential home parks- affordable homes for older people 37. Around 250,000 people in Britain choose to live in residential park homes, according to Government figures. Government research also shows that the demand for this popular form of housing outstrips supply, and that local authorities tend to overlook the importance of this sector as a provider of low cost, high quality accommodation . Park homes account for around 85 ,0 00 units of residential accommoda tion in England on around 2,000 residential home parks2. 38. Park homes are built to a British Standard (B83632) . This is now a very high standard with good insulation and low maintenance requirements. 39. Prices often compare extremely favourably with nearby bricks-and-mortar properties, normal ly half the price of an equivalent detached or semi-detached bungalow in the same market area. Accordi ngly, park homes have become very popular with the elderly and early retired who can release the capital from their existing bricks-and-mortar homes (freeing these for younger , larger families) to invest in a pension. 40. Moreover, these safe and friendly communities, where neighbours, and indeed park owners, look out for each other, allow older residents to stay in their homes longer relieving hard-pressed social services. Park homes are also attractive to key workers' families who cannot afford fa mily sized homes in an area, but would prefer to live in a compact dwelling with a small garden ar ea, rather than a flat. 41. Residential parks are largely located in attractive rural areas, and susta in closely bonded and mutually supportive communities - where residents can enjoy independence without the need of support from public funds. In order to meet growing demand for this quality affordab le housing, the sector needs to be allowed to expand existing parks, and to create new residential park developments. SEE ATTACHED PHOTOS 42. Park homes are a unique form of housing tenure, recognised under dedicated legislation.</p> <p>Residential parks provide pitches for park homes, the main residence of their owners (who rent their pitch from the park). They have security of tenure (under the Mobile Homes Act 1983 (as amended) . Park homes are caravans as defined and regulated through the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960, the Caravan Sites Act 1968. Local authorities, usually environm ental health departments, issue residential parks with caravan site licences, with conditions ; the site licenceis written having regard to Model Standards issued by the Secretary of State.</p>	
REF170	A&D Architecture	<p>6) Policy 32 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 ."</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy can sufficiently deliver the right type and mix of housing in Bassetlaw. It is based on robust evidence (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020). It provides a level of flexibility that will enable developers to work with the Council to determine a suitable mix of housing. It is not considered necessary to separately assess the need for Park Homes. The Local Plan contains sufficient policies to address the needs of static caravan sites should an application be submitted. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2020) assesses the need for market homes, affordable homes, and specialist homes. Park Homes is a type of housing product and would be covered by these categories. The approach taken supports all age groups, the HEDNA considers the needs of a range of households, including older and disabled people, families, single people, and younger people, taking into consideration the needs of people wanting to get on to the property ladder. It does not</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST32 - HOUSING MIX, TYPE AND DENSITY			
			discriminate. Park homes are not considered to be a form of affordable housing as identified by the NPPF 2021.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 33 - SPECIALIST HOUSING			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 115, Policy 33 Spread specialist housing through the District so that older people can (where they wish to) retain local connections.	The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of specialist housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. But delivering specialist housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. The Council and its partners will need to continue to identify other mechanisms for delivering specialist housing. The Viability Assessments states that specialist housing to higher Building Regulations standards can only be achieved on sites of 50 or more units. There are fewer opportunities to deliver larger sites in rural areas due to the need to ensure development reflects local character. The Council's Housing Strategy team work in partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council's Social Care department and with Bassetlaw CCG to assess the need for older and disabled people's housing. They have produced a Housing Strategy which identifies how the Council will deliver this type of housing.
REF060	Notts County Council	Parking should be provided in accordance with current residential parking guidance unless it can be evidenced that the needs of residents would justify an alternative level of provision.	Policy ST37 ensures that all new development is designed to incorporate the relevant aspects of the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards.
REF128 (Comments also made under reference number 1669799) - Pictures attached	Resident	Previously commented on Planning Application 17/00152/NMA for houses to be built on Harworth pit site to be known as Simpson Park. Those comments were not taken on board if indeed they were even considered. The housing development is of massive proportions & will have a big impact on our existing village/town but it would appear that there is little regard given by the developers & planners to what the people of Harworth & Bircotes really need as has been happening consistently over previous years. Several years ago I attended a presentation in the parish hall at which plans for around 1000 houses on the old pit site were unveiled. Of those 1000 or so houses there was not one single bungalow on the plans. This was pointed out at the time by myself & several other people to the people giving the presentation, Harworth Estates & Bassetlaw District Council probably, but there was no perceived uptake of the point at the time. Eight years on this development is now in progress with a proposed 996 houses to be built. There are no bungalows built to date & from enquiries that I have made it would appear there are still no proposals to include bungalows in the remaining number. The development off Bawtry road has several hundred houses to be built but no bungalows to date & none planned. There is a real shortage of bungalows in the village/town for the elderly & the infirm residents, both council & private. Others, of which I am one, would like to move into a bungalow before I fall into either one or both of the above categories. But I don't want to be cramped in a small 2 bedroom one, I want one that reflects my needs, space & no stairs. There are of course those people who would simply prefer to live in a bungalow anyway, given the choice & availability. As these new estates are being built the ratio of bungalows to houses in Harworth is gradually reducing from an already low number & at the same time the number of the elderly & infirm is increasing. This is obviously reducing availability & choice to the ever	The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of specialist housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Viability Assessments states that specialist housing to higher Building Regulations standards can only be achieved on sites of 50 or more units. The Local Plan cannot require bungalows to be built in Harworth and Bircotes because there is no evidence to support this approach. But delivering specialist housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. Developers are also asked to consult with the public on larger scale proposals prior to submitting a planning application. This provides an opportunity for the community to engage with developers on design and housing need/mix. Where there is a Neighbourhood Plan in place, Neighbourhood Plan groups can also negotiate with developers regarding housing mix for a particular site if there is a site allocation policy in the Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 33 - SPECIALIST HOUSING			
		<p>increasing population. point 3.23 states that effectively Harworth & Bircotes will double in size over the coming years. It is therefore obvious that the number of available bungalows per head of population will half. What kind of council allows that? Bassetlaw does! Have some very good small bungalows for pensioners in the village/town but they are in very short supply. With regard to private bungalows they are also very few & far between & as far as I am aware there are no plans to build any. Surely out of 996 properties there ought to be a sensible & fair mixture of housing to suit all ages & needs not just 3 & 4 bedroomed houses because they generate maximum payback for the developers. In my opinion the village/town is in desperate need for 2 & 3 (or even 4) bedroomed bungalows & both the town & district councils have an obligation on behalf of residents to insist on a good mix of quality properties to be built that reflects the needs of the community & so far they have failed miserably in that obligation. Apparently, by law, developers must provide a percentage of social housing but what about the elderly & infirm who struggle with or cannot manage stairs? The people of Harworth & Bircotes have been badly let down by Bassetlaw council with their total lack of foresight with planning applications regardless of all their statements in previous Neighbourhood plans, see attachments, & the current proposed plan. Tommy Simpson, local hero & legend would be 83 years old today had he lived. With all the pulverising & punishing work his legs & body had done I doubt he would be able to manage stairs now & would probably be looking to purchase a nice, spacious, quality bungalow on the development bearing his name. Wouldn't he be so disappointed? If Bassetlaw keeps making all the right noises about providing housing to meet the needs of the community perhaps one day they may listen & do exactly what they say & insist that developers build a certain percentage of good quality bungalows, of varying sizes, as a condition of planning being granted. The same applies to any future housing that Bassetlaw plans to undertake for themselves. Please stop this downward spiral of ever decreasing availability of bungalows that are drastically needed to meet the needs of our community.</p>	
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	<p>Para 7.18, Specialist Housing, Page 113. Whilst the Policy is supported it is somewhat of a surprise that in 16 years time most (58%) of the population of Bassetlaw will be over 65 and require some sort of specialist provision. That appears to give the sense that Bassetlaw cannot hold on to its young and middle-aged people who will leave the District before retirement. A disappointment. Page 155, Para D, Residential Care Homes. It has to be noted that provision of these homes that are able to maintain this policy will be out of the reach of most Small Rural settlements as they do not have the infrastructure required in this policy.</p>	<p>Table 9 on page 18 of Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) indicates that, by 2037, 29% of the population will be over 65. Not all people over 65 will require specialist provision. This broadly aligns with Nottinghamshire and the East Midlands. The policy supports care homes in appropriate locations. Developers are required to demonstrate that care homes can be accommodated in proposed locations. This will involve working with Bassetlaw CCG and Nottinghamshire County Council's social care department to ensure proposals are acceptable.</p>
REF197	Resident	<p>the text says that "47% of Bassetlaw people (12,000) will be aged 65+" – is this correct?</p>	<p>Table 9 on page 18 of Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020) indicates that, by 2037, 29% of Bassetlaw district's population will be over 65. This equates to 35,713 people.</p>
1669799	Resident	<p>(7.18.4) What is (Part M4 (2)? Bungalows are mentioned but Bassetlaw certainly hasn't ensured they were provided with new developments so I can only assume there are numerous get out clauses to enable them to get round that in Harworth & Bircotes. (7.18.6) Where does Harworth & Bircotes fall in relation to Policy ST33 of Part M4 (2)? I have no doubt this can be a complex & complicated issue but surely the lack of bungalow built on new developments should have been ringing alarm bells somewhere, but not Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>Part M4(2) is an optional building regulation requirement that can only be imposed through a planning condition linked to an evidenced policy in an up to date Local Plan. Unfortunately the development in Harworth & Bircotes has been consented under the Bassetlaw Core Strategy which does not contain the up to date policies that allow this condition to be sought. On adoption of the Local Plan dwellings within larger sites should be built to a higher accessibility standard so that buildings can be accessed more easily i.e. level floor or ramp access. Internal layouts should also enable ease of movement. Full details can be found on the Government's website: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/access-to-and-use-of-buildings-approved-document-m</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 33 - SPECIALIST HOUSING			
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 115, Policy 33 Spread specialist housing through the District so that older people can (where they wish to) retain local connections.	The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of specialist housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. But delivering specialist housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. The Council and its partners will need to continue to identify other mechanisms for delivering specialist housing. The Viability Assessments states that specialist housing to higher Building Regulations standards can only be achieved on sites of 50 or more units. There are fewer opportunities to deliver larger sites in rural areas due to the need to ensure development reflects local character. The Council's Housing Strategy team work in partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council's Social Care department and with Bassetlaw CCG to assess the need for older and disabled people's housing. They have produced a Housing Strategy which identifies how the Council will deliver this type of housing.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	The provision of many more senior citizen dwellings in various forms has to be encouraged. The population is getting older. This aging population now has very different desires and requirements. Many people no longer retire at 60 or 65, some retire earlier, others carry on working. Senior citizens no longer sit at home in a rocking chair drinking tea, many are very active partaking in many forms of exercise, social activities, they involve themselves in the community with many actually leading the way. They need to have the accommodation fitting to such an active senior group. There is a misunderstanding that seniors rely more than younger people on services etc. Senior citizens do not pop to the shops every day, they do not do the school run and many do not go to work although many still work mostly locally or from home. They tend to make better use of home deliveries for their every day requirements, food, library books, medication etc and, as such, the location of this form of housing should be somewhat more relaxed with rural sites being made available. It is often the case that people at retirement age who live in a village and have done so for much of their lives have to vacate their home and seek single storey dwellings within a town or large village and thus leave their community. The provision in most of our village of some single storey accommodation would allow many to vacate the family home and continue to live in the village. This has the knock-on effect of providing younger families with accommodation in these villages at an affordable rate. We would not have to build as many new family homes in these villages or elsewhere. It would also have the major benefit of keeping communities together and once again aid wellbeing amongst the community and its occupants in general. This is something that our local authorities used to back in the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s and there is clear evidence of Council bungalows in most of our villages, both large and small. A return to this form of rural development with a cap placed on land values such that a landowner could see a reasonable return on his unwanted parcel of land and with developers providing dwellings that have been designed and built to certain standards and values would achieve viable rural housing. The Council again may be able to partnership such schemes.	The Local Plan is seeking the maximum amount of specialist housing possible based on the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Viability Assessments states that specialist housing to higher Building Regulations standards can only be achieved on sites of 50 or more units. The Local Plan cannot require bungalows to be built because there is no evidence to support this approach. But delivering specialist housing is not the responsibility of the Local Plan alone. Developers are also asked to consult with the public on larger scale proposals prior to submitting a planning application. This provides an opportunity for the community to engage with developers on design and housing need/mix. Where there is a Neighbourhood Plan in place, Neighbourhood Plan groups can also negotiate with developers regarding housing mix for a particular site if there is a site allocation policy in the Neighbourhood Plan.
REF195- Peaks Hill Farm	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management (Peaks Hill Farm)	Broadly supported although concern is expressed that para. C. sets an inflexible minimum requirement of 20% of market housing being designed to meet requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings. There would appear to be no justification for the figure of 20% and greater flexibility is needed to ensure that the Policy is robust and adaptable to the circumstances at a particular point in time. Suggest that para. C is reworded to refer to the 20% figure as being a target with the actual figure to be determined at the time of planning applications and assessed on the need identified at that time.	The findings of the specialist housing needs assessment (on Page 115 of the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020)) indicate that the Council would be justified in seeking 100% of homes to be to M4(2) standards subject to viability. The 20% requirement is based on the findings of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. This policy is necessary to address the housing needs of the community.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 33 - SPECIALIST HOUSING			
REF198	Gladman Developments promoting former Bevercotes Colliery site	<p>Policy ST33 sets out policy requirements for specialist housing including the provision of a minimum of 20% of homes to meet M4(2) Building Regulations on development proposals of 50 or more dwellings.</p> <p>In principle, acknowledge the importance of delivering housing to assist in meeting the needs for older people and those with mobility issues. However, it is important that policies of this nature are formulated on robust evidence to ensure that they represent a justified response to the needs of residents over the plan period. The NPPF allows local authorities to make use of optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing, where this would address evidenced need. Eric Pickles' Written Ministerial Statement (2015) further highlighted that optional new national technical standards should only be required through Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need and where viability has been considered. While the Local Plan highlights the growing elderly population within the district in paragraphs 7.18.1 to 7.18.3, this does not solely justify the implementation of the proposed policy requirement. Further reference is given to the Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update, GL Hearn, 2020 which provides information relating to a projected increase in the number of people facing mobility issues by 2037. Yet this fails to account for the fact that existing homes can be modified to meet the needs of older and disabled people and that in many cases homes built to the mandatory M4(1) standard will appropriately meet their needs both now and in later life. While it is noted that a requirement for 20% M4(2) provision is the maximum that can be sought from a viable scheme and can only be sought from the market housing element of a proposal, it appears that the viability assessment has only tested viability against a 20% provision. This does not offer clearly evidenced need or viability. 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>	The Policy is based on robust evidence of housing need and delivery. The findings of the specialist housing needs assessment (on Page 115 of the Bassetlaw HEDNA (2020)) indicate that the Council would be justified in seeking 100% of homes to be to M4(2) standards subject to viability. The 20% requirement is based on the findings of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. This policy is necessary to address the housing needs of the community.
1671323	William Davis	It is noted that the response to our previous comments refers to the 'Local Housing Need Assessment 2020'. However, this document does not form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.	The response should have said 'Housing and Economic Needs Assessment'. Bassetlaw HEDNA forms an important part of the evidence base for Bassetlaw Local Plan.
REF170	A&D Architecture	7) Policy 33 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."	No amendment required. The Council is satisfied that the Housing Mix policy can sufficiently deliver the right type and mix of housing in Bassetlaw. It is based on robust evidence (Bassetlaw Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, 2020). It provides a level of flexibility that will enable developers to work with the Council to determine a suitable mix of housing. It is not considered necessary to separately assess the need for Park Homes or to identify sites for park homes. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2020) assesses the need for market homes, affordable homes, and specialist homes. Park Homes is a type of housing product and would be covered by these categories. The approach taken supports all age groups, the HEDNA considers the needs of a range of households, including older and disabled people, families, single people, and younger people, taking into consideration the needs of people wanting to get on to the property ladder. It does not discriminate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST34 - SITES FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS			
1647946	Resident	The provision of an additional 17 pitches (up to 34 caravans / semi permanent homes is unacceptable placing an unacceptable increase in traffic on Smeath Lane & Tiln Lane towards Retford. Potentially at least 60 cars in addition to commercial vehicles. It should also be recognized that accommodation on the existing site already exceeds the maximum number permitted by the existing planning permission and includes many non permitted residences including buses, narrow-boat and some semi permanent buildings. If detailed examination took place it may be seen that the existing accommodation on site already covers the number of pitches required in future over and above the numbers already permitted.	There is a need for 40pitches by 2037 to meet the needs of the gypsy and traveller community. Policy ST34 makes provision for new pitches to meet the identified need for the first 10 years of the plan (29 pitches). Any proposals would be extensions to an existing use. They would need to satisfy the criteria of the Policy in terms access to the highway network, and be will integrated and managed. Well-planned and designed sites that make effective use of previously developed land and/or that positively enhance the environment will be supported.
1666840	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	I note the comments relating to five additional pitches in Treswell. Although I do not support a further extension of the site I recognise the challenge of finding suitable new sites and can see the plans logic of increasing the number of pitches in established communities. Any further growth (above five) would be strongly opposed as the site would become too large in relation to the local villages (as per govt planning guidance).	Comments are noted.
REF213	Treswell with Cottam Parish Council	Policy ST34 sets out the need for sites for Gypsies and Travellers and identifies a site in Treswell for an additional 5 pitches. In September 2019 Treswell Park travellers' site increased its number of pitches to 22; that relates to 25% of homes in Treswell. From the site plan it would appear the site is full to capacity. Therefore, concerns were raised in relation to this further allocation in the village of Treswell- where are these 5 proposed pitches to be located?	Any proposals for increase in pitches would need to accord with the criteria set out in the Policy. Only well-planned and designed sites that make effective use of previously developed land and/or that positively enhance the environment will be supported.
REF214	Historic England	Policy ST34: Sites for Gypsies and Travellers - The reference to historic environment considerations in Section C-7 is welcomed.	Welcome support is noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 35 - HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	In general these do need to be strictly controlled through the Planning Approval Process, most HMO's are created by flouting such rules and laws. Whilst this policy appears specific to Town centres, there is a growing trend to convert the larger houses built many years ago in the Small Rural Settlements into either HMO's or Care Homes. This policy needs to be extended to cover such eventualities / applications.	Thank you for your comments. The Policy covers the whole of the District and ensures development is controlled as it requires developers to provide evidence of need in support of their application within the Local Plan area.
REF169	Resident	page 119 para A.3 Add provision for cycle storage; like other high-density accommodation, occupiers of HMOs are at least as likely to require this as car parking.	Criterion A1 3 ensures HMOs are supported by at least the minimum parking provision as required by the Nottinghamshire County Council Parking Standards. This includes appropriate cycle parking provision.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 36 – AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY WORKERS DWELLINGS			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 120, all paragraphs. It is welcomed that this section of Bassetlaw society should be protected, new dwellings should only be made where a) there is a need and b) it is an exception to the Local and Neighbourhood Plans. The release of existing properties should be offered to existing agricultural/forestry workers first. Must not be forced out of their homes.	Thank you for your comment. The Policy ensures that the provision of rural workers dwellings will only be supported where it is essential to meet the needs of an agricultural or forestry business.
REF194	P&DG on behalf of Woodward Schools (Nottinghamshire)	Policy 36's wording of "Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwelling" is restrictive in its title and should be amended to reflect a more comprehensive policy for "Development in the Countryside", similar to as tested on Examination in nearby Bolsover District only recently. The policy could include a more prescriptive set of circumstances in which development would be supported. For instance, the Bolsover Draft Local Plan, only adopted last year, 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; and • 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. Notwithstanding our view that site specific policies should be included in the Plan for the two Worksop College sites, the resulting policy would result in forming a much more concise and methodical policy relating to all development in the countryside. Furthermore, the policy would complement others in the plan that support the rural economy, tourism related development and the visitor economy which seeks to bring underused or neglected heritage assets back into economic use, furthermore it would be compliant with paragraph 83 of the NPPF.	The Council is satisfied that the approach taken in the Local Plan to planning in the rural area is comprehensive and addresses all of the rural planning issues appropriately.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 36 – AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY WORKERS DWELLINGS			
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	<p>In the previous stage of consultation, P&DG raised concerns with the wording of Policy ST31 “Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings” (now Policy 36), stating it is restrictive. We suggested amending the policy to “Development in the Countryside”, similar to the adopted policy in the Bolsover Local Plan, believing it would be a more comprehensive approach to development in rural Bassetlaw. Planning Policy Officer’s responded to this comment, stating that Policy ST2, ST11, ST12 and Policy 31 comprehensively address all matters relating to rural areas as identified by National Policy. P&DG disagree with this opinion. By merging Policy ST12 “Rural Economic Growth and Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas” and Policy 36 “Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwelling”, it would create a comprehensive, concise, and methodical policy relating to all development in the countryside, including those in the smallest settlements in the hierarchy. It would promote modest growth within the rural economy, allowing limited housing and improvements to the local tourist offer, as desired by other policies in the plan. Furthermore, the new combined Policy would complement ST13, particularly part E which relates to tourism related development which seeks to bring underused or neglected heritage assets back into economic use, furthermore it would be compliant with paragraph 83 of the NPPF. Ideally, Policy 36’s wording of “Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwelling” should be amended to reflect a more comprehensive policy for “Development in the Countryside”, as tested on Examination in nearby Bolsover District only recently. The policy could include a more prescriptive set of circumstances in which development would be supported. For instance, the Bolsover Draft Local Plan, only adopted last year, 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; and • 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. Notwithstanding our view that site specific policies should be included in the Plan for the Welbeck Estate, the resulting policy would result in forming a much more concise and methodical policy relating to all development in the countryside. Furthermore, the policy would complement others in the plan that support the rural economy, tourism related development and the visitor economy which seeks to bring underused or neglected heritage assets back into economic use, furthermore it would be compliant with paragraph 83 of the NPPF.</p>	The Agricultural and forestry workers dwellings policy is considered appropriate to address this issue.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST37 - DESIGN QUALITY			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 123, section 8 Misterton Parish Council supports the drive to high-quality design, which should reflect local character and use suitable materials.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF092	DHA Planning	Support the changes to Policy ST37 which overcome our previous concerns.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Have no faith in the District Council to preserve local character and distinctiveness. The District Council already have a Successful Places Supplementary Policy Document approved in 2013 with regard to design, plotsize and amenity space. In East Markham 5/6 bedroomed properties have been built on very small plots with amenity space much less than that outlined in Successful Places. Properties have also been allowed where living spaces are close to adjoining boundaries and overlooking adjoining residences. This has been repeatedly pointed out to BDC but they have still granted permissions. <i>The following was written in reference to the January 2020 DLP</i> East Markham Parish Council 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.</p>	Policy ST37 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 ST37.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST37 - DESIGN QUALITY			
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 124 – In general this is welcomed in as much as it protects the existing character and build of rural settlements. Page 125, Para 8, Accessibility – This has to be welcomed in a world where 58% of the population will be aged 65+ by 2037.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	Throughout the document, reference is made to ‘new housing developments being of high quality, well designed, energy efficient and respectful of the setting’ (4.11, ST2, D2). Have no issue with this statement as this is what should have always been expected of any development but, ‘well-designed’ and the accompanying 3 criteria can be very subjective. Could there be a situation where modern, energy efficient homes would not be of a similar style to the locality that could then prevent their development? Would like to think that significant weighting should be applied to the eco-credentials during the planning process.	Policy ST37 4 refers to the use of design to tackle climate change. Furthermore, 1d supports individual and innovative design which responds to the positive features if the local area. The appropriateness of each application, including energy efficient homes will be judged on their own merits at the planning application stage.
REF153	Natural England	Welcome this Policy particularly the section on the environment (4) which aims to maximise opportunities to incorporate measures which enhance the biodiversity value of development and help the natural environment adapt to a changing climate. The wording could also particularly reference the incorporation of green wall/roofs/water gardens within development designs. These measures are included in the National Design Guide, which we note has been referenced within the Plan. Integrated water management (as mentioned above) could also be incorporated into designs for greater climate resilience.	See revised policy which includes reference to green walls/roofs and integrated water management.
REF182	Anglian Water	Policy ST37 – Design Quality (page 124) - SUPPORT Policy ST37 as drafted cross refers to the water efficiency requirements outlined in Policy ST52 of the Local Plan and is therefore supported.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST37 - DESIGN QUALITY			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to develop a design guide policy that directs new development to build high quality housing that meets the need of the local area. There are number of key design aspects that should be covered to ensure that are appropriately incorporated into new development. Recommend that Policy ST37 incorporates statements to cover SuDS, the drainage hierarchy and water efficiency. SuDs Major developments are required to incorporate SuDS, to maximise the benefits of SuDS for the developments that they part of, they must be designed from an early stage within the development process and are design to deliver against the 4 principles of SuDS design, Water Quantity, Water Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity. Recommend that the some wording to the effect of: 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. 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 we appreciate that they have the main responsibility to advising the LPA on surface water / SuDS design considerations. Drainage Hierarchy The drainage hierarchy is outlined within planning practice guidance paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080-20150323). However, it is important that surface water is manage and disposed of sustainably back to the natural environment. By incorporating this into the design policy, it will be clearer to developers that these principles will need to be applied resulting in better site designs and layouts and preventing compromises or changes later. The following wording could be used to promote the use of 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. Water Efficiency Water is a vital resource need for life as such we really need to use it responsibly, by designing new development that is water efficient, we can minimise the impacts of new development on water consumption. This approach is more sustainable and will benefit both residents of existing and future properties. The impacts of climate change is likely to increase the scarcity of water and to mitigate these risks will need to start acting now. The use water efficient technology and design are both recommended within the Humber River Basin Catchment Management plan. We would recommend that wording to the effect of: "All development should be design in accordance with the optional water efficiency target of 110 l/p/d, as per Building Regulations Part G"</p>	Sustainable drainage is covered by the flood risk and drainage policy and water quality policy. Duty to Cooperate discussions with Severn Trent have confirmed that is considered appropriate to address this matter in the Local Plan.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>2. Architectural Quality and Materials The BREEAM /ecohomes criteria (2006 onwards) contain a long-standing section relating to Biodiversity and would expect measures to benefit biodiversity being automatically included in house building standards within the District. In particular, swift, house sparrow and bat boxes could be incorporated into new buildings, where appropriate. This has been achieved in the Barratts DWH development at Cotgrave, for instance, so this demonstrates it can be achieved elsewhere. Provisions for Hedgehog (gaps in fencing etc) and use of water from roofs etc should also be built into new schemes (the latter will of course help achieve the water saving targets. Please refer to BREEAM: the world's leading sustainability assessment method for masterplanning projects, infrastructure and buildings – BREEAM BCT's new book, called 'Designing for biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings' (RIBA Publishing 2013, 2nd edition) Proposed amendment: Include biodiversity elements to the housing standard.</p>	Policy ST37 4 d promotes the use of nationally recognised standards in accordance with Policy ST52. ST52 references BREEAM but no specific reference is provided for residential development. This is considered to provide flexibility over the plan period allowing the LPA to positively respond to changing government legislation and guidance.
REF214	Historic England	The requirements set out within this policy are welcomed in terms of the historic environment and associated placemaking links.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST37 - DESIGN QUALITY			
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 123, section 8 Support the drive to high-quality design, which should reflect local character and use suitable materials.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF058	Sport England	Reference to active Design to improve Design quality and healthy place making Supported.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	As indicated in paragraph 8.1.2 the National Design Guide expects good design to consider the qualities of the place not just the building. This principle needs considering greater when evaluating the worth of residential development next to a power station and in flood zones (Cottam) and next to our busiest trunk road and junction at Apleyhead. It should also be used in the evaluation of Bevercotes Colliery site which is a place that would lead to both good design and an exciting and innovative use of energy. The LPA should also be promoting their own design guides which can be more location specific rather than the broad parameters within Policy ST37 and the National Design Guide. Local Neighbourhood Plans can achieve so much more in this department if encouraged and helped to do so.	The National Model Design Code and future national planning policy is expected to require locally specific Design Codes that could provide further place specific guidance for new development. The Local Plan will support the use of design codes in the district, and will encourage neighbourhood planning groups to undertake design codes to inform their plans.
REF170	A&D Architecture	8) Policy ST37 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 9 should be added as follows: "9 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 ST37 applies equally to all forms of new development, and is suitably generic and flexible to ensure that proposals for a range of development including static caravan sites can be appropriately considered. 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 ST37.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 38 - SHOP FRONTS, SIGNAGE AND SECURITY			
REF214	Historic England	The requirements set out within this policy are welcomed in terms of the historic environment, enhancing the experience of the District's high streets and placemaking in general. It also offers opportunity to support strategic Policy ST14 - Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Security in a positive way.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST39 - LANDSCAPE CHARACTER			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 127, Figure 31 This is too small for most people to read the legend!	This Plan, and others where there are legibility issues will be replaced.
1665999	Resident	This section boasts how good are arable land is so why are you allowing this productive land for sale when brownfield land remains empty. this goes against the constitution.	There isn't enough suitable or available brownfield sites to accommodate the level of growth required through the Local Plan and therefore some greenfield land is being used. However, the suitable reuse of Brownfield land remains a priority for the Council in terms of delivering sustainable development in the future.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the additional criteria at B. (development at edge of settlement locations), which should go some way towards preventing a recurrence of the bad practice which has been all too common over recent years (e.g. hard edges of developments and no sympathetic relationship to adjacent areas).	Thank you for your comments.
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	B. Proposals for development in an edge of settlement location will be expected to: advocate amending the wording to stipulate that boundary landscaping for edge of settlement locations should use native species appropriate for the landscape character area and ideally, of local provenance.	A reference to the use of native species has been added to the Policy.
REF214	Historic England	The requirements set out within this policy are welcomed in terms of the historic environment, associated placemaking links and advocating the links between the built, historic and natural environments.	Thank you for your comments.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 127, Figure 31 This is too small for most people to read the legend!	This Plan, and others where there are legibility issues will be replaced.
1671323	William Davis	The proposal to split the previous Policy ST34: Landscape Character with Part C (Green Gaps) becoming a separate policy is supported. The reworded Policy is broadly supported.	Thank you for your comments.
REF159	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 127 8.3.1 the sentence makes no sense and needs rewording.	This section has been reworded to provide a clearer explanation.
REF186	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>Commented on the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (response dated 9th March 2019, submitted by email) and the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (response dated 26th February 2020, submitted by email) and are making the comments below in light of these earlier responses. 1. November 2020 Summary of consultation responses to the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan</p> <p>We first need to point out that there are two errors in the summary of the January 2020 consultation responses. The first error is that our comments on the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST34 (on landscape character) have not been incorporated into the summary of the January 2020 consultation responses. Instead, comments we made in response to January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST 50 (on sustainable transport) have been copied in under Policy ST34 (and again under Policy ST50). Ask you to rectify this and take into account what we actually said in our consultation response regarding Policy ST34. Our comments on ST34 are reproduced in full below</p> <p>This policy significantly weakens landscape protection compared to Policy 17 in the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. The following clear guidance in Policy 17 has been deleted: "2. Development proposals that would have an unacceptable impact on landscape character, visual amenity and sensitivity will not be supported. 3. The provision of alternative, replacement or additional landscape features either within the development site, or in an appropriate alternative location, may be appropriate in circumstances where the impact is demonstrated to be necessary to facilitate an otherwise acceptable scheme. Proposals to offset any loss or damage will be subject to the agreement of an appropriate management scheme by the Council where necessary. 4. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to the landscape, the prior condition of the landscape will be taken into account in the consideration of development proposals." Bassetlaw may well have (in their view at least) compelling reasons for this change. If so, we would be interested in hearing them.</p> <p>There is a risk that the weakened landscape policy will allow adverse consequences for local landscapes and amenity value, especially if the policy wording in relation to particular allocations is equally open-ended and general. Policy 15 : HS1 could be an example of this risk. The wording at C. is as follows :</p>	<p>Apologise for those errors and thank you for providing your response to us again.</p> <p>In terms of the changes to policies between the draft versions of the Plans, some of these references have either been moved to other, more relevant, policies such as those relating to development, or were considered overbearing or are covered by National Policy. We have changed a few points to help strengthen the Policy and added a separate point related to the unacceptable impact from development.</p> <p>We have considered your responses and made relevant changes to the policy where appropriate. Your comments relating to Policy HS1 have been added to that section and a response has also been provided.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST39 - LANDSCAPE CHARACTER			
		<p>“C. The masterplan framework will guide the creation of a sustainable and high quality living and working environment and will make provision for: 1. Good Quality Design and Local Character</p> <p>a) Landscape-led high quality design that integrates the new with the existing, that adds value to the local area and endures over time”. In the absence of any specific criteria as to what would constitute ‘high quality’ or ‘adding value’, it is difficult to see what basis Bassetlaw would have for rejecting any masterplan, or even for asking applicants to make changes to a submitted masterplan. In relation to this example, we are also aware that local residents have in their comments on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 expressed concerns about Policy 15 : HS1, especially about the adverse impact on valued views if the western side of the proposed allocation is developed.” Would still be interested in the arguments which led to Bassetlaw to decide not to incorporate the clearer guidance in the text from Policy 17 in the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan into the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan The second error is that our comments on ST15 : HS1 in our response to the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (see above) have not been incorporated into the section on this policy in the summary of the January 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan consultation responses. We ask you to take these into account too.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
1638182	Resident	Support the proposal for Green Gap 7 - Retford South - Eaton. However, given how visible the land on the east side of Ollerton Road (adjacent to Lansdown Drive) is from London Road, suggest that the policy should state that there should be no built development in this location.	There are views of the open land from London Road with the (Lansdown Drive) housing behind it (See Appendix - Photo 1). However, the existing rectangular built edge to the settlement is dominant in the landscape. The form of the existing built up area and the need to achieve an efficient and effective use of infrastructure suggests, therefore, that development east of Ollerton Road/South of Lansdown Drive is possible without prejudicing landscape quality, whilst still enabling a viable and lasting Green Gap of an appropriate size, to be defined. A sensitive design and layout, respecting topography and utilising new open space and planting could achieve a satisfactory landscape relationship with the proposed GG7 to the South. As noted in previous reports, topography and the presence of the public right of way to the South, create an opportunity for a recognisable and robust edge to built development within the Green Gap
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 129 – This has to be a must and defines the spaces between settlements or builds. However, it is not currently present in (for example) Ranskill / Torworth where a development is being allowed directly on the border across the 2 villages.	In the Local Plan Scrooby is defined as a Small Rural Settlement with limited new dwelling requirements. The (Draft) Scrooby NP covers Scrooby and Scrooby Top and it defines a settlement boundary for the main village. Land outside that area is open countryside where the LP policies ST1 & ST2 would apply to new development and there are no proposed development sites. Ranskill is also identified as a Small Rural Settlement, with a new dwelling requirement of 30. This is being addressed through an emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The Draft NP includes “Significant Green Gaps to the north and south of the village” and it is

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			appropriate that this local matter is determined through the NP process rather than addressed in the higher-level Local Plan. Torworth, to the south of Ranskill, is regarded as being in the countryside in Policy ST1. Scrooby lies to the south east of the proposed GG1 Bircotes – Bawtry across the River Ryton, which is a long term and robust GG boundary.
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Party acknowledges the determination of the Plan to preserve and improve the Green Spaces detailed at Section ST34 but wonder if it is time to flood GG6 and ST48. Both these areas are poor quality low lying historic flood plain areas, and perhaps now is the time to create managed Wetlands to help mitigate the flood risks already endured by adjacent properties. If we do not start the conversations about returning some lands to a more natural historic state as part of a managed flood plan, then we will be still mopping out the same houses in 2040 - unless they have been abandoned. Pockets of Green Space in urban areas should be considered for local environment management opportunities. There is good evidence to show that communities will look after their precious amenity areas if they are given a role in the management of it. The Labour Party believes increasingly, local authorities are working with community organisations to see if new models of managing these spaces can be developed, creating both efficiencies and added value services and activities as a result.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the plan. The Plan should make a declaration that the future Flood resilience of both our Town Centres - Worksop town floods more frequently than Retford town now - is a key objective of the Plan, and this 'will include restoring historic Flood Plains in the Idle Valley'. The Plan needs to make clear that there will be the opportunities for Community involvement in environmental protection and green spaces. The Plan should note remits of the proposed Retford Town Masterplan to include a specific environmental plan for the Town Centre.</p>	The suggestions relating to flood plains and washlands are reasonable as a way of addressing climate change. However, the comment does raise the question of longer-term management rather than the actual designation of Green Gaps with which the Local Plan is concerned. Policy ST41 (Green and Blue Infrastructure) and other Local Plan policies cover the comments on Worksop and Retford Town Centres.
REF135	Pegasus Group on behalf of land owner	As discussed in our previous representations, it is considered that the Green Gap to the north of Langold should be amended to exclude the full area of the extended site proposals (as discussed below). 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.	The context for Green Gaps is explained in the Local Plan and in the Introduction and Methodology section of the 2019 Report. The exercise was not intended to be a District Wide landscape analysis, a role which has been fulfilled by earlier studies. Rather, it is intended to be a targeted assessment of areas of land around towns and larger villages. The approach to the assessment of and proposals for a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas (including greenfield locations and power station sites) is explained in the Economy (para. 3.22), Vision (Strategic Objectives 1, 4 & 5) and Spatial Strategy Sections of the Local Plan. The eastern edge of the built up area of Worksop (Kilton) and the western edge of Retford (Ordsall) are 6 miles (9.5km) apart. It is acknowledged that there are existing and proposed large scale warehouse buildings along the A57, west of Worksop but these sites are within landscaped settings and do not create an impression of or represent continuous development. The proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village is separated from these buildings by the A1 and several large woodlands including Apleyhead, Sharps Hill and Top Wood (which is to be retained around a proposed employment site). The proposed Garden Village Site is triangular, with the narrow apex to the east. That point is

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			<p>still 1.25mls (2km) west of the edge of Retford and the majority of the site is some 2.5mls (4km) away. In addition, the western built up boundary of Retford is framed by the substantial proposed GG8. In Section 5.3 of the Local Plan, the principles of the proposed Garden Village and Policy ST3 require that at least 40% of the site area is given over to a green & blue infrastructure network that “...<i>respects and enhances the landscape qualities of the area...</i>” The site is well-contained by defensible boundaries which together with the green/blue infrastructure will further minimise any perception of continuous built development between Worksop and Retford. It is not, therefore considered justified or appropriate to consider wider Green Gap designations across the district or that the proposed Garden Village site should be considered as a Green Gap.</p>
REF211	National Trust	<p>It is not clear how Green Gaps have been identified as the associated report only includes an assessment of the areas already suggested by the Council. Consequently, it is unclear why a Green Gap has not been considered between Worksop and the A1 (and on to Retford) 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. 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. Reviewed the Green Gaps Report Addendum October 2020 and were confused to note that our previous representation (much of which is replicated above) has been reported by paragraph 2.3 as ‘Support in principle’ for the policy, with no further consideration being given to the detailed comments. Clearly this does not adequately address our response in relation to Green Gaps.</p>	<p>The context for Green Gaps is explained in the Local Plan and in the Introduction and Methodology section of the 2019 Report. The exercise was not intended to be a District Wide landscape analysis, a role which has been fulfilled by earlier studies. Rather, it is intended to be a targeted assessment of areas of land around towns and larger villages.</p> <p>It is considered that the policy, whilst soundly based and realistic, is aspirational in that it introduces Green Gaps into Bassetlaw planning policy for the first time. This is part of a wider strategy to achieve sustainable development that will meet economic, environment and social needs.</p> <p>National and local landscape character assessments are considered in relation to several key aspect of the Local Plan. In addition to references to these in the Sites (Land Availability) Assessment and Green Gap reports, these studies/assessment either form or are referenced in other Local Plan background reports and evidence papers. However, a reference could be made in the explanation of Policy ST40 (Green Gaps) and it is recommended that para. 8.47 be amended to read: “Evidence, <i>including information for national and local landscape character assessment</i>, will need to...”</p> <p>There is detailed coverage of Sherwood Forest within Policy ST42 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity). The eight proposed Green Gaps include locations/areas outside Sherwood Forest consequently, reference to a single, are specific restoration project is not appropriate.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			<p>The approach to the assessment of and proposals for a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas (including greenfield locations and power station sites) is explained in the Economy (para. 3.22), Vision (Strategic Objectives 1, 4 & 5) and Spatial Strategy Sections of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village is separated from these buildings by the A1 and several large woodlands including Apleyhead, Sharps Hill and Top Wood (which is to be retained around a proposed employment site). The proposed Garden Village Site is triangular, with the narrow apex to the east. That point is still 1.25mls (2km) west of the edge of Retford and the majority of the site is some 2.5mls (4km) away. In addition, the western built up boundary of Retford is framed by the substantial proposed GG8.</p> <p>In Section 5.3 of the Local Plan, the principles of the proposed Garden Village and the Policy ST3 require that at least 40% of the site area is given over to a green & blue infrastructure network that "...respects and enhances the landscape qualities of the area..." The site is well-contained by defensible boundaries which together with the green/blue infrastructure will further minimise any perception of continuous built development between Worksop and Retford.</p> <p>It is not, therefore considered justified or appropriate to consider wider Green Gap designations across the district or that the proposed Garden Village site should be considered as a Green Gap.</p> <p>The report will be amended to reflect your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF223	Resident	<p>In our comments on the previous version of the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020, expressed the hope that the Council would expand the proposed green gaps into the land areas immediately north and north-east of the settlement edge of Retford towards Tiln Lane and Clarborough, to maintain the separation of Retford and Tiln and of Retford and Clarborough (Reference 377 January 2020 Bassetlaw Local Plan). The officer response dismissed the proposal because of the significant landscape and heritage assets or existing designations that would limit and further manage development in this location. The green gaps report addendum October 2020 contains statements (p12 and 18-19) that apparently support the incorporation into a green gap of the above-mentioned land areas to the north and north east of Retford. The statements on page 12 quoted below refer to a current consultation on changes to the planning system: Planning for the Future (August 2020). Observed that the above-mentioned land areas played a crucial part in “health and well-being, in terms of exercise” and “recreation” during the national lockdowns imposed as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. The footpaths in these land areas were extensively used by pedestrians and dog walkers, including children. A green gap north and north-east of Retford would support the intent to “ask for beauty and to be far more ambitious for the places we create, expecting new development to be beautiful, and to create ‘net gain’ not just ‘no net harm’, with greater focus on ‘placemaking’ and ‘the creation of beautiful places’ with the NPPF”. Also the proposed green gap designation north and north east of Retford “could complement the intended (landscape and character led) masterplan approach that the new separate, green gap policy in the Bassetlaw Local Plan will require for development within or adjoining green gaps”. The green gaps report addendum proposes that “the extent and role of any green gap may be reconsidered when the Local Plan (or a successor document) is reviewed” (p18). Strongly encourage a prompt review of whether the land identified above (north and north-east of Retford) be included in a green gap. The green gaps policy clearly applies in detail to the land refer to above (see statement on p18 and 19 of the addendum), in particular the design proposals and the need to consider “the sequential approach that there are no appropriate sites for a proposed development outside the green gap in question”. Finally we expect that a green gap designation in the above-mentioned location would be helpful in encouraging development therein to include safe walking and cycling routes, as a natural choice for all shorter journey’s or as part of a longer journey. Perhaps a green gap designation will facilitate access to future grant aid in the regard. There are at present no designated safe cycling routes in the potential green gap north and north-east of Retford to connect with the green lane routes in Hayton and Clarborough Parishes. Unsafe cycling routes include Smeath lane (a very busy Lorry route, sustrans advises caution) and the Chesterfield Canal towpath (too narrow for shared use by cyclists, walkers, dogs and fishermen). A green gap policy would encourage upgrading of footpath surfaces for all levels of walkers and cyclists with amenity tree planting, wildflower meadows, and vistas and viewpoints with seating provision.</p>	<p>The canal, forming the western boundary of GG5 (Clarborough – Welham), is a clear and permanent feature in the landscape. West and SSW of Clarborough the land is clearly open countryside across to Smeath Lane and beyond to Bolham Hall and Tiln Lane. To the north of Smeath Lane, the Idle Valley opens out and there is no settlement for 3 to 5 miles (5 to 8 km). New housing is being built west of Tiln Lane and south of Bolham Way, which extends the built-up area. In the north east quadrant of Retford there is an irregular and complex boundary to the built up area offering few opportunities to identify a long term robust boundary to a GG. In addition, the area is undistinguished in landscape terms. At present, therefore, it is not considered that there is justification to identify a new or extended Green Gap. In the meantime, countryside policies in the Local Plan, the protection of the footpath network and the green corridor designations of the Canal and the River Idle represent an adequate and appropriate means of managing development in this location.</p>
1670041	Globe Consultants Ltd	<p>This policy identifies Retford East as Green Gap 6 which includes derelict brown field land that desperately requires investment and development to deliver enhanced amenity to the locality along Blackstope Lane. By including such a site within the Green Gap policy, without sufficient acknowledgement that such investment will be supported where it delivers a net benefit to the amenities of the area, as opposed to securing its openness, the policy is likely to result in the perverse and counter-productive result of disqualifying the necessary investment.</p>	<p>There is a (demolished) former factory site off Blackstope Lane within the Green Gap. However, it adjoins a wet woodland (of habitat and landscape value (within Flood Zone 3) which runs across to the canal. Housing, further west along Blackstope Lane is outside the Green Gap. It is acknowledged that two other commercial premises (a stonemason and a lawnmower repairer) and a cleared site off Grove Road are not in the Green Gap. However, they form a contiguous unit and directly adjoin the built up area. It is appropriate, therefore, to use Blackstope Lane, the railway line and Grove Road as the Green Gap boundary in this location. To the south, the contribution that the open land in the Idle valley (west of the railway) makes to the landscape setting of Retford is significant. To the north of Blackstope Lane the canal (a major green corridor in the Local Plan) is a clear and permanent feature in the landscape so acts as a defensible</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			boundary for the Green Gap. The features referred to above are shown in photos 2, 3 & 4 in the appendix. The policy wording allows for essential development within Green Gaps and for development to have a positive impact on the “...openness, character, appearance and functionality of the landscape characteristics of the relevant Green Gap.” where specified criteria can be met. Therefore, it will be possible for the existing businesses to invest in their sites and premises. However, it will be necessary for such development to take account of the landscape and habitat value of brownfield land, which may be naturally regenerating so that the integrity of the Green Gap remains intact.
REF110	Resident	ST40 Page 129 Clarification or more detailed information is required on Green Gap 7 Retford South -Eaton to enable comment in the future	The 2019 report and the 2020 addendum cover GG7 in detail and the comments above on Ref. 163 explain why some well planned development may be appropriate adjoining the existing built up area.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Green Gap 7: Retford South – Eaton has much to commend it but there is a segment at its northern end adjacent to Whitehouses Road that is an intensive horticultural operation with the associated polytunnels, storage building, car parking and the adjacent football pitch and changing building. The Green Gap line should be relocated towards the south boundary of this operation.	The presence of this business and the playing field is recognised, and it is acknowledged that there are several associated small buildings/structures and greenhouses, albeit that the majority are temporary. Noting that Green Belt principles can be applied to Green Gaps, buildings for agriculture or forestry and facilities for outdoor recreation are considered appropriate. If the boundary of the Green Gap were to be moved south to remove these uses/structures, it would be difficult to establish a recognisable and defensible long term boundary. Whitehouses Road/Goosemoor Lane is a recognisable, robust and defensible boundary for the Green Gap. The Appendix, photo 5 shows how the horticultural uses sit satisfactorily within with Green Gap. On the Local Plan Policies Map, the southern boundary of the Retford East Green Gap (GG6) runs along the north east side of the East Coast main line. However, it is acknowledged that it includes part of The Brambles residential development to the north. The boundary should be amended to exclude the development. The (2019) Green Gaps report and Policies Map will be revised accordingly.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Land to the south of Whitehouses Road. This is shown overlaid with the key for locally important open space, green gaps and playing field and outdoor sports facility. The latter is the local football pitch and changing facilities. However, the remainder of this larger location is an intensive horticultural operation with structures and car parking provision. All of the land on both the north and south side of Whitehouses Road has always been horticultural land, the majority of it owned and used by the Barker family who owned and worked Fairy Grove Nurseries, now a housing estate. The identification of a locally important space is incorrect and the idea that it is a green gap is wrong due to the intensive use and buildings. On the same plan and immediately to the west of the above land is the new housing development known as The Brambles and is located on the former Norman Nurseries. On this same inset plan it is hatched over as a green gap and underwashed with the Committed housing layer. It cannot be both. The green gap allocation should be redrawn.	Agreed. The Green Gap has been amended to exclude the developments at the Brambles and Kenilworth Nurseries.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF195- Peaks Hill Farm	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management (Peaks Hill Farm)	Policy ST40: Green Gaps does not appear to recognise that there may be circumstances where, for example, strategic transport links or other development infrastructure is required. Whilst it may be considered that sub-para.B.1. addresses this point, it would be helpful if the supporting text to this Policy acknowledge that certain forms of infrastructure that are considered necessary would be acceptable in regard to sub-para.B.1.	<p>The consideration of an appropriate northern boundary of the proposed Peaks Hill Farm (large scale) housing site allocation led to the proposed Green Gap being moved southwards from that originally considered in the 2019 Green Gaps report. This decision recognised the clear landscape connection between the farmland either side of Red Lane. BDC noted that, by including new woodland and open spaces in the design of the new housing, a satisfactory relationship could be created at the same time as providing a clear long term boundary for the Green Gap. However, it is acknowledged that in making those changes, the extent of the existing employment operations off the B6045, at Carlton Forest, south of the junction with Red Lane is not properly recognised by the Green Gap boundary as currently drafted.</p> <p>A reference is now made within the policy for the allowance of critical infrastructure within a green gap.</p> <p>It is considered that the boundary be redrawn in part using the curtilages of existing buildings, parking and servicing areas, as follows. South from Hundred Acre Lane to the rear of Sherwood Caravan storage, residential properties and the Milton Equestrian Centre. West along Red Lane, turning south along the rear of the Hollings and Wright Engineering sites, a residential property and the telecoms mast up to the boundary of Elddis Transport. The area outside the Green Gap would include the recently permitted B1/B2/B8 development (18/01093/OUT). West (as currently drawn) around the edge of the existing employment site denoted in the Local Plan. These changes would not prejudice the integrity or landscape value of the Green Gap. There is, however, no justification in landscape terms or in relation to habitat connectivity for the adjacent former quarry area, including the previously restored mound to be excluded from the Green Gap. These features are shown in photos 6 & 7 in the Appendix. It is understood that, although the planning history of the quarry is long and complex, there is a condition requiring restoration to a heathland habitat. This landscape/habitat focus supports the inclusion of the site in the Green Gap. The suggested boundary changes would negate some of the concerns about the application of the Green Gap policy. However, the landscape and habitat value of the restored minerals site (when restoration is completed in accordance with the planning conditions), indicate that the landscape led approach to deciding upon what type and extent of development may</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			<p>be appropriate to a Green Gap is reasonable and justified. The boundary changes suggested above recognise current and committed employment uses but also consider the intention to secure the restoration of minerals sites to open habitats. The latter uses are entirely appropriate for inclusion in a Green Gap.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF117 Ordsall South	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	<p>Policy ST40 is not justified and should be deleted. There is no need for this in the Local Plan as it is an unnecessary level of policy restriction. The purposes of the Green Gaps are not set out clearly in the draft Local Plan or in the background Green Gap document. Reference is made in the supporting texts to Policy ST40, to “Green Belt” policy and the 2009 Landscape Character Assessment as justification, as well as to ecology, recreation, access, settlement character and separation reasons. The rationale and justification for the Policy is unclear. Noting this, there is also no criteria used for defining specific areas or why Green Gaps 1-8 are justified. The Policy areas selected are therefore unjustified. The document states that Green Gaps do not preclude development (paragraph 8.4.6). Yet Part B introduces strict development control tests that would prevent pretty much most forms of development. Reference is made to demonstrating a ‘positive impact on openness’. As the Council is aware, Green Belt policy in NPPF refers to the tests of openness and permanence. It is unclear how the Council envisages a positive impact on openness could be achieved through development? It is unclear what the Green Gaps policy may achieve that would not be achieved by other policies at a national and local level and by good practice. It appears to be an attempt to introduce a Green Belt policy in all but name.</p>	<p>The approach to defining Green Gaps was intended to be broadly based, including: - Using an existing evidence base (e.g. relevant NCAs and the 2009 Study). - Recognising recent commitments and potential Local Plan allocations. - Taking account of Neighbourhood Plans. - Information from recent site visits.</p> <p>The 2009 assessment remains pertinent in conjunction with the NE National Character Areas. Green Gaps have been defined based on the emerging policy context, recognising existing commitments and emerging allocations for new housing and employment around settlements.</p> <p>The context for Green Gaps is explained in the Local Plan and in the Introduction and Methodology section of the 2019 Report. The exercise was not intended to be a District Wide landscape analysis, a role which has been fulfilled by earlier studies. Rather, it is intended to be a targeted assessment of areas of land around towns and larger villages.</p> <p>There is a clear justification for Green Gap policies, based on planning practice and national guidance. Examples are drawn from Local and Neighbourhood Plans (see Section 3 in the 2019 Addendum report and this report).</p> <p>It is incorrect to state that Green Gaps are a backdoor way of introducing Green Belt into Bassetlaw. The analysis within this and other Green Gap reports is explicit on this point, but a clearer statement that it is not the intention to replicate Green Belt policy will be included in the explanation for Policy ST40.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
REF177	Axisped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>Axis previously objected to the inclusion of their site within the Green Gap under Policy 34, Landscape Character. The Council have not prepared a response to these comments within their Summary of comments document. Our representations previously made are still relevant. FCC strongly disagree with the inclusion of their site within the Green Gap. FCC's 8-hectare site is of low landscape value. Whilst, it is acknowledged that Green Gaps do not prevent development from taking place, clearly the subjective policy tests within the emerging policy text would place additional restrictions on the proposed employment uses which would be contrary to the permitted uses on the east of the site. FCC's site is not included within the assessment area of Green Gap 3 (Carlton in Lindrick – Worksop North) set out within the Bassetlaw Green Gaps Report (November 2019). As such, we previously queried whether the inclusion of FCC's site was an error. The Green Gap Addendum Report (October 2020) notes at paragraph 2.6 that a comment concerned the extent of Green Gap 3, between Carlton in Lindrick and Worksop, where it adjoins committed new housing north of Worksop. It is assumed that this relates to FCC's previous comments. The response states: "There are no drafting issues; the comment aims to maximise development by reducing the Green Gap. This is not justified in landscape terms, given the scale of recent/ committed development." The Green Gap Report (November 2019) describes the boundary as running along Red Lane which is located to the north of the site. FCC's site and the land surrounding it has therefore not been assessed as part of this report and as such it is considered unsound to designate this additional land without fully assessing its landscape value. Given that the site was not included within this assessment area and that the Council have granted employment development on part of the site, it is clear that the Council do not consider the landscape in this area to be overly sensitive. Development within the western half of the site would be within the quarry base and as such visual impacts would be less when compared to the existing approved scheme within the east of the site. This Policy has been revised to include additional restrictive policy tests at paragraph B which states that development of undeveloped land and intensification of developed land will only be supported subject to meeting two criteria. The first, B1 states that the development must be essential in that location, and that there are no suitable sites outside of a Green Gap that could meet the needs of the development. FCC strongly object to this sequential based policy criteria, which would require FCC to demonstrate that there were no other suitable sites outside of the Green Gap before their site at Carlton Forest would be considered to accord with policy. FCC's site is undoubtedly appropriate for development, as has been demonstrated by the existing permission. It comprises a sustainable, under-utilised site where development should be encouraged. The second criterion requires a Landscape Statement to be submitted to demonstrate that any proposal will have a positive impact on the openness, character, appearance and functionality of the landscape characteristics of the relevant Green Gap. This is an unnecessary and onerous required to apply to FCC's site given that the site is previously worked for sand extraction and part of the site has planning permission for employment uses. Part of the site has planning permission for employment uses and given that the Council has granted employment development in this area, without the submission of a Landscape Statement, it would appear that the Council do not consider the landscape within this area to be particularly sensitive. The land within the western half of FCC's site is no different in landscape value terms to the part of the site with planning permission. The Council's approach to designating this site as Green Gap clearly contradicts the permission for employment development. As written, it is considered there are significant failings with Policy ST40 given that the policy proposes to designate land as Green Gap without undertaking an assessment of this land. The approach is clearly unjustified and therefore unsound.</p>	<p>The consideration of an appropriate northern boundary of the proposed Peaks Hill Farm (large scale) housing site allocation led to the proposed Green Gap being moved southwards from that originally considered in the 2019 Green Gaps report. This decision recognised the clear landscape connection between the farmland either side of Red Lane. BDC noted that, by including new woodland and open spaces in the design of the new housing, a satisfactory relationship could be created at the same time as providing a clear long term boundary for the Green Gap. However, it is acknowledged that in making those changes, the extent of the existing employment operations off the B6045, at Carlton Forest, south of the junction with Red Lane is not properly recognised by the Green Gap boundary as currently drafted. It is considered that the boundary be redrawn in part using the curtilages of existing buildings, parking and servicing areas, as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - South from Hundred Acre Lane to the rear of Sherwood Caravan storage, residential properties and the Milton Equestrian Centre. - West along Red Lane, turning south along the rear of the Hollings and Wright Engineering sites, a residential property and the telecoms mast up to the boundary of Elddis Transport. The area outside the Green Gap would include the recently permitted B1/B2/B8 development (18/01093/OUT). - West (as currently drawn) around the edge of the existing employment site denoted in the Local Plan. <p>These changes would not prejudice the integrity or landscape value of the Green Gap.</p> <p>There is, however, no justification in landscapes terms or in relation to habitat connectivity for the adjacent former quarry area, including the previously restored mound to be excluded from the Green Gap. These features are shown in photos 6 & 7 in the Appendix. It is understood that, although the planning history of the quarry is long and complex, there is a condition requiring restoration to a heathland habitat. This landscape/habitat focus supports the inclusion of the site in the Green Gap.</p> <p>The suggested boundary changes would negate some of the concerns about the application of the Green Gap policy. However, the landscape and habitat value of the restored</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
			minerals site (when restoration is completed in accordance with the planning conditions), indicate that the landscape led approach to deciding upon what type and extent of development may be appropriate to a Green Gap is reasonable and justified. The policy stance is reasonable for land included in a Green Gap.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST40 - GREEN GAPS			
1671323	William Davis	<p>There remain significant objections to Policy ST40: Green Gap in terms of the principle of the policy in relation to GG4 and the supporting evidence used to prepare it. The policy wording requires development of undeveloped land or intensification of developed land (which would cover most development) to only be supported if it is essential and no alternatives exist outside the Green Gap; this would appear to be an attempt to introduce a ‘green belt’ style policy. It is considered that the purpose of the policy is confused. Part A of the policy refers to areas being designated for their “landscape quality and character of the land” rather than keeping settlements separated; indeed it is noted that no areas elsewhere are being protected for their landscape quality. While the Green Gaps Report Addendum (Oct 2020) refers to examples elsewhere, notably Adur (Policy 14) and Charnwood (CS11), these policies are focussed solely on preventing coalescence rather than the landscape. If this is the aim of the policy it should be reworded to follow the wording used in Adur and Charnwood:</p> <p>Extract from Adur Policy 14: Local green Gaps – “Within these areas any development permitted must be consistent with other policies of this plan, and must not (individually or cumulatively) lead to the coalescence of settlements.” Extract from Charnwood Policy CS11: Landscape and Countryside – “We will protect the predominantly open and undeveloped character of Areas of Local Separation unless new development clearly maintains the separation between the built-up areas of these settlements.”</p> <p>If Policy ST40 is intended to protect locally valued landscapes as is indicated in Part A of the policy, then it is considered essential that the methodology used to identify areas is based on a robust and recognised methodology. It is noted that the response to our previous comments confirmed that the methodology has not used the Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment Edition 3 (GLVIA3); as such it is considered that the Policy fails to meet the tests of soundness as it is not justified by proportionate evidence. It is also noted that in other Green Gaps (especially GG3: Carlton in Lindrick- Worksop North) the boundary of the designated area has been drawn to take account of the proposed Peak Hills Farm. This does not appear to have been a consideration for GG4 despite the potential for LAA206 to create a more defensible long-term boundary than the current footpath Our original objections remain as follows:</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>Green Gap Report (November 2019):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference is made to the land around St Anne’s 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 	<p>There is a clear justification for Green Gap policies in principle, based on planning practice and guidance. Examples can be drawn from Local and Neighbourhood Plans. In relation to this comment, the matter is, therefore not one of principle, but more about policy wording and the validity of Green Gap 4 (Worksop West – Shireoaks and Rhodesia). In terms of the policy wording, it is incorrect to state that Green Gaps are an attempt to introduce a Green Belt style policy. The analysis within this report and the previous Green Gap reports is explicit on this point. However, a clearer statement that it is not the intention to replicate Green Belt policy will be included in the Policy explanation to reinforce this. The policy cross references in the 2019 addendum report concerned the principle of Green Gaps and it was not intended that policies bespoke to other areas should be cut and pasted into Bassetlaw. This comment is, as was the case with earlier comments, 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of existing evidence (e.g. the relevant NCAs and the 2009 Study). - Recognising recent commitments and potential Local Plan allocations. - Taking account of Neighbourhood Plans. - Information from recent site visits. <p>With reference to the NPPF, it is not necessary that a landscape which is designated in some way (e.g., as a Green Gap) must be “valued.” 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. This is a PROW, well used, long established and clearly visible on the ground. There is a connection onto Ashwood Road, and it is signed from the north/south track leading from Manor Lodge Farm to Mansfield Road, as shown in the photos 8 & 9 in the appendix. See above comments on the applicability of GVLIA3. These are in fact detailed in the main 2019 report.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST41 - GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE			
REF003	Canal & 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 Policy ST41, which should help to ensure that future development takes account of the unique biodiversity and function of waterway corridors in the district.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Misterton is bisected by the Chesterfield Canal, so it is an important feature of the village. The Parish Council supports the protection of the Canal for connectivity, biodiversity, and amenity value. The Parish Council agrees with keeping development at a distance from green corridors.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Discussion of both Green (land) and Blue (water) infrastructures together is welcomed accepting the heavy mix of the two in the rural settlements areas.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	The garden village could have a significant impact on Elkesley and would appreciate it if there could be some direct consultation with the villagers to help decide how the communities could support each other and not leave Elkesley as a remote satellite village: There are a number of policies and items listed in the Local Plan that support this need: Policy ST41, 6 linking walking and cycling routes, bridleways and public rights of way to and through development, where appropriate;	Consultation will continue with the directly affected parish councils and communities to further ensure the Garden Village and existing communities are mutually supportive of each other such as through Policy ST41 6. Which promotes links via walking/cycling, bridleways and public rights of way to and through new development.
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to incorporate green and blue infrastructure within development. These corridors can provide space for the incorporation of SuDS, facilitating good SuDS design principles. Supportive of the approach outlined within bullet point 9 to protect watercourses, as existing watercourse provide a vital link within the natural water cycle and sustainable outfalls for surface water drainage.	Thank you for your comments, your support is welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF003	Canal & 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 ST42, 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 believe that part E of policy ST42 could assist in ensuring these aims are met.	Welcome support is noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF011	Fred Walter & Son Ltd	<p>Importantly, submitted comments to the last round of consultation in early 2020 and have not received any direct response from the Council. Reviewed the Policies Map (November 2020) and note that there remain proposals to extend the Local Wildlife Site ('LWS') designation, covered by Policy ST42 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity', onto our land. As previously stated, have not been directly consulted about this proposal and, whilst we do not disagree with the general principle of the LWS designation, can find no clear justification or evidence as to why it is deemed necessary to extend it onto our land. Our efforts have included a review of the Sustainability Appraisal (January 2020), where we can find no mention of the proposed extension. It is our view that the proposed extension is somewhat arbitrary given the status of the land it affects. To demonstrate the areas of land referring to; Appendix 1 to this letter shows an extract from the adopted 2011 map adjacent to an extract from the January 2020 draft map and the November 2020 draft map. Have annotated the 2020 extracts to show where our land is affected by the LWS extension. These 'Areas' are ringed in orange and are numbered 1-4. Note that Area 3 has now been removed from the extended LWS area, which we strongly support; however, the remaining Areas are still within the extended LWS.</p> <p>Importantly, none of the areas are considered to have a degree of ecological value that justifies the LWS designation. Some specific comments on each of the Areas (1, 2 and 4) are provided below and overleaf:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area 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. Area 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 we do not see why any significant ecological value has been attributed and why is included in the LWS. • Area 4 – this land is currently in arable rotation and is intensively farmed. The nature of the farming operation means that ecological value is limited. Consider that 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. Appreciate an explanation and a direct discussion with officers regarding the removal of the extended LWS from our land. Respectfully request that the proposed boundaries on the latest November 2020 draft map are amended to remove the additional pieces of land, reinstating the boundaries established by the 2011 map. 	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 Master map and recent aerial photos
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Pages 132-133, sections 8.6.3 and 8.6.6 Would it be helpful to list these designated sites to assist developers in the future?	Those that fall within Bassetlaw are shown on the Policies Map

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF116	id Planning on behalf of Lidl (Great Britain)	<p>The Draft Plan sets out the purpose of Policy ST42 'Biodiversity & Geodiversity' which seeks, amongst other things, to achieve biodiversity net gain that will leave the District's biodiversity assets in a better state than currently exists. The policy seeks to reflect what is still emerging legislation and not law in the draft Environment Bill 2019. It is noted paragraph 8.6.17 acknowledges that it is expected that biodiversity net gain can be achieved through good design of new development with features such as sustainable drainage or tree planting. Criterion E of the policy relates to 'Biodiversity Net Gain' specifically and states: "All new development should make provision for at least 10% new biodiversity gain on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution. A commuted sum equivalent to 30 year maintenance will be sought to manage the biodiversity assets in the long term." Support the general thrust of Policy ST42 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 on a number of grounds. Seeks to apply biodiversity net gain of 10% to all new development. This could not only reduce developable area to an extent it affects viability of a site, but could result in a further cost to development also affecting viability, particularly if the site was previously developed land with contamination issues. The added cost providing biodiversity net gain over and above the cost of regenerating a site could well affect delivery of development in the future and indeed could be a factor that would discourage development of more costly sites from coming forward. It is recognised the Draft Environment Bill (2019) proposes the mandatory requirement for net biodiversity gain in development, whilst the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) also references biodiversity net gain, with paragraph 174 noting plans should protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by pursuing opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>Current policy in the NPPF (2019) does not necessitate a percentage requirement for net biodiversity gain and therefore the proposal to do so under the emerging Draft Local Plan appears to be at odds with the NPPF in setting such a figure and with no flexibility in recognition of where this may not be unachievable on certain sites. The Draft Plan also sets out that this requirement has been considered as part of the Bassetlaw Whole Plan Viability Assessment, however a review of the Assessment it is unclear where the requirement for 10% net biodiversity gain has been factored into development costs. This is particularly relevant in the context of the concern raised above where redevelopment of previously developed vacant land is marginal in viability terms. The NPPF (2019) requires that local plans are aspirational but 'deliverable' (paragraph 16) and that in order to be 'sound' they are effective and justified, providing an appropriate strategy which is based on proportionate evidence (paragraph 35). It remains unclear whether Policy ST42 is justified or viable and are 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 National Planning Policy Framework (2019). As policy currently stands in terms of national guidance, are not of the view that Policy ST42 is deliverable, particularly given viability considerations for many new development proposals. Consider reference to a 10% net biodiversity requirement should be removed from Policy ST42 which should be amended to reflect the wording of the NPPF (2019) in order to provide flexibility to ensure that development is deliverable. With the exclusion of the 10%, the wording could still apply to 'all new development' as its aspiration subject to whether such provision is practicable and viable. This would be addressed on a case by case basis. Object to the proposed policy on the basis of the addition in the policy wording to the need for a commuted sum equivalent to 30 years maintenance to manage the biodiversity assets in the long term. This would be a further cost to the developer, raising further viability concerns over new developments coming forward. In the event that a financial contribution is agreed as being necessary for off-site enhancements rather than on site provision, a financial contribution should not be provided incorporating a separate commuted maintenance sum as well. It is not clear how maintenance would be factored in to any off-site contribution and should not be factored in. In those circumstances any off site contribution should be a single one off payment. In addition, if</p>	<p>The Chancellors' 2019 spring statement indicated it will be mandatory for all development in England to deliver a 'Biodiversity Net Gain'. A more recent government statement (23 July 2019) outlines further details about how the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement will be defined, as well as exemptions, protections for 'irreplaceable habitats', and how net gain will be administered.</p> <p>Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 8-022-20190721 of the PPG: The National Planning Policy Framework encourages net gains for biodiversity to be sought through planning policies and decisions. Biodiversity net gain delivers measurable improvements for biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats in association with development. Biodiversity net gain can be achieved on-site, off-site or through a combination of on-site and off-site measures. It may help local authorities to meet their duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.</p> <p>Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 8-021-20190721: Plans, and particularly those containing strategic policies, can be used to set out a suitable approach to both biodiversity and wider environmental net gain, how it will be achieved, and which areas present the best opportunities to deliver gains. Such areas could include those identified in: natural capital plans; local biodiversity opportunity or ecological network maps; local green infrastructure strategies; strategic flood risk assessments; water cycle studies; air quality management plans; river basin management plans; and strategic protected species licensing areas. Consideration may also be given to local sites including where communities could benefit from improved access to nature.</p> <p>Policy ST42 is in line with the latest update to the forthcoming Environment Bill expected to receive Royal Assent in autumn 2021, 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. However, it is expected that the regime will not be implemented until 2023. The Plan will reflect that position. 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>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
		<p>provision is made on site to address biodiversity net gain, this should not then also include a contribution towards future maintenance. As highlighted at paragraph 8.6.17 of the supporting text, the Council clearly envisage that “In general, it is expected that biodiversity net gain can be achieved through good design of new development.....so their use should not create additional costs to new development”. The requirement, in all cases, for a commuted sum equivalent to 30 years maintenance to be provided is not justified, it would add cost to a development and in many cases effectively duplicate on site maintenance carried out by a site owner / developer / landlord or tenant. For example, if the biodiversity net gain was achieved through a ‘green roof’, that would be maintained in the future by the occupier or owner/landlord of the building. A 30 year maintenance contribution should not be provided. It is often the case that biodiversity enhancements can be achieved through careful selection of planting species within a soft landscape scheme. Maintenance of the landscaping would be carried out by the operator of the site and is an on-going maintenance cost which the occupier or owner of the site would incur in any event. It is not the case that those parts of a site often used to achieve biodiversity enhancement would then be adopted by the Council and the cost of management of that space would fall on the public purse in the same way as would occur for some public open space provision on housing developments that may be adopted by a Council. As drafted, the policy would result in a further development cost added to the overall site development cost and one which would in any event often be duplicated by the site owner in managing the site and maintaining elements such as soft landscaping. A 30 year commuted sum for maintenance is not justified and should be removed from the policy wording. As worded the plan is not positively prepared or justified and therefore is not ‘sound’. Suggest the following wording: “All new development 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>A maintenance contribution is expected to be a requirement through the Environment Bill. This will be carefully managed in accordance with the provisions of the new legislation. But the Council will ensure the necessary measures are put in place to avoid double counting.</p> <p>In light of the above the proposed amendment to the Policy is not considered to be in accordance with national planning guidance.</p>
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 136 – Protection of these is welcomed and vitally important to the small rural areas of Bassetlaw.	Welcome support noted
REF153	Natural England	<p>Pleased to note that many of the comments that we made in relation to this topic both within the explanatory text and the policy wording have now been incorporated into this draft. 8.6.3. In this paragraph advise that the distance of the Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC from the boundary of Bassetlaw Borough is approximately 3km. 8.6.7 Support the preparation of the Recreational Impact Assessment which is currently being undertaken which will provide strategic evidence of the potential recreational impact on the Clumber Park SSSI, Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC and the Sherwood NNR. This will provide valuable guidance on how to best to mitigate for any impacts on the sensitive habitats and species within these designations. Whilst we welcome the section on Nature Recovery Networks, suggest that the national approach to the Nature Recovery Network (which was recently launched), stemming from the Government’s 25 Year Environment Plan, should be mentioned to put the initiative in context. Here is a link for further information: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network</p> <p>8.6.16 note that the wording regarding Biodiversity Net Gain has been updated to explain that it is relevant to all development, which is welcome. Policy ST36: Natural England welcomes point 3 of the Policy wording that requires management and mitigation measures to address recreational impacts on Clumber Park SSSI, Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC, and Sherwood Forest ppSPA as identified in the strategic Recreational Impact Assessment (RIA) which is currently being undertaken. Natural England will continue to work the with the Council and the RSPB as the RIA proceeds to ensure that, a satisfactory level of evidence is gathered so that appropriate management and mitigation measures can be included into future iterations of the Local Plan and HRA. Pleased to see that mitigation hierarchy is fully set out at point 5 and the connection made to the Nature Recovery Network.</p> <p>Welcome section E on Biodiversity Net Gain and that it will apply to all development.</p>	<p>Comments made in relation to the supporting text and Policy are noted</p> <p>The distance from Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC from the boundary of Bassetlaw has been amended in the text.</p> <p>National approach to the Nature Recovery Network has been added.</p>
REF182	Anglian Water	SUPPORT welcomes the reference to development proposals providing biodiversity net gain having followed the mitigation hierarchy.	Welcome support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF203	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity Net Gain Section E States: 'All new development should make provision for at least 10% net biodiversity gain on site, or where it can be demonstrated that for design reasons this is not practicable, off site through a financial contribution. A commuted sum equivalent to 30 years maintenance will be sought to manage the biodiversity assets in the long term'. Welcome the fact that BDC are leading by example by requiring that all new development should make provision for at least 10% net biodiversity gain on site. 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. Perhaps developments that intend to provide biodiversity net gain above the minimum requirement could be favoured.	Noted. Current government guidance supports 10% net biodiversity gain. Forthcoming Environment Bill expected to receive Royal Assent in autumn 2021, requires development to deliver a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity so the Local plan is consistent with emerging legislation. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment shows that 10% can be achieved but any additionality could not be secured as part of a viable development.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust generally supports policy ST42. In Part 2 of the policy (national designations) there is a drafting error and that the words 'will be refused' should be substituted for 'will be protected'. Welcome the commitment in Part 3 to mitigation for recreational impacts on Clumber Park SSSI, the precise meaning of 'appropriate management, mitigation and monitoring on site' and how this will be monitored and enforced by the Council is somewhat unclear and would welcome further information.	Will be refused is considered to be the correct wording. In relation to Mitigation measures to address recreational impacts on Clumber Park SSSI and Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC, and Sherwood Forest ppSPA more detail is provided in the explanatory text in para. 5.3.19 and 8.6.7. Work on the Recreational Impact Assessment being undertaken in partnership with neighbouring authorities, Natural England, the National Trust and the RSPB is at an advanced stage. It will determine the potential recreational impact of the Bassetlaw Garden Village on the above designated sites individually, and cumulatively with other planned housing development within and outside the District. It will identify any potential management, mitigation and avoidance measures. This will inform policy development.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Pages 132-133, sections 8.6.3 and 8.6.6 Would it be helpful to list these designated sites to assist developers in the future?	Those that fall within Bassetlaw are shown on the Policies Map
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	Support the amendments to policy ST42 which now aligns with the Government's proposals within the Environment Bill 2019-21 which imposes a mandatory requirement for development to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity.	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST42 - BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY			
REF177	Axis PED Ltd on behalf of FCC Environment	Policy ST42 seeks to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of Bassetlaw. Paragraph 4 confirms that proposals have a direct or indirect adverse effective on a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) will only be supported where there are no reasonable alternatives and the case for development clearly outweighs the need to safeguard the ecological value of the site. The Policies Map extract below confirms the majority of the site is designated as a LWS. The full extent of the LWS is shown within the Policies Map extract below. The entire LWS is in the ownership of FCC, however development is not proposed within the central part of the LWS. A Phase 2 Botanical Survey was undertaken in 2017 to support the planning application for employment uses on the east of the site. This confirmed the LWS did just about qualify as the required six acid grassland indicators were recorded across the site, however the LWS is generally of low quality and ecological value. The survey demonstrated that the proposed employment development would not detrimentally affect the overall integrity of the local ecology subject to the imposition of conditions. With regards to the remainder of FCC's site, the survey found that none of the areas within the proposed development area meet the criteria to be designated as an LWS. Development is currently proposed within the area formerly used as a quarry. An aerial image of the site from 2020 is shown below. The aerial image clearly shows that the majority of the western part of the site where future development is proposed is sand with limited vegetation around the periphery of the site. Development could be undertaken without impacting the ecology of the site. Planning permission has already been granted for development within the east of the site and given that the majority of the western part is sand, the site can no longer qualify under the LWS criteria and should therefore be removed from this designation. FCC can offer improvements, as required, to areas of the LWS not proposed to be developed within their wider landholding. The policy wording should also be amended to provide further clarity with regards to 'reasonable alternatives'. It should be the case that if development can come forward without detrimentally impacting the ecological integrity of the site then this should be acceptable without needing to look for reasonable alternatives.	The site being promoted for employment use forms part of the designated Carlton Forest Sandpit Local Wildlife Site. Local Wildlife Sites are part of the Government's overall strategy for biodiversity conservation, and are recognised as having a significant role to play in meeting national biodiversity targets. The NPPF also places emphasis on protecting, restoring and recreating priority habitats, and networks. The protection of LWSs contributes significantly towards this aim. The Local Sites Panel is a technical subgroup made up of local experts. The primary purpose of the Local Sites Panel is to produce criteria for the selection of LWSs in Nottinghamshire. Once agreed, these LWS criteria are applied by the Nottinghamshire Ecological and Geological Data Partnership (NEGDP) who undertake to identify and notify Membership of the Local Sites Panel which consists of a range of organisations including local authorities, nature conservation NGOs, and the private sector. The specific tasks of the Local Sites Panel are to produce draft criteria for the selection of LWSs, in relation to habitats, species groups and geology, for ratification by the NEGDP. Criteria for the selection of LWSs is based on habitats and a species. These criteria are intended to cover the full range and distribution of habitats of nature. It allow for the designation of sites that support rare species, or are threatened. It Identifies sites of nature conservation value in a rigorous, and defensible method and which also includes public consultation. The Local Plan identifies the Local Wildlife Sites as submitted by the NEGDP. As such the Council is unable to change a designation. It must be changed by NEGDP following assessment.
1671323	William Davis	It is noted that part E of the Policy in relation to biodiversity net gain has been updated to apply to all development in line with the Environment Bill. In relation to the Viability Appraisal paragraphs 4.25 to 4.29 set out the assumptions on policy costs; these do not make reference to biodiversity net gain and it is unclear what figure has been used. Indeed paragraph 4.27 refers to costs being based on contributions over the preceding five years; these costs would not factor in Biodiversity Net Gain or the proposed management costs.	The assumptions on policy costs are set out in page 8 of the 2019 Whole Plan Viability Assessment. It provides a cost allowance for Site Specific Biodiversity surveys, mitigation and enhancement. It shows that 10% net gain can be achievable as part of a deliverable scheme.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST43 - TREES, WOODLANDS AND HEDGEROWS			
REF060	Notts County Council	Hedgerows isolated from or inaccessible from development frontages should be subject to a management plan where abutting public highway or proposed public highway.	Criterion 4 of Part B of the Policy requires an application to be accompanied by a detailed management plan providing details of maintenance arrangements for trees and hedgerows.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST43 - TREES, WOODLANDS AND HEDGEROWS			
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	Policy ST43 details how BDC will “protect existing trees, woodland and hedgerows and secure additional planting that increase canopy cover in the interests of biodiversity, amenity and climate change adaptation”. While this is welcomed the reality of the situation is that Bassetlaw District Council fails to enforce existing planning conditions designed to provide such protection. Unless BDC commits to providing the resource to ensure enforcement and prosecution of developers who destroy such habitats this policy is no more than a box ticking exercise.	Policy protects trees, woodland and hedgerows from loss. The Council has the power to take enforcement action where necessary.
REF153	Natural England	Note that at paragraph 8.7.7 of the explanatory text that Policy ST43 sets out the District’s contribution to the national tree planting target, however this does not seem to have been included in the policy wording	Bassetlaw’s contribution to the national tree planting target has been added to the Policy.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST43.	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST44 - THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT			
REF003	Canal & River	Due to its age, and the presence of historic structures such as locks, bridges and lock houses, and its relationship with past industrial development in Worksop and Retford, the Chesterfield Canal does constitute a heritage asset, which contributes toward the character and setting of the district. Welcome the inclusion of the canal and its associated structures within paragraph 8.8.2, which should make it clear to decision makers that the canal should be considered as a heritage asset. Welcome the general principles of Policy ST37, which should help make the Local Plan effective in meeting the aspirations set out in section 15 of the NPPF.	Support welcome and noted.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 137, para 8.8.2 With a Grade 1 listed parish church, Misterton Parish Council feels that the bullet points should include and make reference to all the ancient churches in the District.	<i>“numerous grade I & II* listed churches and”</i> added to this paragraph
REF060	Notts County Council	This Policy is very much welcomed and commended for the thorough reach of the policy, including the positive approach to dealing with heritage assets ‘at risk’. Worth considering reference to systematic evidence gathering as part of the monitoring of the historic environment to identify heritage that is ‘at risk’, this is a necessary resource commitment to enable ST44. 7 to be delivered on. It might also be worth including wording that references the ‘celebration and enjoyment’ of the local historic environment, as a natural extension to the positive policy statements of ST44, possibly as part of point 6. Important to include reference to the continued support for, and use of, the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record as the appropriate repository of information about the historic environment of the district.	Support welcome and noted. Reference to enjoyment of the historic environment is covered by point 10. Celebration will be added for completeness. Reference to the Historic Environment Record has been highlighted in the supporting and directly in Policy ST44. Covered in paragraph 8.8.11.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Section 8.8 lays out the Council's approach to the Historic Environment, culminating in Policies 44 and 45. This recognises the diverse and important cultural heritage of the District and its contribution to the quality of life, to the character of places/spaces and the important role it plays in community value, culture, identity and well-being. Both policies are consistent with national and local guidance and ensure that the finite archaeological and heritage resources within the District will be conserved/protected in accordance with their significance. It allows for this significance to be assessed appropriately through the planning process and for a regular review of the District's heritage assets to be undertaken (such as conservation area appraisals). It also makes provision for community access and engagement. Both Policies read well, however there is a slight tendency to treat archaeological remains as something different to the historic environment, whereas hope that all heritage assets are seen as a part of a wider continuum, the legacy of which is our historic environment today in its entirety. Welcome the inclusion of this section and policies in the Draft Local Plan.	Support noted. The approach will be clarified to ensure that archaeology is recognised as part of the historic environment not as a different element.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST44.	Support welcome and noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST44 - THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT			
REF214	Historic England	Paragraph 8.8.3 refers to Cresswell Crags in a landscape context with other heritage assets, but would it be better places in paragraph 8.8.2 where 'the most important aspects' are set out? Suggest that The Dukeries are referred to here for context since these have influenced the landscape including former deer parkland areas and the rural villages and farmsteads. Paragraph 8.8.8 - recommended that the first sentence of this paragraph be deleted or reworded. It is also recommended that any use of 'preserve' is reworded to conserve in line with NPPF terminology. The provisions of strategic Policy ST44: The Historic Environment are welcomed.	The first sentence of para 8.8.8 has been deleted and for consistency with national policy reference will be made to conserve, rather than preserve assets. Paragraph 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 amended appropriately.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 137, para 8.8.2 With a Grade 1 listed parish church in Misterton, and a Grade 2 listed parish church in West Stockwith, the bullet points should include and make reference to all the ancient churches in the District.	Paragraph 8.8.2 amended
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	In order for applicants, developers and agents to assess proposals correctly, particularly with conservation areas then the Council's Conservation Area Appraisals have to be up to date and correct in their understanding of the historical importance of the area. Conservation Area Appraisals require updating frequently as new developments obviously alter the character and setting, input from agents and the private sector for these appraisals should be encouraged.	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 45 - HERITAGE ASSETS			
REF060	Notts County Council	Thorough response to the requirements of the NPPF section 16, however it would be appropriate for point D to include reference to the four tests required by NPPF paragraph 195 to justify substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, otherwise this point is likely to provide inadequate weight to the issue.	Reference to national policy is made in paragraph 8.8.8 of the supporting text. For completeness, reference to national policy provisions will be made in part D but it is not considered appropriate or necessary to repeat national policy in the Local Plan.
REF127	Lincolnshire County Council, Archaeological Planning Advice	Section 8.8 lays out the Council's approach to the Historic Environment, culminating in Policies 44 and 45. This recognises the diverse and important cultural heritage of the District and its contribution to the quality of life, to the character of places/spaces and the important role it plays in community value, culture, identity and well-being. Both policies are entirely consistent with national and local guidance and ensure that the finite archaeological and heritage resources within the District will be conserved/protected in accordance with their significance. It allows for this significance to be assessed appropriately through the planning process and for a regular review of the District's heritage assets to be undertaken (such as conservation area appraisals). It also makes provision for community access and engagement. Both Policies read well, however there is a slight tendency to treat archaeological remains as something different to the historic environment, would hope that all heritage assets are seen as a part of a wider continuum, the legacy of which is our historic environment today in its entirety. Welcome the inclusion of this section and policies in the Draft Local Plan.	Support noted. The approach will be clarified to ensure that archaeology is recognised as part of the historic environment not as a different element.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Plan Area	Care must be taken to protect also the historic areas of Bassetlaw where over time they have lost their physical historical buildings or assets. For example: Scrooby is steeped in historical significance but the buildings (Manor House, etc.) have long since been lost. These areas should be treated in Policy ST45 in the same way as those with remaining physical assets.	These areas are within the Conservation Area, a Scheduled Ancient Monument and in the setting of Listed Buildings so are covered by the contents of these policies. The open space element of the policy, as amended, will also help.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST45. There may be some minor drafting errors that need to be corrected.	Support welcome. Drafting errors will be addressed

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 45 - HERITAGE ASSETS			
REF214	Historic England	Section B relates to enabling development in respect of heritage at risk. Recommended that this section be removed from the policy since it implies a) that such development will be supported and, b) that such development relates to heritage at risk only. The supporting text makes reference to enabling development and it is suggested that that would be sufficient and that any proposals relating to such development could be dealt with through the general heritage asset policy text. Alternatively, a separate part to the policy could be included after the 'archaeological sites' part. Happy to discuss alternative wording if that approach is taken forward. Section D does not differentiate between exceptional and wholly exceptional circumstances set out in the NPPF. Recommended that this section be reworded to reflect the requirements of the NPPF.	Proposed changes have been reflected in Policy 45.
REF197	Resident	i. Worksop – the Railway Hotel appears to have been excluded from the Worksop Plan area – not sure why – this is a part of the view relating to the listed railway station – other buildings in front of the station do not greatly enhance the “Gateway to Worksop” that the railway station provides. The approach to the town centre from the station along Carlton Road could be considered an important part of the future of the town. ii. Retford – there are two properties that appear to be vacant opposite the railway station – one is referred to in Policy 28 – HS12 – there is the opportunity to take a strategic view of the first thing travellers will see of Retford when leaving the station and possibly enhance the practical aspects of traffic approaching the station and turning around and possibly additional car (for electric)/bike parking spaces etc.	<p>Town centre regeneration and environmental enhancement is a key objective of the Local Plan,</p> <p>Key improvements will involve avoiding conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic and making improvements to the environment, physical infrastructure within the town centres. These will be identified through the Worksop Central DPD, the Retford Business Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policies aim to improve the vitality and viability of town centres by supporting redevelopment and diversification of use.</p> <p>This will be helped by the recent changes to the use classes order and making it easier to change the use of commercial buildings to residential.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST46 - PROMOTING HEALTHY, ACTIVE LIFESTYLES			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	Our towpaths provide public access to the Green Infrastructure network, which can promote active lifestyles and benefits to wellbeing. As explained above, 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.2. 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. Welcome the inclusion of towpaths within part B.5. the policy text, which makes it explicit that our network forms part of the wider network of spaces for active leisure, including walking and cycling. 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 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. 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. 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.	<p>Thank you for your comments. Developer contributions are detailed in the Local Plan ST60 Delivering Infrastructure.</p> <p>Moving forward, the Council will continue to work collaboratively with the Canal and River Trust on the production of the Developer Contributions SPD.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST46 - PROMOTING HEALTHY, ACTIVE LIFESTYLES			
1656935	Resident	The current leisure centre in Harworth and Bircotes is simply not fit for purpose. A town of this size deserves a facility that should accommodate the growing population, as well as neighbouring villages. Investment is needed to completely regenerate or provide a new facility as the town continues to grow. Infrastructure is needed to provide more cycle friendly routes on the back of the increases in participation seen in cycling throughout 2020.	Thank you for your comments. Infrastructure provision in the Local Plan can only be sought from site allocations. However, relevant Local Plan policies ensure that other development will make the necessary contributions to improving infrastructure in the district, including Harworth & Bircotes. This could include leisure facilities.
1660972	The British Horse Society	Riding, driving and looking after horses have a considerable physical and mental health benefits to equestrians (Favoli and Milton, 2010; Sung et al, 2015), particularly as a high proportion are mature women who would not otherwise have outdoor activity (Church, 2010). Horse riding and carriage driving should be included in the sustainable travel described in the policy along with cycling and walking. The Active travel agenda includes equestrians. Jesse Norman MP, Parliamentary Under – Secretary of State for Transport in a House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 (1) stated: “We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders.....Horse riders are vulnerable road users—there is no doubt about that, and there never has been—and they have been included in the work we are doing.” New development plans provide opportunities to improve and extend the bridleway and byway network for enjoyment of equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. Safe surfaces and dimensions should be provided for and the BHS has detailed guidance on these crucial matters to ensure all users are included and developers meet requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and associated legislation.	Thank you for your comments. Horse riding has been included in section B5 of the Policy and is also referenced by the Local Plan Sustainable Travel policy ST57.
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	Parish Council members attended the launch of the Plan at the Rural Conference where it was clear that there was a large amount of enthusiasm at Bassetlaw District Council for the proposed Garden Village. While it is recognised that this may be a solution to the increase in housing required in the District it would have been nice to see a similar level of enthusiasm for how the District Council intends to implement policy ST46 to ensure that Bassetlaw’s existing rural villages are future proof, green, vibrant, and viable in the long term. The more cynical members of our community view the Garden Village as a vanity project likely to divert money and resources which could be spent elsewhere in the District.	Thank you for your comments. Policy ST46 applies district-wide so would therefore apply to all new development including in the rural area, and Ranskill. The inclusion of a strategic policy about healthy lifestyles will ensure that residents of new development, irrespective of location, are able to have healthy, active lifestyles.
1658674	D2N2	9.1 Healthy and Active Lifestyle para 9.1.6 in agreement that development should be future-proofed. Covid-19 has exposed both the significant potential to drive up productivity through adoption of digital services and the development of digital skills, but also the potential risks of digital exclusion if infrastructure to enable digital working and learning is not in place.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	The local cycle network is far from adequate for a number of reasons. It is neither joined up, extensive or maintained. In Retford alone, most of the cycle lanes are taken by residential parking. This endangers cyclists further when having to overtake parked cars. The cycle path from Retford to Markham Moor is far too narrow and poorly maintained. Riding a cycle with a child trailer, three wheeler cycle, or anything wider than a normal cycle is incredibly difficult due to the width of the path available. With a little further civis, paths could be widened to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians safely coexisting. In an age where use of the motor vehicle should be discouraged, practical alternatives should be provisioned. A strong and maintained network of cycle paths, connecting the key residential areas of Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick, Langold, Misterton and Tuxford, to the main three towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth should be a major priority for any progressive and green strategic plan. 56% of all car trips in England are less than 5 miles and in a relatively flat region, many of these could be converted to cycle journeys, reducing pollution, congestion and improving general health. A stronger cycle network green infrastructure would encourage people to work and live in the area, as many people are moving away from long commutes. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/729521/national-travel-survey-2017.pdf Some disused railways lines and canal paths could be enhanced or repurposed as commuting and leisure routes, improving the lifestyle and health of local people as	Thank you for comments. The Local Plan ensures that new development is supported by appropriate infrastructure, this includes infrastructure for walking/cycling. The Council will continue to work with organisations such as Sustrans to improve cycling and walking networks across the District.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST46 - PROMOTING HEALTHY, ACTIVE LIFESTYLES			
		well as tourism to the area. NCN 647 (National Cycle Network route) is fragmented and not fit for purpose. The route is not direct and has not been invested in. As a result, it takes in some narrow roads that have 60mph speed limits, as well as some unfinished sections of grass/mud track. (e.g. the route from Tuxford to Fledborough). NCN 6 (National Cycle Network route) is a pretty and quiet route for summer recreational riding and hardened mountain bikers, but is not suitable for normal commuter type cycles, in many places it is muddy and not well maintained. The points 3.27 to 3.31 are little more than a reference to the issue with few real proposals. Shifting to transportation methods such as cycling and walking require adequate infrastructure, such as foot paths and cycle paths. Where developments are planned, adequate off street parking must be provisioned, far too much parking on pavements discourages walking and endangers local residents who are often forced to walk in the roads.	
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	Policy ST46,5 creating high-quality, inclusive environments that incorporate Active Design that increase opportunities for safe walking, cycling and sustainable movement through a network of well-connected sustainable travel routes, public rights of way	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF169	Resident	page 144, para C Great idea to require an RHAM for all schemes of 50+ dwellings.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	Policy ST46,5 creating high-quality, inclusive environments that incorporate Active Design that increase opportunities for safe walking, cycling and sustainable movement through a network of well-connected sustainable travel routes, public rights of way.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF058	Sport England	Health Lifestyle and Policy ST46 – supported	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	As a healthcare provider and commissioner of services welcome the inclusion of the areas identified in the Healthy Communities section of the plan to optimise healthy living opportunities. 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 site where we are already seeing increases in urgent and emergency care attendance levels. There is also 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.	Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work with NHS Bassetlaw CCG to ensure that development appropriately contributes to adverse impacts on primary, community and secondary care services.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This is an important aspect of all our lives and probably one reason why the population is now living longer and enjoying better health into old age. This policy is a major positive aspect when considering the old colliery site at Bevercotes for residential use as opposed to the residential allocations at Cottam and Apleyhead. Bevercotes scores massively on many fronts but of this particular aspect it is hard to envisage a better location.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted. Bevercotes Colliery has planning permission for employment use. Significant environmental constraints exist which mean it is considered inappropriate for a residential allocation. Apleyhead is proposed as an employment allocation not residential, and Cottam is earmarked for regeneration after 2037, as a mixed use development.
1671323	William Davis	The clarification that developments of 50 or more units should use the Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix is welcomed.	Thank you for your comments, your support is noted.
REF170	A&D Architecture	10) Policy ST46 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."	The technical specification of all new multi-use paths is agreed with the Local Highways Authority. This includes ensuring that the speed is appropriate. This is a detailed matter and will form part of the proposals considered at planning application stage.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST48 - DELIVERING QUALITY, ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE			
REF089	Resident	The Spatial Strategy for Retford shows where new housing and employment is to be located but does not show where new parks and extensive tree planting should be located even though they may require planning permission. My suggestion in Retford is for a linear riverside park extending from Ordsall in the south to Kings Park and the town centre and northwards to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve. It would include extensive tree planting as well as paths and cycleway links to adjacent housing areas, schools, the station and the town centre. This would deliver many of the visions and objectives for active travel, healthy life styles, green and blue infrastructure and biodiversity listed in section 4 of the Plan (references listed below). Can this proposal be included in the Local Plan?	New development in Retford will provide for extensive new open space, including a country park and additional open space at Ordsall and new open space at Trinity Farm near Idle Valley which will help provide the north –south green corridor. Both will include tree planting, foot and cyclepaths.
REF173	Resident	Appreciate the re-evaluation of the village in the settlement hierarchy to be separate to that of Worksop; however have a query relating to the Policies Map in relation to the proposed Green Gap at Shireoaks Colliery/Woodlands. Why the colliery pit (excluding open areas fronting Marina Drive) are designated as Green Gap but not 'locally important open space' under the jurisdiction of Policy ST48. They are both. The policy position of a Green Gap here is supported, but wish to ask how this will interrelate in policy with harnessing biodiversity net gain and S106/CIL receipts offset from other development sites. This is after all, not just during the times of COVID, a site that is used by many residents outside of Shireoaks including people of new housing developments locally. The recognition of this site as a locally important open space, as well as a Green Gap, would help target and support the long term future and maintenance of the site as more people increasingly benefit from it.	Areas defined as ‘Green Gap’ have been designated due to their landscape value and so this differs from an ‘open space designation’, as they largely refer to their recreational value. The Council’s Open Space Assessment is periodically reviewed. The Council will take this comment into consideration and will analyse the space accordingly, to judge whether it merits an open space designation. Biodiversity net gain is covered in Policy ST42 Biodiversity and Geodiversity.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST49 - PROMOTING SPORT AND RECREATION			
REF058	Sport England	A previously advised - 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. Does there need to be a similar policy to ST48 for the delivery of sports facilities and playing fields to meet the demands form development. Using the playing pitch demand calculator, Sports facilities calculator and other mechanisms for sports facilities. Based on the evidence in the PPS and Built Sports Facilities Strategy? It is noted that the Hub sites referenced in policy ST49 B1 are indicated on the polices map does this need to be address referenced in the policy. Does there need to be a description of what is intended at the HUB sites? What does a hub site mean? Both are Rugby with other sports? Does there also need to be a link to development to secure investment into these sites. Work is underway to develop the Built Sports Facilities Strategy – Will there be a mechanism to feed in contribution requirements from development to meet need as the report is not yet finalised. How will any indications of new, additional or replacement facility requirements be covered particularly if this requires a land allocation.	The Playing Pitch Strategy and Built Facilities Study will be monitored annually and updated when necessary, possibly alongside a review to the Local Plan. Where there is a need to deliver new facilities as part of a development, then this will form part of the site allocation policy and be included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is liked to developer contributions.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST49 - PROMOTING SPORT AND RECREATION			
REF139	Resident	On the subject of amenities, at the meeting it was mentioned that the Bassetlaw area sadly lacks a number of the leisure facilities that kids look to do, therefore you have to travel outside the area to allow your children to participate. Talking about things like Climbing walls, roller blading / skating rink, skiing facilities (think Xscape at Castleford), trampoline park etc. Mentioned at the meeting, you have Centre Parcs who have their headquarters in Nottinghamshire. They have the expertise in building and running multi-functional leisure facilities under one roof. Tapping into their knowledge and expertise may be invaluable for the development of the amenities. At the moment the Bassetlaw area uses the school sports hall for out of school badminton, short tennis, table tennis etc. But this is not conducive if parents are not participating in the sport as there is nowhere to sit whilst their child plays the sport. Centre Parcs provide the whole environment under one roof – badminton, short tennis, table tennis, climbing wall, roller rink, cafes and places for parents to sit and watch in a comfortable environment.	Thank you for your comments.
REF194	P&DG on behalf of Woodward Schools (Nottinghamshire)	While there is merit in Policy ST49 including school and college sites in the hierarchy of locations to secure and maintain pitches and sports facilities, have concerns with the soundness of designating Policy ST49 across all of the College and ancillary buildings where they cease to apply for the purpose of the protection of sports pitches. The policy should apply to the pitches themselves, and ancillary facilities that may relate to those pitches, and justified by evidence as to their viable use. If they are not used for such purposes, then they should not be allocated as such in the Local Plan. There is a concern that such a designation is too restrictive and prejudices the flexibility of the rest of the site to be considered for other uses in the future.	The Policy reference has been amended to only include those relevant areas of land and buildings that are associated for sport and recreation. The Policies Map has also been amended to reflect the consented use of the land within the College's ownership.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 50 - PROTECTING AMENITY			
REF071	Minerals and Waste, NCC	Policy 50 seeks to protect private amenity and part b of the policy outlines that for proposals adjacent to 'bad neighbours', which includes incinerators and waste sites, that an applicant will need to show the proposed development does not compromise the neighbouring site and any future occupiers of the new development will not have an unacceptable loss of private amenity. As outlined in Policy WSC10 and its supporting text within the Waste Core Strategy, waste facilities are an important part of our infrastructure and so existing and potential future waste sites need to be safeguarded from other types of development, such as housing, which could restrict the facility and potentially sterilise the site. Policy WSC10 though does not seek to restrict development but to take a flexible approach so to accommodate development. For example, taking consideration of any nearby waste management facilities in a site plan layout, which could include using parking or landscaping as a buffer zone from any existing or potential waste use. As per paragraph 182 of the NPPF, it is the applicant (or agent of change) who should be required to provide suitable mitigation as the existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. A reference to the agent of change principle could be included within Policy 50 which would help to safeguard waste facilities and amenity and compliment Policy WCS10.	Policy amended under additional criteria to clarify that where the operation of an existing business or use could have effects on new development the applicant is required to provide suitable mitigation.
REF182	Anglian Water	Supportive of the requirement for new development proposals to demonstrate that they don't have an impact on the on-going use of existing operational sites managed by Anglian Water. This is relevant to our existing water treatment works in the district which are operated on a continuous basis to supply water to our customers.	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 50 - PROTECTING AMENITY			
REF170	A&D Architecture	11) Policies 50 and ST53 should be modified to prevent inappropriate development control of the layouts of Park Home static caravan site development proposals. Compliance by Park Home static caravan site operators with model standards published by central government and license conditions imposed by the Council sufficiently safeguard residential amenity inside Park Home static caravans sites. A new sub-section C (Policy 50) and D (policy ST53) should be added as follows: Policy 50: "C In the unique case of Park Home static caravan development proposals the Council will be satisfied that residential amenity inside the Park Home site itself is safeguarded if license conditions imposed by the Council state that the layout shall conform to model standards published by Central Government"	It is considered that Policy 50 as well as other policies in the Plan including design provide sufficient protection to safeguard the residential amenity including that for caravan park development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy 51 - CONTAMINATED AND UNSTABLE LAND			
REF003	Canal & River Trust	Welcome consideration given to the need for development to address land at risk of contamination or being unstable. Development upon contaminated or unstable land in proximity to our waterways could subject them to contamination or structural damage, which could threaten the ability of our network to provide a resource for the local community. Account for these hazards in the Local Policy would help protect our network, and help make the Local Plan more effective in meeting the aims of paragraph 180 from the NPPF.	Reference to likely adverse effect upon the waterways has been included in the Policy.
1664136	The Coal Authority	Support the inclusion of this policy which requires the risks posed by unstable land to be addressed.	Support noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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. The Boards 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 District 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. Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board (TVIDB) covers an area of low-lying land from the west of Gainsborough, straddling the River Trent and its tributaries, down to the south of Nottingham, a total of 44,093ha. The Board maintains 778km of watercourse and operates 18 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced. The Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board covers an area of 28,737ha running from the Ouse following the west bank of the Trent moving south west down to Markham Moor. The Board maintains 450km of watercourse and operate 20 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced. Responsibilities of both Internal Drainage Boards. The Boards have permissive powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to exercise general supervision over all matters relating to the drainage of land within the Boards' district. The Boards also have such other powers to perform such other duties as conferred or imposed on internal drainage boards by this act. The Boards' Byelaws and the Land Drainage Act 1991 allow the Board to take action to ensure that the free flow of water is not restricted. Board maintained watercourses are cleaned out annually and it is important that access is preserved for machinery to enable this work to be undertaken. The Boards' Byelaws prevent the erection of any building, structure (whether temporary or permanent) or planting of trees/shrubs etc. within nine metres either side of a Board maintained watercourse. Responsibility for maintaining all other watercourses generally falls upon the riparian owner(s) unless it is a main river, which is the responsibility of the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The requirement for drainage design to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall has been added to part 3 of the policy criteria.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
REF116	id Planning, Lidl (Great Britain)	<p>Policy ST52 sets out a range of criteria seeking to ensure that consideration is given to how new developments will reduce carbon emissions, and mitigate against and adapt to the impacts of climate change through design by demonstrating they have considered a number of broad aspects. Recognises the need to ensure development is sustainable and adaptable and therefore supports the general thrust of Policy ST52 which accords with the aspirations of the NPPF (2019) in meeting the challenges of climate change. Welcomes amendments made to the previous wording of the policy (was Policy ST45) and criterion (d) which required that all commercial developments made provision for at least 25% of their available spaces for visitor and commercial parking to be fully fitted with electric charging points. This requirement has been removed from the policy wording in the latest Draft Plan. In this context Policy ST52 no longer requires a specific percentage (%) to be provided but that all new developments include the provision for electric charging capability, including the provision for electric vehicle charging infrastructure on new developments (criterion 1(d)). This ensures the matter is given consideration and some provision is made. Lidl include EV charging space provision on all their new development sites and therefore support the principle of what the policy seeks to achieve. However still has concerns with regard to what is now criterion (c) within part (1) of Policy ST52 (formerly criterion 1[f] of Policy ST45). The policy still seeks as follows:</p> <p>1. (c) Requiring non-residential development of 1,000sqm or more to meet BREEAM very good-excellent standards....</p> <p>Criterion (1)(f) of Policy ST52 continues to provide little flexibility in the application of BREEAM and the potential to adopt other measures demonstrating that sustainable development can be achieved. For example, a number of new office and employment buildings are often designed to be EPC 'A' rated. That and other measures are available in the construction sector to ensure that sustainable buildings are constructed. BREEAM provides an arbitrary checklist approach which is not always successful in achieving a sustainable development outcome and which can sometimes inadvertently set unachievable standards for development sites of varying characteristics. For example, sites with little in the way of existing ecology or indeed a site which was cleared for a variety of reasons prior to development being promoted, may be unable to score points associated with an area such as ecological mitigation and subsequently cannot meet the required BREEAM standards. As highlighted above there are other measures that can be used to ensure a sustainable building is constructed with the climate change agenda taken into account. Consider Policy ST52 (1)(c) is too prescriptive in its mandatory requirement for BREEAM without consideration of any possible sustainable design alternatives such as EPC ratings or other design measures which equally will secure sustainable design and development. The policy does not provide any flexibility in criterion (1)(c) for scenarios where delivery of BREEAM or other sustainable design standards are not viable. The policy does not go far enough to ensure that development is deliverable under its application. Requests that greater flexibility is incorporated into Policy SP52 to allow for consideration of other alternative sustainable design measures to be provided by development and to ensure that the plan is successful in allowing development to be deliverable. As previously, we suggest that criterion (1)(c) is amended as below: "Requiring non-residential development of 1,000sqm or more to meet BREEAM very good-excellent standards or equivalent". The proposed amendments to Policy SP52 criteria (1)(c) would ensure consistency with the NPPF (2019) by adopting a sustainable but deliverable approach (paragraph 16) which is effective (paragraph 35) in ensuring the delivery of development.</p>	Policy ST52 1(c) has been amended to include "or equivalent" after BREEAM very good-excellent standards to take into account any update or change in legislation through the Plan period.
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	Page 157, Para 2. B), i. - 5 trees per new dwelling built is welcomed	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Plan does not appear to make a firm requirement that all future developments over a certain number MUST be of dwellings that of the highest standards of environmentally friendly construction and are designed to make full use of low carbon energy sources. If the UK Govt is serious about Carbon neutral targets, then our houses for future generations must be constructed and fitted out in such a way. Being Carbon Neutral is the future and this is a Local Plan for the Future.</p> <p>Section 14 of the NPPF 2019 (p 44) advises this: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change¹⁴⁸.</p> <p>“The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.” The NPPF goes on to say - To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should:</p> <p>a) provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development, while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily (including cumulative landscape and visual impacts). b) consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development; and c) identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable, or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers Local planning authorities should support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy, including developments outside areas identified in local plans or other strategic policies that are being taken forward through neighbourhood planning. The only known about low carbon energy is that it gets cheaper and cheaper each years. New analysis from Bloomberg New Energy Finance suggests that from 2022, the cost of electric cars will start to drop below that of internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles. Government policy commits us to a low emission vehicle future, but the local plan fails to address provision of EV charging at domestic or community level. Another example is solar power. The material cost of a solar array on a new home is less than £2,000 (with costs falling by 20% each year). Solar presents a limited cost difference to developers but can reduce a domestic electricity bill by up to 50% and over 25 years - reducing energy poverty and carbon emissions across the District. The lowest cost time to install solar is on new homes is when they are being built as labour and scaffolding are provided. The Plan must be ready for these technologies. Even if we debate whether low carbon measures are good investments today, we know they will be valuable in the life of the Plan. The Plan must force developers, looking to save a few quid today, to at least look at new technology and present evidence of their merit to planners. Suggested changes to the plan request the following alterations: - Bassetlaw District Council explicitly recognise in the Plan that “low carbon technologies including solar, heat pumps and electric vehicles are expected to proliferate during the life of this Plan and the Council shall take all reasonable measures in planning and standards to ensure these technologies are available to all local resident - Although we recognise that the Council may not be able to mandate low carbon technology all homes, in accordance with NPPF Section 14 they can request that: - In planning applications, developers must provide evidence of their consideration of installing the decarbonised heat, EV charging and solar panel on their homes. This must include their analysis of the marginal costs of installing the technology .Our contract with Veolia for recycling evokes feelings of frustration and disdain amongst residents. The lack of viable recycling for residents is evidenced by Bassetlaw having some of the lowest recycling rates in the country. Houses in multiple occupation presently have poor or no recycling facilities. Residents at the Mill Bridge Close Development in Retford have raised concerns for a number of years that no recycling is provided. The Veolia contract has failed to provide meaningful recycling with inadequate or unclear information given to residents. Recently just one recycling bin for the development of over 40 houses was provided and not clearly identified for recycling. The Veolia contract has failed Bassetlaw.</p>	<p>Policy ST52 and Policy ST53 are intrinsically linked to the most up to date Government standards and guidance on renewable energy, energy standards and on mitigating and adapting to climate change. The Plan supports the use of appropriate low carbon and renewable technologies within developments. There is a cross-over between what planning policy can deliver and the required building control standards. The Local Plan proposes a transition towards low carbon technology and renewable energy generation through the inclusion of government standards, but also by allocating a large site for those uses at the Former High Marnham Power Station site. New larger developments such as the Bassetlaw Garden Village is proposing higher than usual urban design standards that take into account of the latest sustainable planning principles, at the time of construction. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates the type of measures that can be accommodated within the District as part of a viable scheme. The Plan also requires new developments to provide the necessary connection infrastructure so all properties have the capability of charging an electric vehicle. Waste recycling and their standards are dealt with by Nottinghamshire County Council and via their Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
		The Local Plan makes little mention of recycling provision. It must set targets and/or aspirations for recycling which we can hold our present and future suppliers to.	
REF153	Natural England	Welcome this paragraph which explains that tree planting should be carried out and managed in a coordinated way to complement and positively contribute to the Nature Recovery Network. Would emphasise that tree planting projects should consider the “right trees in the right places”, i.e. that appropriate native tree species need to be selected that enhance existing habitats. Pleased to note that integrated water management has been mentioned in this paragraph and draw attention to the guidance recently issued by CIRIA (link above). Natural England welcomes point 2f which aims to mitigate against the impacts of Climate Change by reducing the impact of climate change on biodiversity and the natural environment by providing space for habitats and species to move through the landscape and for the operation of natural processes. Add that Nature-Based Solutions would be some of the most beneficial methods to achieve energy efficiency and climate change adaptation, for example shade from street trees can deliver cooling and surface water management; green walls can contribute to temperature control. Suggest that all opportunities should be taken to encourage natural techniques over traditional hard engineering/infrastructure solutions (i.e. greening the grey).	References to native trees have been added to the supporting text and Policy ST52. References to urban greening methods have been added to the supporting text and policy ST52. This will include issues like nature based solutions and green walls and roofs. A reference to ‘natural based solutions’ has been included within the supporting text to Policy ST52.
REF175	Resident	Hopefully all the new estates will have the necessary infrastructure to enable the charging of electric vehicles and alternative fuel/smart technologies which is not mentioned in the Ordsall South policy. People will need to be able to charge their low emission vehicles in the evenings and off-peak times which will be cheaper and more convenient.	Where appropriate, all new development (residential and commercial) will be required to provide the necessary infrastructure to support the use of electric vehicle charging through Policy ST52.
REF182	Anglian Water	Policy ST52 refers to developments being required to minimise water consumption by meeting the optional requirement of 110 litres/per person/per day. Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England 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. Fully support the inclusion of this standard in the policy. 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 using integrated water management to manage (surface water) run off and provide a non- potable water supply as this will help to reduce demand on existing water supply.	Thank you for your comments.
REF197	Resident	There is little mention of bringing existing housing stock up to the standards outlined – e.g. insulation, solar power, permeable driveways etc – incentives and support to promote awareness etc of UK government funding etc may be beneficial. Does there need to be a bolder approach with charging points in public car parks – the more charging available the more the fear of electric may subside. Should there be initiatives to promote the use of smaller cars in town centres (e.g. differential parking charges, special car parks for smaller cars etc) – rather than trying to promote multi-passenger journeys - every year the cars seem to get bigger taking up more space on the roads and in the car parks. There does not appear to be anything about plastic use, deposits on bottles, aluminium cans etc etc. Many items which are defined as “widely recyclable” are not accepted in the blue bin recycling scheme at the moment – will there be a wider inclusion in the future? Water efficiency – is there a need for some joined-up actions? – on the one hand, Bassetlaw is at risk of drought, on the other, it is at risk of flooding. Would a reservoir or two be the answer?	The Local Plan supports the appropriate use of renewable energy technologies on new and within existing developments. Existing properties will need to adapt and reduce their carbon emissions if the UK is to achieve its overall ambition to reduce carbon emissions to net zero. Proposals for all renewable energy schemes large or small will be considered alongside relevant national and local planning policies. Water efficiency is covered by Policy ST52.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST52- REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS, CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION			
REF201	Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy ST52 to incorporate: • water efficiency measures within development that meet with the 110 l/h/d or BREEAM for not residential development; • Green spaces and infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of climate change; • Surface water management systems that help to mitigate increases in flood risk. Would recommend highlighting these approaches both strategically so that they will be applied to all development not just the allocation, but also detailed within specific development policies to ensure that developers are aware of the need to meet these requirements.	Thank you for your comments.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST52.	Thank you for your comments.
1670869	Resident	it is disappointing to see that Para A under this policy uses the word 'considers' - as a society, nation and district we must be more ambitious than this, and require all and any new developments to minimise carbon foot print, mitigate for and adapt to climate change...	The word 'consider' has been replaced with 'demonstrate'.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This is to be welcomed and should be a major consideration when sites for major development are considered such as Cottam and Apleyhead allocations. Vehicles and Electric Charging Points This is to be welcomed but government directives and market forces are already changing the type of private vehicles on our roads. In 2020 total car registrations to date and in operation are:- 903,961 petrol engine cars 261,772 diesel engine cars 357,126 hybrid engine cars 108,205 fully electric cars Within the above new car registrations were:- 58,494 petrol engine cars 15,813 diesel engine cars 36,461 hybrid engine cars 21,914 fully electric cars The above figures are from the SMMT website and it is clear that the percentage of electric and hybrid cars purchased, registered and used is now over 43% of total car sales for the year 2020. This fact in itself is a clear indication that the reliance upon the motor vehicle in the future will not be looked on as unsustainable. Pollution from the private car will be a thing from the past and zero carbon vehicles will become the norm. More and more electricity is being generated in sustainable ways. All new homes now are to be fitted with charging points or at least the infrastructure to accommodate one, charging points are becoming easier and less costly to install and electric vehicles are becoming more affordable, user friendly and so much better designed. This move forward by others will mean local authorities should be able to consider better locations for us all to live as opposed to directing us to existing towns or sites adjacent to major highways and railways and adjacent to working power stations with all the associated pylons, cables, transformers etc.	Thank you for your comments. The requirement to provide infrastructure to enable connectivity for electric vehicles is identified by Policy ST52.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	Suggest that for all of the above policies consideration must be given throughout the policy wording to the specific conditions and limitations presented within rural Bassetlaw to deliver the means of the policy requirements via conventional means. Heritage and landscape constraints are just two of the potential reasons. It is suggested that all three policies must be written subject to the proof that they can be viably and practically delivered in the specific context of the proposals concerned. There must be an ability in the policy wording for the applicant to demonstrate if such conditions are unsuitable to deliver the policy aspirations (in part or full).	Policy ST52 requires that applicants demonstrate that they have considered the criteria in the policy. Therefore should the applicant consider that the provisions of the policy are not practical or economically viable an alternative approach can be considered. This would include for heritage or landscape reasons.
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	Support the principles set out in the above policies and highlight the benefits regeneration of Bevercotes Colliery as a circular economy, green enterprise zone could deliver within Bassetlaw. Further information is provided within the Vision Document at Appendix 1. Furthermore, the historic colliery use of the site presents an opportunity to restore economic value to the area alongside provision of a scheme which provides renewable and low carbon energy creation benefitting both the site and the wider area. Indeed, the proposed scheme will create a circular economy where all applicable forms of renewable energy will be utilised on site while delivering a wider, green economy and infrastructure supporting sustainable modes of travel.	Thank you for your comments. Bevercotes Colliery has planning permission for employment development. Proposals consistent with that permission will be acceptable.
1671323	William Davis	The policy is broadly supported. Policy 1 d requires that all new developments make provision for electric charging capability with paragraph 10.1.12 setting out that this means providing the ability to connect charging infrastructure in the future. This approach is supported as it will allow residents to choose the charging equipment which suits their vehicle.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST53 - RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY GENERATION			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	With its interest in 'green' issues, Misterton Parish Council feels that there should be an imperative for developers to use solar roof tiles, or solar panels at the very least. And that buildings should be orientated so that they maximise the opportunity to use solar power.	The use of renewable energy technology within new buildings or the retrofitting of existing buildings will be supported where it complies with other relevant planning policies. The Local Plan also supports the development of appropriate community renewable energy schemes.
REF146	Elkesley Neighbourhood Plan Group	Under Policy ST53 is there the potential to use solar panels as sound barriers alongside Elkesley and other communities that run alongside the A1 – as is often seen in European countries.	The use of renewable energy technology will be supported where it complies with other relevant policies within local and national planning policy.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	Under Policy ST53 we would like to see the potential to use solar panels as sound barriers alongside Elkesley and other communities that run alongside the A1 utilised as is often seen in European countries	The use of renewable energy technology will be supported where it complies with other relevant policies within local and national planning policy.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST53.	Thank you for your comments.
REF024	Resident	With regards to West Burton surely the best solution would be a desulphurisation plant that burns household waste to generate electricity. This would stop a percentage of waste going to landfill, be good for the environment, keep people in work and keep the site in use to generate electricity for which it was built for.	Thank you for your comments.
REF044	Resident	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. 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 at West Burton 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.	Planning will play its part in helping the Country become net zero by 2050. The Local Plan allocates a Green Energy Hub at the former High Marnham Power Station. This site has the opportunity to produce renewable energy and provide a circular economy for businesses on the site and beyond. In addition, new development is encouraged to incorporate appropriate renewable energy technologies within schemes to reduce carbon emissions and create a more sustainable development. This includes the use of more sustainable construction materials and the reduction of water use.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	With my interest in 'green' issues, I feel that there should be an imperative for developers to use solar roof tiles, or solar panels at the very least. And that buildings should be orientated so that they maximise the opportunity to use solar power.	The use of renewable energy technology within new buildings or the retrofitting of existing buildings will be supported where it complies with other relevant planning policies. The Local Plan also supports the development of appropriate community renewable energy schemes. In addition, developers are encouraged to use sustainable and low carbon construction materials within the developments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST53 - RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY GENERATION			
REF162	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Seems to me everyone's looking at the housing side to this local plan, when we get more housing it will create more household waste. So could we please look at the West Burton power station site maybe to work with the energy producers and have a state of the art waste incinerator put on the site. Advantages are incinerating general waste, production of electricity directly into the national grid. Direct rail and road links already in place. Creating energy from household waste produced in Bassetlaw. Creating jobs for local residents. This is one way to invest in Bassetlaw for the future. It's a site fit for purpose.	The site has not been considered within this Local Plan as it is not considered available for development. However, if the site becomes available in the future, then this can be considered for regeneration within a review of this Local Plan.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This is a very technical area and it is hoped that the Council has experts that can guide and assist and of course consider proposals brought forward. Within Bassetlaw we have examples of wind and solar energy generation, together with at least 2 AD Plants, these latter 2 operations utilising energy crops and also vegetable and fruit waste, products that would otherwise either not be grown or sent to landfill.	Thank you for your comments.
REF224	Sheffield City Region	The Draft Plan sets out ambitious proposals for growth in both housing and employment for Bassetlaw which will complement those of South Yorkshire. In particular, the MCA and LEP welcome the Draft Plan's emphasis on new and developing opportunities such as renewable energies and low carbon technologies, reflecting themes in the new South Yorkshire SEP. Proposals for a new Garden Village in the Draft Plan as well as the Renewable Energy Hub are also supported. These are exactly the type of innovation needed to help close the divide between north and south and level up our areas.	Support for the spatial strategy and the emphasis on developing renewable energies and low carbon technologies, including at the Garden Village are welcome.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	P&DG suggest that for all of the above policies consideration must be given throughout the policy wording to the specific conditions and limitations presented within rural Bassetlaw to deliver the means of the policy requirements via conventional means. Heritage and landscape constraints are just two of the potential reasons. It is suggested that all three policies must be written subject to the proof that they can be viably and practically delivered in the specific context of the proposals concerned. There must be an ability in the policy wording for the applicant to demonstrate if such conditions are unsuitable to deliver the policy aspirations (in part or full).	Any proposal for renewable energy technology will be subject to other relevant planning policies but the Plan does not require renewable energy to be provided as part of new development. Point 3 ensures adverse impacts including for heritage or landscape reasons should be taken into account.
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	Support the principles set out in the above policies and highlight the benefits regeneration of Bevercotes Colliery as a circular economy, green enterprise zone could deliver within Bassetlaw. Further information is provided within the Vision Document at Appendix 1. Furthermore, the historic colliery use of the site presents an opportunity to restore economic value to the area alongside provision of a scheme which provides renewable and low carbon energy creation benefitting both the site and the wider area. Indeed, the proposed scheme will create a circular economy where all applicable forms of renewable energy will be utilised on site while delivering a wider, green economy and infrastructure supporting sustainable modes of travel.	Thank you for your comments.
REF170	A&D Architecture	Policies 50 and ST53 should be modified to prevent inappropriate development control of the layouts of Park Home static caravan site development proposals. Compliance by Park Home static caravan site operators with model standards published by central government and license conditions imposed by the Council sufficiently safeguard residential amenity inside Park Home static caravan sites. A new sub-section C (Policy 50) and D (policy ST53) should be added as follows: Policy ST53: "D In the unique case of Park Home static caravan development proposals the Council will be satisfied that residential amenity inside the Park Home site itself is safeguarded if license conditions imposed by the Council state that the layout shall conform to model standards published by Central Government".	It is considered that Policy 50 as well as other policies in the Plan including design provide sufficient protection to safeguard the residential amenity including that for caravan park development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF018	Resident	<p>live in East Markham and I grew up here as a child. I am dismayed at the state of property and infrastructure development in our village. During 2020 we have had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raw sewage flowing across multiple streets (Askham Road, High Street, Low Street). This is caused by inadequate combined sewage and highway drainage which fail several times per year • raw sewage erupting in multiple private gardens, by forcing up residential manhole covers in Low Street • persistent foul drain smells around High Street/ Askham Road. This is caused by pumping raw sewage up from Markham Moor into the combined sewage and highway drainage pipes • repeated flooding of business premises on Askham Road – three times year to date • immediate sewage/ drainage problems being reported with new build homes on High Street (the Pinfold Development) • the ongoing closure of Priestgate, meaning that Askham Road and Beckland Hill represent the only 2-way vehicular access to the village • extensive building works on Askham Road causing traffic chaos and safety issues opposite the primary school • extensive building works on Beckland Hill causing gridlock on this street. Gridlock was previously unheard of in our village • blocking of pavements/ destruction of grass verges and road surface on Farm Lane and Church Street caused by construction vehicles seeking off street parking • innumerate blocked drains (Lincoln Road, Church Street, York Street, Beckland Hill) caused by the extensive building work in the village and absence of proper clearance by Bassetlaw/ Notts CC/ Severn Trent • repeated road closures across the village – Church Street, Farm Lane, Beckland Hill, Hall Lane • residential properties flooding in Great Lane and Low Street • residential gardens flooding – Great Lane, Low Street, Lincoln Road, Beckland Hill • standing water on multiple roads- High Street, York Street, Great Lane <p>About 100 additional houses are under construction/ have planning consent. We do not even know how much they will worsen the already fragile situation. Our community cannot understand why more and more residential consents continue to be granted when so much is going wrong in this village already. Bassetlaw is giving no effective consideration as to what the cumulative effect of all this construction work is. Put frankly, our roads, drains and sewers cannot cope. Concreting over green spaces and placing ever more demands on the inadequate drainage system is a recipe for disaster. Bassetlaw's action on increasing the housing stock and inaction regarding the inadequate infrastructure is directly worsening all of the above. I ask that no further building consents are granted until the above matters are properly attended to.</p>	<p>The prevention of flooding is an important issue. Where development contributes towards the risk of flooding or drainage issues within communities across Bassetlaw. However, the Bassetlaw Local Plan doesn't allocated development sites within East Markham so there are no localised policy recommendations for the village. Where there is a flooding or drainage issue, developments will be subject to National Planning Policy requirements and those identified within Local Plan Policy ST54.</p> <p>Within East Markham, if a flood risk or drainage issue is identified, then planning applications will be subject to consultation with statutory stakeholders such as the Environment Agency. These stakeholders will, if relevant, will provide a detailed response to the District Council. These will then be considered along with other responses during the decision making stage of the process.</p>
1671182 submission inc. pictures	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Thank you for your unstinting efforts in compiling this Local Plan, and seeking the comments of residents and interested bodies. I write here about S54, and the evidences used to support it.</p> <p>ST54 All development proposals are required to consider and, where necessary, address the effect of the proposed development on flood risk, on-site and off-site, commensurate with the scale and impact of the development. Proposals, including change of use applications, must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (where appropriate), to demonstrate that the development, including the access, will be safe, without increasing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall;</p> <p>The Plan is further informed by Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Progress Update 1</p> <p>In the update on the Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment November 2020, JBA Consultants define various Levels of Flood Risk Assessment. Five of the six Retford developments identified in the Plan table</p>	<p>The Local Plan has prepared several Flood Risk Assessments that identify current flooding issues and recommendations for proposed planning policy or any allocated site that is identified within an area at risk from flooding. However, the Local Plan can only deal with the implications/issues that arise from its proposed growth and any identified locations it seeks to allocate. Where development does, or is likely to have, an impact on flooding or drainage, then Policy recommendations are included within the relevant areas – including Retford.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
		<p>(2-1) are seen to require a Level 2 Assessment. This is detailed here – Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Since 2018, new information on flooding and flood risk has become available and the District was affected by severe flooding in November 2019. The flooding particularly affected Worksop, Retford, Shireoaks and Rhodesia. The County Council flood investigations for these Retford locations are available here.</p> <p>New river models are now available for the River Idle at Retford (Environment Agency) and Retford Beck (Bassetlaw District Council).</p> <p>The Environment Agency are currently updating the model of the River Ryton in Worksop which should be available in early 2021. JBA Consulting are currently preparing a Level 2 SFRA for the relevant sites identified in Table 2-1.</p> <p>The Level 2 SFRA assessment of sites will assess variations in flood risk across the proposed site allocations, identifying site-specific Flood Risk Assessment requirements and helping guide local policies to ensure sustainable development as well as seeking opportunities through new development to reduce flood risk to existing communities. The Level 2 SFRA will also include a broad scale assessment of suitable Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) options, providing an indication of where there may be constraints to certain sets of SuDS techniques. Sites have been identified as requiring Level 2 SFRA where they are located in the Environment Agency's Flood Zones, adjacent to an Ordinary Watercourse and/or have significant surface water flood risk.</p> <p>The Level 2 SFRA will provide further information to Bassetlaw District Council about the nature of the flood risk to each site and the degree of mitigation and drainage work that would be needed to ensure that the development was safe to occupy and would not increase flood risk elsewhere. Where residential sites are proposed in Flood Zone 3 it will provide the evidence needed to inform the Exception Test. It will enable the District Council to make a decision regarding which sites, or parts of sites are at the greatest risk of flooding and what, if any, mitigation is required to support their development. This will then inform the emerging planning policy for the site or area and the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Level 2 Assessments will be available in early 2021.</p> <p>The note finishes with - What developers should do for now? And says this: For any sites coming through in the interim period, developers should refer to Section 10, 11 and 13 of the Level 1 SFRA. They should contact: •The Environment Agency to obtain the latest modelling for the River Idle in Retford if the site is likely to be affected by it; •Bassetlaw District Council to obtain the latest modelling for the Retford Beck in Retford if the site is likely to be affected by it. The models should be used to inform the site-specific Flood Risk Assessments.</p> <p>In the meanwhile, Darrel Road and particularly Blackstope Lane areas of Retford flood relatively regularly, and there's sometimes a requirement for those residents to leave their homes, and always a requirement to repair and renew after each episode. The Environment Agency will provide emergency on-site pumps to alleviate some of the problems, but in certain areas flood water and sewage become mixed. Large areas of the Retford Town Centre are sometimes just a few inches away from a severe (2007 type) flood.</p> <p>The NCC Report paper (11 pages Section 19 Appendix D) identified the following responsibilities in connection with the Nov 2019 flood and follow up actions – Environment Agency a). The Environment Agency carries out maintenance, improvement or construction work on main rivers (Retford Beck) to manage flood risk. b). They have a duty as a Category one responder under the Civil Contingencies Act. This means they must have plans in place to respond to emergencies and control or reduce the impact of an emergency.</p> <p>Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board a) Internal Drainage Boards are independent public bodies responsible for managing water levels in low-</p>	<p>The Environment Agency, drainage boards and the Lead Flood Authority – Nottinghamshire County Council are responsible for more strategic flooding issues and wider flood prevention measures.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
		<p>lying areas. They are the land drainage authority within their districts and their functions include supervising land drainage and flood defence works on ordinary watercourses (Carr Dyke).</p> <p>b)They hold the powers in Section 25 Land Drainage Act 1991 to require works to maintain a proper flow of water in ordinary watercourses in internal drainage district.</p> <p>So here we are today, 14 months on from November 2019, and these were the promised actions, the Report said this -The Environment Agency will</p> <p>a) Continue to progress the proposals for improvements to the Retford Beck and endeavour to secure funding for a flood risk management scheme.</p> <p>b) Review their Communications and Engagement Plan, including pro-active communications with the community to help them better understand risk management authority responsibilities, maintenance activities and mitigation taking place in the area.</p> <p>c) Review current Environment Agency maintenance schedules.</p> <p>d) Review screen design at Grove Lane.</p> <p>e) Complete bathymetric survey on the River Idle to inform future maintenance.</p> <p>And: The Internal Drainage Board will be reviewing ways of improving the operation of the Carr Dyke and its interaction with the River Idle to reduce the risk of future flooding. These pictures from the NCC report.</p> <p>Unfortunately there is still no strategic plan for Retford to ensure that the Idle levels remain at such a height that will allow the Retford Beck and Carr Dyke to discharge naturally and quickly into the Idle. Only local pumps or strategic mitigation will resolve these flood issues, which are now happening on a frequent basis. In the current Plan it doesn't clearly state what I (and many West Ward residents who have contacted me) believe must happen –all new builds identified in the Local Plan should take place with a significant financial contribution specifically for improvements to the Idle watercourse around Retford, because every one of those new builds will add to the already 'full after rain' River Idle.</p> <p>Various strategies are identified in some other worthy evidence in support of ST54, including clear advice from NPPF and others about how to mitigate rising water levels, our Plan needs to clearly state that these steps WILL be taken and paid for by future development, because Worksop Town Centre, Retford Town Centre and numerous locations elsewhere across the District will be regularly flooded by the time the plan comes to completion – we must plan now to work on the Idle and its tributaries for what will be in 20 years time.</p> <p>The Evidence document and map showing the watercourses across Retford illustrate the problem well, in conjunction with the maps provided within the NCC report. Both the minor waterways (the Beck and Carr Dyke) are naturally in low lying areas, and if the outlet (the Idle) is higher than the drain, back filling will occur and no 'flow' can take place. Unless both of these drains have pumped outlets in times of stress, the flood threat will remain. There remains another alternative involving the permitted flooding of historic floodplains – this too would work over large sections of the Idle Valley. In particular the area close to the Ordsall South plan, where several lakes form on a regular basis, and also the very low quality semi flooded land around Blackstope and Bracken Lane which contributes to the perennial Beck problems. Lakes by design at all these locations will ensure the buiding of new houses will not adversely affect the eco-system. It will also enhance ST46 Healthy Lifestyles if these lake perimeters are used for footpath and cycle routes where appropriate, and of course ST41 the Green/Blue balance will be well served by the creation of wetland type environments. Another lengthy Retford section of Idle valley between the river and Bolham Lane would also give the land back to nature if it was to be sensitively flooded and a Wetland/lake created. It is not possible to build on that land, and the current state of most of it is deplorable. A large managed lake close to Retford Town centre would be an enormous wellbeing and tourist asset.</p> <p>All this can take place in accordance with Environment Agency and NPPF guidlelignes as referenced in Evidence to the Plan, and should be included and routinely applied to any further new builds</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
		<p>developments consisting of 10 or more dwellings.</p> <p>These strategies are detailed in the guidelines – extracts here:</p> <p>All new development close to rivers should consider the opportunity presented to improve and enhance the river environment. Developments should look at opportunities for river restoration and enhancement as part of the development. Options include backwater creation, de-silting, in channel habitat enhancement and removal of structures. When designed properly, such measures can have benefits such as reducing the costs of maintaining hard engineering structures, reducing flood risk, improving water quality and increasing biodiversity. Social benefits are also gained by increasing green space and access to the river.</p> <p>FLOOD STORAGE. Flood storage schemes aim to reduce the flows passed downriver to mitigate downstream flooding. Development increases the impermeable area within a catchment, creating additional and faster runoff into watercourses. Flood storage schemes aim to detain this additional runoff, releasing it downstream at a slower rate, to avoid any increase in flood depths and/or frequency downstream.</p> <p>Methods to provide these schemes include: enlarging the river channel; raising the riverbanks; and/or constructing flood banks set back from the river.</p> <p>The construction of new upstream storage schemes as part of upstream catchment-based approaches within Bassetlaw district would provide one potential strategic solution to flood risk. Watercourses which are rural in their upper reaches but have high levels of flood risk to urban areas in the downstream reaches are potential candidates, as the open land in the upper reaches can potentially provide the space for an attenuation area, providing benefit to the urban area downstream.</p> <p>CATCHMENT AND FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION. Compared to flood defences and flood storage, floodplain restoration represents the most sustainable form of strategic flood risk solution, by allowing watercourses to return to a more naturalised state, and by creating space for naturally functioning floodplains working with natural processes. Although the restoration of floodplain is difficult in previously developed areas where development cannot be rolled back, the following measures should be adopted: Promoting existing and future brownfield sites that are adjacent to watercourses to naturalise banks as much as possible. Buffer areas around watercourses provide an opportunity to restore parts of the floodplain.</p> <p>Removal of redundant structures to reconnect the watercourse and the floodplain. There are a number of culverted sections of watercourse located throughout the district which if returned to a more natural state would potentially reduce flood risk to the local area.</p> <p>The Plan needs to be revised to show that all of these options are suitable for Bassetlaw, and all developments (of 10 or more dwellings) as they reach 25% of target will have to make a financial contribution to a dedicated Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Resilience fund.</p> <p>I submit this in my capacity as a Bassetlaw District Councillor for West Ward Retford, having listened to the views and comments of Ward residents.</p>	
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Under item A. New point suggest #4.</p> <p>That new developments should refer to local parish councils for consultation relating to local concerns and historic flooding or drainage problems.</p> <p>In areas where existing drainage systems are old or inadequate, especially where sewage and rainwater share the same pipework, that new developments are only sanctioned where additional or enlarged drainage systems are provided by the developer and/or waste-water company. E.g. Severn Trent.</p>	Parish Councils are already a consultee for planning applications within their areas. In addition, where a flooding or drainage constraint is identified through a proposed development, then the relevant flooding and water authorities are also subject to consultation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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.</p> <p>The Boards 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.</p> <p>Bassetlaw District Council 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.</p> <p>Overview of Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board</p> <p>Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board (TVIDB) covers an area of low-lying land from the west of Gainsborough, straddling the River Trent and its tributaries, down to the south of Nottingham, a total of 44,093ha. The Board maintains 778km of watercourse and operates 18 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced.</p> <p>Overview of Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board</p> <p>The Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board covers an area of 28,737ha running from the Ouse following the west bank of the Trent moving south west down to Markham Moor. The Board maintains 450km of watercourse and operate 20 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced.</p> <p>Responsibilities of both Internal Drainage Boards</p> <p>The Boards have permissive powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to exercise general supervision over all matters relating to the drainage of land within the Boards' district. The Boards also have such other powers to perform such other duties as conferred or imposed on internal drainage boards by this act. The Boards' Byelaws and the Land Drainage Act 1991 allow the Board to take action to ensure that the free flow of water is not restricted.</p> <p>Board maintained watercourses are cleaned out annually and it is important that access is preserved for machinery to enable this work to be undertaken. The Boards' Byelaws prevent the erection of any building, structure (whether temporary or permanent) or planting of trees/shrubs etc. within nine metres either side of a Board maintained watercourse. Responsibility for maintaining all other watercourses generally falls upon the riparian owner(s) unless it is a main river, which is the responsibility of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Consent will be required from the Board to undertake works such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works in, over, under or within nine metres of any Board maintained watercourse. • Installation of a culvert, weir or other like obstruction within any watercourse. • Any works that increase the flow of surface water or treated foul effluent to any watercourse within the Board's district. <p>The Boards' also respond to planning development consultations whereby advice is provided regarding surface water drainage and potential impacts up on the Boards' drainage network.</p> <p>In many areas TVIDB's and the Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board's catchments extends beyond the district boundary, therefore future development outside of the Board's boundary may require the Board's consent prior to increasing the flow or volume of water into the Board's district.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with flooding and water authorities and other stakeholders throughout the preparation of the Local Plan. Thank you for providing additional details for the two local drainage boards.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>The Retford Labour Party Branch is extremely concerned about Flood prevention and protection in the Plan. It is a matter of when not if a major flood event will hit our town and dwellings and businesses in places such as the Retford Beck, the Carr Dyke and several other town centre areas already see serious flood challenges. Bassetlaw has one of the UK's leading water management companies within the District - ACE in Rampton. We have the expertise to address issues, but do not have the measures in place right now.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recommends that: "Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards."</p> <p>The Plan sets out some 'wish lists' for Flood Management in the Town (and District) without actually presenting any options, costs or implications for either New Build or existing homes. This is unsatisfactory given what the District has experienced so regularly since 2007. Fiddling around the edges should not be part of a 'Strategic' Plan for Bassetlaw – we and future generations deserve better.</p> <p>The NPPF document clearly references "cumulative effects...local areas susceptible to flooding". We expect much more than what is currently written. We need to radically and rigorously devise and plan for extensive flood plain creations on the Idle, in accordance with Environment Agency best advice.</p> <p>Suggested changes to the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A strategic assessment of flood prevention including specific assessment of the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assessment and identification of new flood plains. Excluding housing development in these areas ○ Refurbishment or improvement of existing flooding measures e.g., dykes and pumping stations. ● No housing development on any flood plains ● Protection from development of all areas critical for flood protection 	<p>The Local Plan has prepared several Flood Risk Assessments that identify current flooding issues and recommendations for proposed planning policy or any allocated site that is identified within an area at risk from flooding. However, the Local Plan can only deal with the implications/issues that arise from its proposed growth and any identified locations it seeks to allocate. Where development does, or is likely to have, an impact on flooding or drainage, then Policy recommendations are included within the relevant areas – including Retford.</p> <p>The Environment Agency, drainage boards and the Lead Flood Authority – Nottinghamshire County Council are responsible for more strategic flooding issues and wider flood prevention measures.</p>
REF153	Natural England	<p>Natural England notes that in 10.3.11 of the explanatory text that the potential for wetlands to be developed with associated habitat improvement and returning watercourses to a more natural state is recognised as being an important part of natural flood management, which is welcome.</p> <p>We also welcome point B6 which intends to maximise environmental gain through enhancing the green infrastructure network and securing biodiversity gain.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage (page 162) - SUPPORT</p> <p>We support the requirement to use Sustainable Drainage Systems and that surface water discharge to the public sewerage network should be prevented wherever possible. This is consistent with the surface water hierarchy and would help to ensure that new development does not increase the risk of surface water and sewer flooding.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to include a policy within the plan to specifically highlight the need to manage flood risk and drainage such that development does not result in an increase in flood risk, and properties are protected from flooding.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF211	National Trust	<p>National Trust generally supports Policy ST54. However, we consider that it could be more aspirational by stating explicit support for appropriate flood betterment schemes, such as de-culverting, urban greening and use of areas in the countryside to receive flood water.</p> <p>Part 2 of the policy requires 'major' developments to contribute positively to reductions in flood risk. We suggest that for developments of any scale, appropriate measures to reduce flood risk should also weigh positively in the planning balance.</p>	<p>Reference to urban greening measures has been added to Policy ST54.</p> <p>'Major' has been removed and replaced with 'Developments' (where appropriate).....</p>
1669241	Resident	<p>We support the wording of the policy ST54 and note the necessary requirements imposed upon developers within flood risk areas. However, any application submissions of developers in respect of locations of identified flood risk yet capable of mitigation and in -principle acceptable to the local planning authority, need to be matched by the appropriate and timely responses of the Lead Local Flood Authority and other stakeholder agencies.</p> <p>Our clients have land interests adjoining Retford town centre at Moorgate and have a longstanding commercial/ leisure scheme capable of generating local employment which awaits further flood modelling inputs to be undertaken by the Environment Agency to confirm acceptability of the scheme. To date they have been waiting for nearly two years for this response. There are other sites in and around Retford in sequentially appropriate locations with development potential subject to agreeing flood mitigation measures that are being held back as a result of incomplete or delayed modelling work by the respective agencies. We would expect that at the time of examination of this local plan, the Council will be able to assure the Inspector that the flood risk assessment works are fully completed and robust to inform appropriate development opportunities across the District in general and Retford in particular.</p>	<p>The preparation of the Local Plan and associated flooding/drainage policies and evidence base has been subject to consultation with all statutory flooding and water authorities. The Council are also continuously working with flood and water authorities and stakeholders through Duty to Cooperate and other more specific issues related to the Local Plan and its proposed development.</p>
1670869	Resident	<p>10.3 et al.</p> <p>The NPPF is clear that development should be avoided in areas of flood risk. the sequential tests are intended for locations where this is impossilble, only, and this does not apply to Bassetlaw as a whole. As such for this District, land in a flood zone should not be proposed for development, especially housing, in this plan (ST7 and ST9) Para 10.3.5). (even with 'supposed' mitigation plans). This is not a 'get out clause' for Authroties or developers to build on land at risk of flooding, now or in the future. Furthermore - given the changes to overall national flood risk, we should expect the NPPF, and associated guidance to be further strgthened in repsecot of flood risk</p>	<p>National Planning Policy sets parameters for Local Plans in terms of Policy and identifying potential land for development. National Planning Policy makes it clear that development should be stirred away from areas of flood risk where possible. Where development is identified within a flood risk area, a flood risk assessment should be undertaken to mitigate any onsite or offsite impacts.</p> <p>The Local Plan has prepared a District-wide Flood Risk Assessment to identify the flooding risks across Bassetlaw either through fluvial flooding or surface water flooding. This also looks at the future implications of Climate Change.</p> <p>Where the Local Plan has allocated sites within an area at risk of flooding, a more detailed flood risk assessment has been prepared to identify what mitigation requirements are needed for the site to be suitable through its design and layout. This could include both onsite and offsite measures. Any policy recommendations or mitigation measures for sites are subject to consultation with the Environment Agency and other water bodies.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF125	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>I am aware I have already commented on the draft plan however I missed something out which has come to my immediate attention due to the pending weather conditions. I cannot believe I forgot to include it having worked on this issue since 2019 floods devastated large areas of my ward.</p> <p>I have been working with the environment agency to look at the possibility of building a flood defence system near The Beck and Blackstope lane area.</p> <p>Having loooked at the plan again before sending this email I cannot see a robust strategy for flood mitigation for Retford. This will would need a whole systems approach using the expertise of all the agencies involved with water, drainage, rivers NCC and environment agency</p> <p>I would like to see more robust detail of the current situation, forward planning for the 30 years of the plan and beyond.</p>	<p>The Local Plan has prepared several Flood Risk Assessments that identify current flooding issues and recommendations for proposed planning policy or any allocated site that is identified within an area at risk from flooding. However, the Local Plan can only deal with the implications/issues that arise from its proposed growth and any identified locations it seeks to allocate. Where development does, or is likely to have, an impact on flooding or drainage, then Policy recommendations are included within the relevant areas – including Retford.</p> <p>The Environment Agency, drainage boards and the Lead Flood Authority – Nottinghamshire County Council are responsible for more strategic flooding issues and wider flood prevention measures.</p>
1671475	Resident	<p>Any future development in Retford should take into consideration the areas which regularly flood ie Blackstope Lane, Grove Lane, Trent Street and Darrel Road. A Flood Alleviation Plan should take priority before any development is authorised. The implementation of such a plan would ensure that current residents are safeguarded from the effects of flooding on their homes. It would also advise on areas which are suitable for development and discount those which are either prone to flooding, or would put other properties at risk of flooding. The Flood Alleviation Scheme has been long overdue and should be fundamental to all other decisions on development.</p>	<p>National Planning Policy sets parameters for Local Plans in terms of Policy and identifying potential land for development. National Planning Policy makes it clear that development should be stirred away from areas of flood risk where possible. Where development is identified within a flood risk area, a flood risk assessment should be undertaken to mitigate any onsite or offsite impacts.</p> <p>The Local Plan has prepared a District-wide Flood Risk Assessment to identify the flooding risks across Bassetlaw either through fluvial flooding or surface water flooding. This also looks at the future implications of Climate Change.</p> <p>Where the Local Plan has allocated sites within an area at risk of flooding, a more detailed flood risk assessment has been prepared to identify what mitigation requirements are needed for the site to be suitable through its design and layout. This could include both onsite and offsite measures. Any policy recommendations or mitigation measures for sites are subject to consultation with the Environment Agency and other water bodies.</p>
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Much of Bassetlaw has seen increased flooding over the years and in light of climate change, this is likely to get worse. It is encouraging that flood risks and mitigation is frequently referred to throughout the plan. A joined up approach with the Environment Agency and NCC (as the lead flood authority) to tackle these problems would be welcomed (it is appreciated that BDC take flooding very seriously).</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST54 - FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE			
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage</p> <p>Flooding is a very emotive issue and generates many different faceted arguments. The idea of water being allowed to flood onto agricultural land in times of heavy rainfall is quite understandable particularly along the Idle Valley and there are continual reminders that this used to be an annual event before river defences were constructed. However, it is not without its problems. Long term flooding of land releases vast quantities of nitrous oxide into the atmosphere due to the breakdown of nitrogen in water logged soils. This gas is one of the more harmful greenhouse gases and probably the most difficult to recapture and exclude.</p> <p>A clear understanding of the effects of flooding on farmland needs to be undertaken. Land that can remain underwater is preferable to land that dries out, gets worked again, fertilised and cropped. These areas to be lost to agriculture could be identified now following discussions and cooperation with landowners, internal and local drainage boards, the Environment Agency and local authorities including the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a detailed Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2) for those sites that are subject to either fluvial flooding or surface water flooding. The assessment identifies the risk type and provides recommendations for policy and the individual sites through design and drainage mechanisms. This assessment and the revised Local Plan Policy will be subject to consultation during Summer 2021.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST55 - PROTECTING WATER QUALITY AND MANAGEMENT			
REF106	Water Management Consortium	<p>The Boards are primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses, therefore the Boards support 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.</p> <p>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. Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board (TVIDB) covers an area of low-lying land from the west of Gainsborough, straddling the River Trent and its tributaries, down to the south of Nottingham, a total of 44,093ha. The Board maintains 778km of watercourse and operates 18 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced. The Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board covers an area of 28,737ha running from the Ouse following the west bank of the Trent moving south west down to Markham Moor. The Board maintains 450km of watercourse and operate 20 pumping stations to ensure that people are safe, and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced. The Boards have permissive powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to exercise general supervision over all matters relating to the drainage of land within the Boards' district. The Boards also have other powers to perform other duties as conferred or imposed on internal drainage boards by this act. The Boards' Byelaws and the Land Drainage Act 1991 allow the Board to take action to ensure that the free flow of water is not restricted. Board maintained watercourses are cleaned out annually and it is important that access is preserved for machinery to enable this work to be undertaken. The Boards' Byelaws prevent the erection of any building, structure (whether temporary or permanent) or planting of trees/shrubs etc. within nine metres either side of a Board maintained watercourse. Responsibility for maintaining all other watercourses generally falls upon the riparian owner(s) unless it is a main river, which is the responsibility of the Environment Agency. Consent will be required from the Board to undertake works such as: • Works in, over, under or within nine metres of any Board maintained watercourse. • Installation of a culvert, weir or other like obstruction within any watercourse. • Any works that increase the flow of surface water or treated foul effluent to any watercourse within the Board's district. In many areas the Boards catchments extends beyond the district boundary, therefore future development outside of the Board's boundary may require the Board's consent prior to increasing the flow or volume of water into the Board's district.</p>	The role of the Internal Drainage Boards has been noted. Reference has been added to the text of the need for developers to consult with them. Criterion 3 has been added to section C of the Policy to require drainage design to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall.
REF182	Anglian Water	<p>Anglian Water is supportive of the requirements in relation to safeguarding potable water sources from the potential risk of pollution arising from new development proposals. Welcome the requirement for all development proposals to demonstrate that appropriate water supply infrastructure is available or can be made available in time to serve the development. 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.</p>	Support for policy is noted

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST55 - PROTECTING WATER QUALITY AND MANAGEMENT			
REF201	Severn Trent	Supportive of the principles outlined within Section 10.4 to protect water quality, large parts of Bassetlaw are underlain by aquifers covered by Source Protection Zones. These zones are designed to protect the groundwater from contamination. It is important that these zones are protected from development. Severn Trent adopts a strict “no development” policy in SPZ1 areas (i.e. land within an SPZ 1 owned by Severn Trent is subject to strict control measures on land use. Strongly advise the Council adopts similar principals for the Site in the areas overlying the SPZ 1 (e.g. the restriction of these areas to green parks, etc.). No SUDS infiltration should be allowed in SPZ 1 areas. Advise that the limitations are extended to SPZ 2 areas as well. However, if this is not possible, then strongly advise that developers are required to adopt suitable control measures and best industry practice when locating and designing SUDS in the SPZ 2 areas. A suitable train of treatment should be implemented where infiltration SUDS are designed in SPZ 2. Where development is located within SPZ3 it is recommended that the EA pollution prevention guidance is followed to ensure that development does not result in contamination of water. Especially where infiltration SuDS are proposed. • HS1 – Peaks Hill Farm – SPZ 3 • HS2 – Former Bassetlaw Pupil Referral Centre – SPZ 3 • HS3 – Radford Street – SPZ 3 • HS4 – Manton Primary School Site – SPZ 3 • HS5 – Talbot Street – SPZ 3 • HS6 – Former Knitwear Factory – SPZ3 • HS7 – Trinity Farm – SPZ 3 • HS8 – Milner Croft – SPZ 3 • HS9 – Former Elizabethan School – SPZ 3 • HS10 – St Michaels View – SPZ 3 • HS11 – Fairygrove – partially in SPZ 3 • HS12 – Station Road – SPZ 3 however SPZ 2 of non-STW GW abstraction site located approximately 0.3 km to the south-west. • HS13 – Ordsall South – SPZ 3 • NP04 – Ollerton Road – Not in SPZ • Garden Village – SPZ 3 • EM001 – Shireoaks Common – SPZ 3 • EM002 – Symmetry Park – SPZ 3 • EM003 – Explore Steetley – SPZ 3 (GIS polygon missing, best estimate of location used) • EM004 – Welbeck Colliery – SPZ 3 • EM005 – Carlton Forest – SPZ 3 (GIS polygon missing, best estimate of location used) • EM006 – Trinity Farm – SPZ 3 • EM007 – Snape Lane – SPZ 3 • EM008 – High Marnham – Not in SPZ • SEM01 – Apleyhead Junction – SPZ 3 • Cottam Power Station – Not in SPZ	Reference in the Policy and the supporting text to the importance of Source Protection zones, and the need for developers to consult with water and sewage undertakers reflects Severn Trent’s comments and is considered adequate.
REF211	National Trust	Supports Policy ST55. There appears to be a drafting error in part B that needs to be corrected, i.e. ‘any risk to the Sherwood Sandstone Aquifer... will be protected mitigated’.	Support noted. The typo will be amended.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
1656935	Resident	Are there no plans to bring rail lines back to Harworth and Bircotes? We sit right in the centre of a large geographical circle that would largely benefit from having a rail link, yet nearest stations are all 20 minutes away. Presumably there is still some infrastructure remaining from the previous rail line that could be restored?	There are no plans to bring a rail service back to Harworth Bircotes within the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
1660972	The British Horse Society	Horse riders are legally permitted to use only 22% of traffic-free public rights of way; carriage-drivers only 5%. Increasing pressure for development of houses and industry is making even fewer of those bridleways and byways available. Traffic increases with new development or change of use so roads become even less safe for riders and carriage-drivers (equestrians) to use to access any traffic-free routes there may be. Between 28 February 2019 and 29 Feb 2020 80 horses were killed on the road and one rider died (BHS, 2020). Riders are also increasingly excluded from verges by creation of foot-cycleways – segregated provision for other vulnerable non-motorised users but equestrians are excluded and forced into the carriageway. The Active travel agenda includes equestrians. Jesse Norman MP, Parliamentary Under – Secretary of State for Transport in a House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 (1) stated: “We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders.....Horse riders are vulnerable road users—there is no doubt about that, and there never has been—and they have been included in the work we are doing.”	Where opportunities exist, support will be given to the improvement of and the creation of new bridleways. However, the delivery of routes and safety is managed by Nottinghamshire County Council.
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 167, section 11.1 Misterton Parish Council would like to see a radical overhaul of bus services: residents should be able to book a bus trip with an 'on demand' service, like Call Connect in Lincolnshire. This would, it is hoped, reduce the number of empty or near-empty buses seen on rural routes.	Other than where required by new development, Bus service provision is a matter for Nottinghamshire County Council and the bus operators.
REF068	Ranskill Parish Council	Policy ST56 Transport Infrastructure does not include any details of improvements to rural travel infrastructure. Instead, it states that “Maintaining and improving access to rural services, through public transport and active travel modes will be supported by Policy ST2” However, details of rural travel infrastructure do not appear under policy ST2 either.	The Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Assessment identifies the current capacity and issues with the road network. Mitigation or improvements to the road network are only required where it is a direct impact from proposed development. Wider improvement measures may be detailed within the Nottinghamshire County Council Transport Plan.
REF094	Network Rail	Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the above document. Our principal area of interest is the Bassetlaw Garden Village allocation, though we do have observations in relation to other proposed allocations. 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.	Noted. Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>Other enhancements to the Bassetlaw plan to help ensure more direct, safe, coherent, attractive and comfortable cycling and walking environments</p> <p>Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Amnesty on parent parking, trial scheme example in York, students also took part in surveys working with urban planners, we would recommend that the councils engage with schools on piloting these ideas, especially to help tackle childhood obesity - https://www.sustrans.org.uk/our-blog/projects/2019/england/street-design-at-carr-junior-school-york ● Routes to and from schools, we feel that all route to schools should have modern, safe cycle and walking routes, and strongly urge collaboration between the council and schools, and other relevant parties e.g. parent groups, cycling and walking groups to create a cross-working group to deliver better, safer, more connected, direct, cohesive and attractive means to getting to school, via healthy and sustainable transport. <p>Bike aid and or fix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We understand NCC has a bike aid scheme planned to help those need a bicycle the most, that is carers, people out of work, receive a bicycle, we also understand that BDC have a planned DR Bike, Bike Fix style sessions organised for Retford and Worksop - this is all to be encouraged, and continued, we urge that this becomes a regular, not one off activity <p>Parks and open spaces</p> <p>Kings Park, a segregated route along the perimeter of the park, from Chancery Lane, to the Bridgate Car Park, would provide access through the centre of town, being safer than the major roads (this has been submitted to the council previously and is supported by the Retford Civic Society and various elected representatives). We provide a walk-through video here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sKjR-ut55AY</p> <p>Cemetery, North Road to Chesterfield Canal, the creation of a small segregated cycle route to connect the North Road cyclepath to the Chesterfield Canal would provide direct access to the greenway route, which is motor traffic free, to the centre of town and beyond. The “kissing gate” and other safety enhanced changes, which compliment the look and feel of the environment could be made. Contributions from developments on the North Road could potentially enable this route (and the canal) to be resurfaced and maintained as a safer commuting route for pedestrians, mobility scooters, carers and parents of those with disabilities.</p> <p>Connectivity and organisation - Transport integration</p> <p>Bus - a challenging thought, is that Retford Bus Station has no provision for cycle parking or storage, given the benefits this would bring, and the low costs. We would encourage the provision of cycle storage, such which has been used in Gainsborough and elsewhere. Train, making the coal-drops and Westfield road would provide much better access, and a choice of access for people of all modes of transport, it could be protected for cyclists, mobility scooters, and walkers. Hybrid, promoting integration with the various transport options, making it easy to use and therefore providing an actual choice through better infrastructure, we are sure would bring benefits. Train, making the coal-drops and Westfield road would provide much better access, and a choice of access for people of all modes of transport, it could be protected for cyclists, mobility scooters, and walkers.</p> <p>Hybrid, promoting integration with the various transport options, making it easy to use and therefore providing an actual choice through better infrastructure, we are sure would bring benefits.</p>	Other than where required by new development, walking and cycling provision, including highway safety, is a matter for Nottinghamshire County Council.
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>Cycle parking and storage</p> <p>There are various options available for cycle parking and storage, to encourage uptake, and keep pedestrians and cyclists segregated. Such as the following company (https://www.cyclehoop.com/category/racks/), which we use as an example:</p>	Where opportunities exist, provision will be made on new development sites for appropriate cycling parking and storage facilities. Wider provision of for cycle parking and storage is also being considered as part of the Worksop

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
		<p>Suggestions for new cycle storage (keeps cycles safe and secure) / parking (encourage it as transport) to protect cycles and encourage more visitors to our local economy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Retford town centre; ● Carolgate (e.g. either end to encourage cyclists to park and walk); ● Market Square; ● Bus Station with safe segregated ingress and egress routes for cyclists; ● Train station; ● Schools; ● Car parks (there are so many in the town centre) 1 car parking space = up to ten cycles (that's more shops, more people, more potential spend); and ● Improve supermarkets, we feel that cyclist parking, signage and road markings are not taken seriously at all, completely contradicting the ambitions for sustainability and healthy transport. <p>Routes and proposals from other groups and individuals We see much parity with our charitable aims, BDC's objectives, and some inspirational ideas from local residents with regards to better connecting the Sustrans network to Retford, as well as suggestions for much better use of the council owned land and green spaces through the town centre.</p> <p>Active Travel Fund - Randall Way - NCC's potentially significant contribution to Retford cycle and walking routes The proposed route on Randall Way, funded by central government, would be a very useful and necessary route, to provide segregated cycle and walking routes from the new north road neighbourhood and business estates, and the local high school. We hope that this will include considerations for improving the route, in any way possible, to the Elizabethan school as well. (At the time of writing, no details were released on this plan, due Jan/Feb 2021).</p> <p>Local people and organisations Two enterprising, knowledgeable, and very experienced retired professionals whom have been kind enough to produce and share their impressive ideas and valuable insights on improving our town for all - some really good innovative ideas, and hard work has been done to produce this work, for which we are happy to support and learn from, and grateful for their permission to share:</p> <p>1. A cycle plan - David Backhouse - representative of a sustainable transport charity https://tinyurl.com/yyhqw8uz - with a view on wider connectivity; and</p> <p>2. Improvements to openspace, footpaths and cycleways in Retford - John Talbot - retired landscape architect https://tinyurl.com/yy5esm5p - with a view in summary of utilising our green spaces.</p> <p>Get Out and Get Active - GOGA - is a well known local charity encouraging walking for all. You can find more about them here: http://www.betterinbassetlaw.co.uk/get-active-bassetlaw/</p> <p>The NHS and GP's Surgeries - working together could encourage and refer people to cycling and walking. They are very busy with the local effort in tackling the pandemic, however, we would encourage engagement with healthcare organisations to support the Bassetlaws Plans, if it has not already been considered - especially as given the councils and government are encouraging walking and cycling - we need the infrastructure and other peripheral support to make this a reality.</p>	Central DPD and potentially through the Retford Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>There are many others, and we are grateful for everyone's support and input into our responses and work.</p> <p>The Chesterfield Canal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Resurfacing could provide all year access and choices, that are traffic-free, protecting walkers and cyclists (this happens safely elsewhere in the country and along the Chesterfield Canal) also Nottingham Canal as a perfect example of modern thinking and partnership with the community; ● Funding could come all of the new housing estates in particular the North Road, Trinity Farm proposals, grants, and other charitable organisations; ● In particular if it could be considered, we would encourage contributions to links to the Chesterfield Canal (through the cemetery, and into town), and a foot/cycle bridge from the Trinity Hospital estate (with access to Babworth Woods and the Canal) to improve the surface as it is not attractive during winter; and ● With an increase in foot and cycle traffic, the potential for erosion will degrade the surface and likely lead to the route not being used, so we would encourage any support that could be given to the Canal Trust and Chesterfield Canal Trust to make this a reality. <p>Existing infrastructure - in use or “abandoned” in Retford</p> <p>We reference these in more detail in our presentation, which the reader can locate at https://trustee.retfordcyclingcampaign.org . We therefore don't detail these routes here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Coal Drops - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j8IACQ3dH28 ; ● The allotments (train station) - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vba4CiWKg_M ; ● Westfield Road - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kdoUeQEjpbQ ; ● Tenterfleet Walk; ● Tiln Lane; ● White houses; ● London road - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OpVp5aWfd0k ; and ● Safety for pedestrians, mobility scooters, parents and carers with prams and buggies, and those of all abilities. Some examples of complaints raised with us ● Parking on cycle lanes (this discourages use, and waste the investment made); ● Cycle Routes not direct, connected, safe, convenient, cohesive or attractive (this does not encourage the update of cycling, and its use as a form of transport) ● Lack of maintenance of existing routes e.g. vegetation, ingress of soil, red tarmac eroded and not replaced (puts people, creates perception or reality of it not been safe form of transport); ● Lack of cycle storage as opposed to cycle parking (backs are not cheap, transport needs protecting); ● Space on carolgate for those who have disabilities e.g. wheelchair users, mobility scooters; and ● Everything else referenced in our surveys. Maintenance ● These routes are described in our presentation made to elected representatives and other organisations in August 2020. It can be found here (slide 28 onwards): https://tinyurl.com/y2wbwsn4 ; and ● It is essential that these proposes routes are maintained and kept usable, to encourage and maintain their use, this also helps to create choices for people who choose to cycle and walk, as well as potential employment opportunities for those who work for the route maintainers 	Where opportunities exist, provision will be made on new development sites for appropriate cycling parking and storage facilities. Wider provision of for cycle parking and storage is also being considered as part of the Worksop Central DPD and potentially through the Retford Neighbourhood Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF126	Retford Cycling Campaign	<p>Benefits for the local economy, tourism and heritage</p> <p>We also talk about the potential benefits for our local economy too, you can find more about our thoughts here: Benefits for the local economy - cycling and walking.</p> <p>We clearly encourage developers and council(s), and associated third parties, to follow the LTN 1/20 design principles, as this will ensure that the infrastructure is equivalent to that which is foreseen, planned, forecasted outside the estate. Or for which guidance is provided from the government on expectations for cycling and walking infrastructure to be delivered outside the site and throughout the town over the years to come and benefiting the local community at all of their life stages - that is everyone from 8 to 80 and beyond. We also look forward to the public publishing and sharing of the WSG cycle audit for Retford. This was referenced in the Bassetlaw Draft Plan, but not available to review at the time of writing.</p> <p>Finally, we are grateful to everyone from the local community and beyond who has contributed to our knowledge and helped to support the charity in its pursuit of its objectives to benefit the community.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>There is a mismatch with the ratios of 'dwellings required' to 'jobs created' when the figures for the whole of the District are compared to the Retford implications. Put simply, Retford town is expected in the Plan to carry about 10% of the total district's total 'New Build' through to the end of Plan, and imbalance is particularly distinct when the 'Employment sites' figure for Retford is just around 3%.</p> <p>This will create a huge challenge for people living in Retford and working elsewhere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan will need to see a much more detailed 'commitment' to matched infrastructure and significant public transport enhancements which must be in place as new dwellings are constructed, and not at the tail-end of any significant development. • We expect "carmageddon" in Retford as those in new homes will need to commute to places of employment (on top of pressure within the town for shopping, school runs and leisure trips). <p>These issues will be exacerbated by the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No rail connection at the Garden Village which will put pressure on both the A1, A57 and connections between Retford and Worksop for commuters from the Garden Village to employment and schools in Retford/Worksop • Serious doubts surrounding cycle provision from the new developments in Ordsall by local residents. Poor facilities for cyclists in the Town Centre. • Overloading of key transport nodes - notably the A638 roundabouts at Hallcroft and Whitehouses, and the A620 roundabout at Ordsall. <p>Suggested changes to the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Bassetlaw District Council are expecting Retford to carry the burden of a disproportionate number of homes, then the Plan must immediately provide for enhanced transportation including better cycling, bus, rail and walking links. • If the plan cannot provide these then the standard method of assessment for new homes must be followed. • A development of a Retford wide cycling and walking strategy including consultation of key local groups such as Retford Cycling Campaign, the Town Centre Master Plan and Friends of Retford Station (to name just a few) • Cycle routes along all major roads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Refurbishment of existing cycle paths and removal of bottlenecks. ○ Provision of off-street parking so that any new or present cycle paths are not restricted by parked cars. • Requests for rail connections (which local campaigners can take to Network Rail and other groups) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rail stations at all new development areas where a railway exists - such as the High Marnham 	<p>Retford is the Districts second largest settlement and therefore is considered sustainable to take an appropriate proportion of the Districts growth. Existing commitments within the town have been considered as part of the distribution of growth along with any infrastructure issues.</p> <p>Where the proposed growth causes a negative impact to the existing highway network, the Retford Transport Assessment recommends mitigation measures. In addition, the Retford Walking and Cycling Audit also recommends improvements to the existing infrastructure either through the delivery of the proposed growth or through external funding and organisations. This include the provision of cycle storage facilities.</p> <p>Existing rail provision is also considered as part of the Bassetlaw Transport Assessment. Where new or improved rail infrastructure can be accommodated, then this has been explored.</p> <p>The former high Marnham power stations rail infrastructure has now ceased and is only operational for test purposes with some of it being changed into a cycling track to Lincoln.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
		<p>development and the Garden Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A direct rail service to Nottingham ● Cycling parking must be provided at all new places of employment and amenity. The requires a level (number of spaces per job) defined against national or international best practice. 	
REF169	Resident	<p>page 169, para 3 New and improved walking and cycling links: whilst identifying routes in the District's three main towns, potential links between them are (except for Worksop – Garden Village - Retford) excluded. Given the intended life-span of this Plan, some outline of identified desire lines for longer-distance routes should be included. These routes might include (i) Worksop – Carlton-in-Lindrick – Langold – Blyth – Harworth/Bawtry; and (ii) Retford – Sutton-cum-Lound – Ranskill – Bawtry. Sections of these routes might then be delivered as and when opportunities arise and funding becomes available.</p>	Where new development can improve existing or create new cycle and walking infrastructure this will be supported. However, the majority of measures are likely to be delivered through other mechanisms such as grant funding or by other organisations.
REF172	Elkesley Parish Council	<p>The A1 being an arterial route from the North to South of the Country is more commonly and widely used since the implementation of average speed cameras and constant roadworks along the M1. The A1 is poorly lit, road surfaces in need of update and suffers high or frequent issues with collisions and broken down vehicles. It is only two lanes, and soon backs up for miles during many incidents or emergency situations. We would like to see provision within the plan to address these issues as and when development is progressed to planning stage.</p> <p>We have 50 mph restricted speed limits on the A1 at Elkesley, we would like to see a policy within the Local Plan that outlines the requirement to complete any future changes to the access and egress at Elkesley, Ranby and Gamston, prior to works starting on any new development site. Some of these junctions are simply not fit for purpose, and an increase of vehicles and people will have a significant effect on noise, carbon and general wellbeing of local residents with regards noise pollution.</p> <p>As part of the “Garden Village” development the current route from Appleby Head (A1 junction) to Retford is proposed as being removed. This will create a catalogue of issues for not only the new village, but the existing road network. It will force commuters to use other, less substantial roads and routes (potentially through Ordsall, Morton, Jockey Lane and Gamston) and increase traffic flow in these areas.</p> <p>Some of these roads such as the small single track from Morton and the single carriageway from Ordsall to Elkesley are barely fit for purpose as things currently stand, with extra traffic and commuting these roads would simply not cope. They already suffer major flooding, cracking and pot hole issues and white lines, lighting and general maintenance is already in decline. We believe there needs to be a specific policy within the plan on road infrastructure, to ensure any proposed developments are not compounding issues that have already been highlighted but not being resolved.</p>	<p>The existing route from the A1 to Retford via Mansfield Road is not being removed. The first part of this road between the A1 and the level crossing is to be realigned so that it appropriately incorporates the development associated with the Garden Village. Measures will be put in place to stop minor routes being used as rat-runs and this is something the Council is in discussions with the County Council about.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF175	Resident	<p>The new estates will increase the amount of traffic coming in and passing through Retford. Traffic on all the main roads leading into Retford are already busy and queues in all directions form at peak times of the day. It is a nightmare when there is an accident on the A1 and traffic diverts through Retford. I suppose this is something we have to live with and where possible avoid travelling at peak times.</p> <p>Another factor is that more and more drivers are taking short cuts along country lanes eg Botney Bay Road and Greenmile Road to get to the A620 and Mansfield Road (B6420). This will probably significantly increase once the Garden Village is built. Also, traffic has increased along Jockey House Lane leading to the A1 and Elkesley. Many drivers seem to have the need to get from A to B as quickly as possible ignoring national speed limits and road conditions. Many are impatient and intolerant of other road users. I used to ride my bike along these roads but no longer feel safe to do so. Whether driving or cycling it does not make for a pleasant experience.</p> <p>Entering/exiting the junction off the North Road (A638) on to Randall Way is difficult due to the constant flow of traffic.</p> <p>Entering/exiting the junction of Tiln Lane on to the A620 is very difficult due to the constant flow of traffic.</p> <p>Entering/exiting the staggard junction at Babworth/Mansfield Road is also difficult due to the constant flow of traffic.</p> <p>Exiting Welbeck Road, Ordsall onto Westhill Road, Ordsall is very difficult because (a) it is a staggard junction with Rufford Avenue and (b) visibility is obscured by parked vehicles on the corners and pathways on both sides of the road. The speed limit is not always adhered to. It is also a heavily pedestrianised area so crossing here for the elderly, those with pushchairs, young children and mobility issues is just as difficult as it is for drivers.</p>	<p>The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the proposed level of growth and the potential sites within the town for highway capacity, highway safety and public transport issues. Where issues are identified, the assessment has recommended mitigation measures needed to improve the issues identified. Where large sites are proposed, there will need to be appropriate infrastructure to support new or enhanced public transport opportunities. This is particularly the case for Ordsall South and Trinity Farm.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF178	Councillors, East Retford South, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Retford Station provides a transport hub at the intersection of the ECML and the Sheffield-Lincoln line. However it ought to be noted that it is an approx. 45mins walk from the southern edge of site HS13 to the Station. Indeed, the option of using the proposed station at the proposed Morton Garden Village might prove more commuter friendly to residents of HS13 if an adequate direct road link could be developed. However, with an anticipated housing figure of only 500 units by the end of the plan period, it remains to be seen if this new station within the Garden Village is achievable.</p> <p>We are disappointed in the missed opportunity to future proof Retford's connection to the District-wide employment opportunities. This should be addressed by maximising the potential to design improved road links between the proposed Garden Village and Retford.</p> <p>In addition, although the emphasis within the plan on improving existing and developing additional footpaths, cycle ways and non-vehicular routes is welcome, there are high levels of concern about escalating traffic moving through Ordsall and on into Retford. Traffic is the primary concern of respondents, with twice as many residents listing it as a concern than any other issue. Ollerton Road, Ordsall Road and the Goosemoor Bridge were highlighted as being areas of particular concern. Further to this, there is a degree of scepticism that the planning system is able to deliver the promises made to the local community. The removal of previous a Planning Condition to improve the Ordsall/Babworth mini roundabout (item 3 in the plan's proposed list of local road improvements) is an example frequently cited by residents as where the planning system has failed to deliver for the local community.</p>	<p>The proposed new station at the Bassetlaw Garden Village is a fundamental part of providing a sustainable development at that site. Although there is no plans for a direct link road, there is the potential for enhanced bus services between the transport nodes.</p> <p>Land has been protected for employment purposes in Retford and additional land at Randall Way is being developed. With its rail links to other larger settlements supports a sustainable commute from to the town to other areas.</p> <p>Where the proposed growth causes a negative impact on the road network, the Retford Transport Assessment proposes mitigation measures where relevant. These include junction improvements, improvements to signalisation and traffic calming measures.</p>
REF184	Doncaster Council	<p>Growth at Harworth and the impact on the local highway network in Doncaster</p> <p>Due to the duty to cooperate issue regarding the impact of growth at Harworth and its impact on the local highway network (as assessed through the Doncaster Local Plan Statement of Common Ground) it is considered that that Policy ST49 – Transport Infrastructure and Improvement Schemes (or at least its explanatory text) should also include the required junction improvement/mitigation measures in Doncaster as well as Bassetlaw junctions listed. This would reflect the work undertaken in the White Young and Green Junctions Assessment Report.</p> <p>Due to past and on-going duty to cooperate discussions regarding the impact of development at Harworth/Bircotes on traffic junctions within Doncaster as well as transport modelling results (undertaken by AMEC for the Bassetlaw Local Plan and part funded by Doncaster Council), it is considered that Section 11.1 should also refer to the A631 corridor, particularly since paragraph 11.1.7 identifies a need to increase capacity along the A57 corridor.</p>	<p>The Council has, and will continue to, worked with Doncaster metropolitan Borough Council on Strategic Transport issues through the Local Plan process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF197	Resident	<p>a. North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership (NNLCRP) is the community rail partnership covering the line and stations in Bassetlaw – should it be included on discussions?</p> <p>b. Is there a need for a joined-up public transport initiative with tickets usable on buses and trains? – perhaps a subsidised (season) ticket plan – working with SYPTE perhaps?</p> <p>a. 2c Bus interchange should be a bus/rail interchange.</p> <p>b. 3c including a regular service to the railway station.</p> <p>c. 3d including a Sunday bus connection from the railway to the bus station.</p> <p>d. 4 Conduct a feasibility study for a railway station at Misterton, including a bus interchange, car park with EV chargers and potentially a commercial or health site. This line serves the Doncaster to Lincoln Line and also the alternative Doncaster to London route. The site is disused (cleared) industrial on a designated flood plain.</p>	The Council has consulted the rail partnerships and other rail authorities and operators through the process. It will continue to do so as the plan proceeds to its next stage.
REF211	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 Bassetlaw Transport Assessment recognises that there needs to be future improvements to the A57. However, this is a strategic issue as it also includes traffic from other authority areas including Rotherham. Any improvements will need to be developed through a collective approach between relevant authorities and bodies.
1666086	Resident	<p>I find the Bassetlaw Plan's list of traffic improvements woefully inadequate. Someone with 'imagination' needs to look at Retford as a 'whole' and come up with a long vision as to how road infrastructure and connectivity can be improved. We do not need any traffic passing through our town that is only 'passing through'.</p> <p>What Retford needs urgently is more bus services that allow people to use its services without the need for a car. An additional doctors surgery in the south of the town with more large open spaces to be enjoyed by all and a new community facility to the south of the town centre.</p> <p>We do not need more and more houses without 'major' improvements to road infrastructure, school and health provision.</p>	The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment only assess the impacts of the proposed growth on the highway network. It does not provide solutions that are not a direct result of planned growth through the Local Plan. Other wider improvement measures will be dealt with through Nottinghamshire County Councils Transport Plan.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Page 167, section 11.1</p> <p>I would like to see a radical overhaul of bus services: residents should be able to book a bus trip with an 'on demand' service, like Call Connect in Lincolnshire. This would, it is hoped, reduce the number of empty or near-empty buses seen on rural routes.</p>	The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the proposed level of growth and the potential sites within the town for highway capacity, highway safety and public transport issues. Where issues are identified, the assessment has recommended mitigation measures needed to improve the issues identified. Where large sites are proposed, there will need to be appropriate infrastructure to support new or enhanced public transport opportunities. This is particularly the case for Ordsall South and Trinity Farm.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF054	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>re transport and traffic across the whole of Retford London Road and goosemoor lane area are already congested and this will become much more congested due to new developments. This area of Retford, coming from the A1 I feel needs more work from NCC.</p> <p>Moorgate hill area Concerns about this area of Retford and the need for work at the low bridge to mitigate the need for HGVs to access Carr hill school area. The developments around here will impact the area and the transport flow undoubtedly and I would have liked to see move visionary work taking place re the bridge. I would have hoped the plan could have been more imaginative about sorting out this long standing issue.</p> <p>Concerns about the roundabout on North road near west Retford is a concern, already congested most days even before the developments as outlined in the plan are built. We also have the ambulance station located on North road which needs consideration. I have concerns about traffic using Randall way and the route past the high school and beyond into town will take place giving concerns about safety of school children, and there will till be the issues of accessing the roundabout.</p>	The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the proposed level of growth and the potential sites within the town for highway capacity, highway safety and public transport issues. Where issues are identified, the assessment has recommended mitigation measures needed to improve the issues identified. Where large sites are proposed, there will need to be appropriate infrastructure to support new or enhanced public transport opportunities. This is particularly the case for Ordsall South and Trinity Farm.
REF063	Resident	<p><i>In reference to the Garden Village</i> I have read the document and although it goes into great depth of the actual development I can't see anything about the road leading up to it. I live on the very dangerous "s" bend from the Retford side and has many accidents already with the amount of traffic and I feel with all the extra traffic that this development will bring, I feel that the number of accidents can only increase. I also know that the dog sanctuary is very worried about the volume of traffic on the same stretch of road at the level crossing.</p>	The Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Assessment identifies potential improvement measures for Mansfield Road, including the improvements to the Babworth/A620 and the realignment of Mansfield road from the A1 to the level crossing at Mansfield Road.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF077	Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council	<p>You will recall that in our original submission observations were made on the possibility of increased and potentially dangerous usage being made of Hundred Acre Lane, Tinkers Hill and Greenway both for access to the village and for access to the A60 highway.</p> <p>I would like to expand our views on that particular issue.</p> <p>It is appreciated that the new road is designed in part to encourage residents on the Peaks Hill Farm Development to gain access to the A57 highway, the M1 motorway at Aston and to other commuter areas in Sheffield and South Yorkshire. In addition, there is an assumption that residents on the new development will travel to Doncaster via Blyth joining the A1 or proceeding to Doncaster via Bawtry.</p> <p>In normal circumstances the assumptions on traffic flow would not seem unreasonable, however the Parish Council would welcome views on the following.</p> <p>At peak periods of travel time, commuters to and from work along with others travelling to and from larger shopping centres in Sheffield and Doncaster with some attending leisure facilities in those areas, there could be a significant number of residents who wish to avoid the hectic travel conditions on the recommended routes via trunk roads preferring instead to access the A60 via Hundred Acre Lane and Greenway, then proceeding to Sheffield, the M1 and South Yorkshire via Rotherham Baulk in the Village or to Doncaster via the A60 through Langold and Oldcotes.</p> <p>The routes described would certainly be preferential to those wishing to avoid the trauma of heavy traffic at Blyth (to Doncaster and the A1) and the A57 at Gateford/Worksop (to Sheffield, South Yorkshire and the M1 motorway). In terms of journey 'time' the routes through the village of Carlton in Lindrick could well be preferable at peak periods.</p> <p>If you add the above potential to the increased volume of traffic generating from approved housing developments in the village on the eastern side of the A60 and at Firbeck Colliery and in Langold, there is, in our view, an identified potential for increased road usage in areas within the village which are already subject to public concern at the foot of Long Lane at its junction with the A60, in addition to the extremely narrow highway access to the village through Greenway via Hundred Acre Lane in the midst of a much valued Conservation Area.</p> <p>Whilst I have no doubt that extensive highway expertise has been applied to the Local Plan proposals, the Parish Council would be pleased to receive further views on the highway concerns being expressed at this stage and what measures can be included within the Plan to negate the described concerns.</p>	<p>Existing transport infrastructure within the area is considered to be either at capacity or slightly below capacity at peak times. The proposed development at Peaks Hill Farm provides a new East/West link road through the site which will make it easier and safer for traffic to access Carlton Road and Blyth Road without having to use other constrained East/West links within the area.</p> <p>The new link with be of a standard to take public transport and the junctions at either end will also be improved. This should help to improve highway safety at Blyth road in particular.</p> <p>The new link should also help to reduce traffic north towards Carlton – particularly those who are accessing the A1 at Blyth as they can use the link to access Blyth Road before entering Carlton.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF109	Resident	<p>11.1.1 & 11.1.2 Due to a potential 440 houses being built on the Trinity Farm site, Retford, North Road and Hallcroft roundabout will not be able to sustain the increase in vehicles. Traffic congestion will increase not decrease regardless of any changes made to the traffic infrastructure. The plans show that the developers anticipate that every household will have 2 cars which would increase the traffic by approximately 400 vehicles from the first phase and 880 vehicles if the second phase is also approved. The majority of the people purchasing the proposed houses will already have jobs and use their car to travel to work. In addition, there will be increased HGV traffic from the planned industrial units. Adding a few cycle lanes and improving footpaths and public transport will not reduce the volume of traffic significantly to allow the traffic to flow.</p> <p>The current road infrastructure already struggles and during peak times it can back 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 no proposals as to how the current road layout can be adapted to reduce the build up of traffic, this building scheme will contribute towards major hold-ups and could also contribute towards an increase in the number of road traffic accidents. When the A1 is closed, this is used as a main diversion route before re-joining the A1 and traffic is at a standstill to Sutton and beyond. 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>	The Retford Transport Assessment has assessed the proposed level of growth and the potential sites within the town for highway capacity, highway safety and public transport issues. Where issues are identified, the assessment has recommended mitigation measures needed to improve the issues identified. Where large sites are proposed, there will need to be appropriate infrastructure to support new or enhanced public transport opportunities. This is particularly the case for Ordsall South and Trinity Farm – and links to Randall Way and North Road
REF110	Resident	Has the transport policy provided to your team taken in to consideration the effect of the A1 being closed either North or Southbound in their calculations ?	No, the Transport Assessment looks at the strategic network flows over a period of time – including AM and PM flows and impacts.
REF144	Resident	<p>One aspect about the evolving growth of Worksop and its surrounds is that much of the housing development has been occurring on the North of the town, whereas the major traffic route is the A57 which itself is supporting many of the major employment facilities on the South of the town - resulting in the need for a large number of local residents to travel across town each day ! This is not an easy task as there is no well developed route for that traffic (and even the Ashes Park Road was not constructed as a suitable dual carriageway to help alleviate that growing problem !).</p> <p>The allocation of land on the A57 opposite the Wilko factory for industrial use is surely going to add to that problem</p>	The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment recognises that there needs to be future improvements to the A57. However, this is a strategic issue as it also includes traffic from other authority areas including Rotherham. Any improvements will need to be developed through a collective approach between relevant authorities and bodies.
REF216	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	<p>Policy ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement Schemes</p> <p>Reference to the Bassetlaw Garden Village should be reassessed if, as I suggest, the housing is to be relocated.</p> <p>Improvement and expansion of bus services, particularly throughout the rural areas, has to be a priority. This policy fails miserably in addressing what is currently a woeful service. It needs serious investment and assistance and, who knows, we may be able to tempt more people to use it particularly if the service is frequent, buses are new and small and the routes are interconnecting.</p>	Where bus services can be improved through planned growth then this will be supported through investment in infrastructure. However, the decisions about general bus services, particularly those within the rural area taken by the County Council and Public Transport providers.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST56 - TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPROVEMENT			
REF224	Sheffield City Region	Transport policies in the Draft Plan, for both rail and active travel, support key planks of our own work in South Yorkshire, helping to improve connectivity and sustainable travel modes whilst tackling issues like poor health and air quality. Importantly, the Garden Village proposal includes provision for a new public transport facility including a rail station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line. This will complement other initiatives in SCR as well as strengthen rail connections to Sheffield from the east. The SCR Integrated Rail Plan (July 2019) provides more detail on how we see these services developing in the future.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF117 Ordsall South	Barton Wilmore on behalf of land owners	6.71 Policy ST56 is a district-wide transport strategy which aims to mitigate the impacts of traffic growth as a result of the delivery of the whole Local Plan. Having a district-wide mitigation strategy is something that is encouraged to demonstrate the holistic approach undertaken in relation to transport. Policy ST56 provides strategic connectivity improvements by non-car modes of transport. These non-car improvements have the opportunity to encourage sustainable mode share from the individual allocations, as well as increased sustainable mode share from the surrounding communities who will also benefit from them. This approach helps to reduce reliance on the private car across the district, leading to reduced reliance on the private car and, consequently, reducing the scale of highway interventions which are likely to be required. 6.72 As set out in Paragraph 11.1.5 of the Local Plan, schemes required to mitigate individual allocations are set out in the site-specific policies, with the detailed requirements to be determined as each allocation is advanced to planning submission. The transport requirements pertaining to Site HS13 are discussed within the Transport Technical Note (forming part of this submission).	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF225	Sheffield City Council	We note that the Plan acknowledges impacts on parts of the A57 as well as noting existing transport and traffic flow issues on parts of the strategic A57, which feeds into and out of Sheffield, however we welcome the policies promoting sustainable transport (ST57), and acknowledgment of the potential role of the rail corridor in future (ST56).	The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment recognises that there needs to be future improvements to the A57. However, this is a strategic issue as it also includes traffic from other authority areas including Rotherham. Any improvements will need to be developed through a collective approach between relevant authorities and bodies.
REF170	A&D Architecture	12) Policy ST56 and ST57 should be modified to safeguard pedestrians against inappropriate cyclist speeds on shared networks by modifying the text of subsection BI (Policy ST56) and B7(Policy ST57) as follows: Policy ST56: "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"	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
1660972	The British Horse Society	It is commendable to see the inclusion of equestrians in the provisions for improving and extending routes to promote Active Travel.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
REF089	Resident	<p>I have lived in Retford and then Welham for the last 37 years bringing up a family of 4 and now with grandchildren. I and my family have always walked and cycled around the town and know the footpaths, short cuts and public spaces very well. Over this time many houses have been built and two new schools, but very little in the way of new open spaces or segregated footpaths or cycleways. Meanwhile the vehicular traffic has increased and the roads are too dangerous for children to cycle on and increasingly unpleasant to walk alongside. This last year has emphasised the need for safe open spaces close to home where we can all exercise and appreciate the freedom and spiritual uplift that walking and cycling in traffic free areas brings. Many of us travel by car to Clumber Park or other local spots but it would be so much better and 'greener' if this need could be provided in Retford where it would be readily accessible to all, including children, and people with mobility scooters and pushchairs etc. Need an improved and larger network of traffic free paths and cycleways linking one housing area with another and links to the local schools, parks and the town centre. The paths and cycleways alongside the roads are good in some places but are not wide enough, and are not pleasant or relaxing to walk along right next to busy traffic. Cars parked over paths and marked cycle routes make them frustrating and dangerous. The best places for walking in traffic free, pleasant surroundings are Kings Park, the Cemetery and the pedestrianised town centre but these are not directly linked to most housing areas. The canal tow path is good but is mostly narrow and often muddy. Retford has grown up over the years with its river, canal and historic road layout to become a very pleasant Market Town with the excellent King's Park, but we need more public open spaces, footpaths and cycleways to match the large increase in the number of houses built in the last 40 years. The new development could provide for some of this and along with the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 Agreements, it would also be fair to use some of the resulting increase in council tax that all the new housing brings to the town. Need improvements to, and better maintenance of, the paths we have so we can benefit from their full width and potential and prevent the gradual deterioration in the fabric of the town and the air of dereliction and neglect that results. It would be money well spent and is a very visual benefit and immediate return for the tax payer and the general public. Make the following suggestions and hope they could be given some consideration to be included in any future plans and budgets for our town. It would be good to have an overall plan for the town but any one of them would be a welcome and beneficial improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A linear open park along the river Idle from Ordsall in the south to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve in the north which could provide for recreation, exercise, tree planting and wild life, and also footpath and cycle way links to housing areas, schools and the town centre. 2. A riverside path and cycleway through a linear park from Ordsall to Albert Road with connections to housing areas and existing footpaths on both sides of the river. 3. An improved footpath and additional cycleway across the river between the railway station and Thrumpton Lane. 4. An improved riverside path and cycleway through a linear park from Bridgegate past Morrisons and extending to the footbridge across the Idle at Bolham Lane. 5. A riverside path and cycleway from the Bolham Lane footbridge through or alongside the fisheries site to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve. (recently closed after being open for at least 25 years) 6. An improved footpath and cycleway from houses and Carrhill School in the Tilne Road area to the footbridge across the Idle at Bolham Lane. 7. An improved footpath, widened footbridge and new cycleway from the Bolham Lane footbridge across the Idle to the houses and the Elizabethan School in Hallcroft. 8. A foot path and cycleway from Morrisons through parkland along the back of the houses off Hallcroft to the Elizabethan School with connections to the housing areas and school. 9. Widen the very narrow footbridge over the Idle linking Morrison's to the town centre. 10. A cycle way along Arlington Way to connect to that already proposed along Amcott Way. 11. Widening of existing roadside footpaths and provision of a cycleway between Retford and the nearby villages of Sutton, Welham and Clarborough to give safe access into Retford for all groups of society. 12. Reduce the width of the roads to the minimum for traffic and correspondingly increase the width of the footpaths and if possible accommodate a cycleway where it would be protected by the new kerb. This to be considered generally throughout the town where possible but it would be possible and most desirable along Hallcroft, North Road, London Road and Moorgate. 13. Close the town centre to through traffic or at least make it one way only, pedestrianise the 	<p>Thank you for your comprehensive response. In terms of the Local Plan, improvements or new walking and cycling infrastructure can only be sought to support the needs or to mitigate an impact for a new development site. This could mean that a new development should provide new walking and cycling infrastructure within the development and/or provide appropriate connections to existing infrastructure to the edge of the site. It may also include offsite contributions towards walking and cycling infrastructure, but this will only be included where the proposed development is materially impacting the existing network.</p> <p>National legislation is clear that development cannot address existing issues. So the majority of issues raised cannot be resolved by the Local Plan. The Retford Walking and Cycling Audit 2020 provides information about the quantity, quality and accessibility of the towns walking and cycling infrastructure. There are some general recommendations which cover broader improvements as well as those for the proposed development sites in the Local Plan. These, and other issues you raise, could be explored through other channels such as via Nottinghamshire County Council (as the Highways Authority) or Sustrans.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
		<p>end of Bridgegate or at least widen the paths, and widen the paths in Market Place and Grove Street. 14. Increase spending on maintenance of the existing footpaths and cycleways to remove encroaching soil, mud and grass to restore them to their full usable width. This to be done throughout Retford but notably on surfaced sections of the canal tow path and on the paths alongside Welham Road. This is a long and expensive list of improvements but we need to start with some of them and also have an annual budget so that, over time, we can bring our public communal areas up to the same standards that we strive for in our own private homes. The quality of the environment in our immediate surroundings has a big impact on our daily lives and only the Local Authority can improve this in the public areas. These suggestions would help improve our health and wellbeing as well have practical benefits in improving and encouraging journeys by foot or on bicycle especially for those who do not have, or do not wish to use a car. A more attractive town makes for a more prosperous town as more people want to live and work in the area and would be public money well spent. These proposals also meet the aspirations in many sections of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan including 'Greening Bassetlaw', and 'Green and Blue Infrastructure' and also the 'Retford Intervention Plan Strategies'. They would translate aspirations into real benefits. Compared to what we collectively spend on our houses the cost is relatively small per household (tens of pounds annually not hundreds or thousands) and, if the public could be reassured that an increase in the Council Tax would be 'ring fenced' and spent on projects close to their homes, am sure the majority would welcome it or at least not complain. It would be money well spent, leave a lasting benefit for future generations and pay for itself by the general increase in the quality and value of all of our lives. Am a retired Landscape Architect with a life time experience working in the public sectors and would be more than willing to discuss any of, or all of the above suggestions with whoever they concern and would like to voluntarily contribute to improving my adopted town.</p>	
REF089	Resident	<p>Recently wrote a letter regarding 'Improvements to Paths and Cycleways in Retford' to all the District Councillors in Retford and Cllr David Pidwell (copy Attached). Of the 6 replies so far received, all agreed with the content and David asked me to send my comments to you in relation to the Bassetlaw Local Plan. Also written to Sustrans and 'Retford Cycling Campaign. I know that the Local Plan largely deals with future development whilst most of my suggestions relate to improvements to existing paths and roads, and the creation of a new riverside park in Retford. Jo White's introduction talks about 'an emphasis on healthy lifestyles and active travel' and states 'the Plan provides for more walking and cycling routes, new parks and open spaces.' Over the past decades new housing developments have been built in Retford and just linked onto the existing paths alongside the roads, many of which are too narrow and less than the 2m and 3m required to meet the NCC standards. In 3.19 it says that 'the local cycle network in Retford makes cycling between residential areas, work and leisure possible'. It does not mention schools but the roads are often too dangerous for cycling on, especially for children and the more nervous. Both senior schools are a long way from residential areas in Ordsall and the east side of the town. Retford needs a plan showing improved and new links for safe walking and cycling throughout the town and to nearby villages, and how these can be delivered. The proposals for paths and cycleways in the Garden Village sound wonderful but could we have a strategy in the Local Plan to bring Retford up to similar standards?</p>	<p>The Local Plan will only identify improvements or new walking and cycling infrastructure where it is required to deliver the proposed development. These will then form part of the infrastructure requirement for the necessary development site.</p> <p>National legislation is clear that development cannot address existing issues. External bodies and funding are a mechanism to implement other improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure in and around Retford.</p>
REF094	Network Rail	<p>Note and support this policy, particularly criterion 2(i) and its reference to "other transport mode" which will also cover issues with level crossings that may arise from development proposals.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Point C. This point needs to be expanded to include clear expectations for connecting major new commercial and residential development. In many cases these will be adding to vehicular transport and could worsen air quality and discourage existing healthy and active pursuits of cycling and walking. Adding cycle lanes and footpaths to connect to nearby towns of Worksop and Retford will discourage car use and make cycling and walking safer.</p>	<p>Where improvements to the existing road infrastructure are required as part of a new development in the Local Plan, then these will be detailed within the relevant planning policies for the proposed development site.</p> <p>New development will only be required to deliver the necessary infrastructure to support its proposed</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
			<p>development and to mitigate against any adverse impact on the existing network.</p> <p>National legislation is clear that development cannot address existing issues. External bodies and funding are a mechanism to implement other improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure in and around Retford.</p>
REF175	Resident	It is good that you are promoting rights of way improvements within and through these new sites. It would be even better if paths/bridleways in the area all connected up to form a coherent network. Love cycling and try to keep to off road tracks. Any improvement to make cycling easier and safer has got to be a good thing although cycle lanes do have their pros (eg improves health, reduces congestion and pollution and cons (eg disrupt the flow of traffic - cause bunching, increase congestion and thus pollution). Having difficulty visualising the West Carr Road to Retford Oaks due to on street parking both on the grass verge and on the road. Also, Ordsall Park Road to Ordsall Primary School which is a very busy road. It would be ok for experienced cyclists not one for primary aged children.	<p>The Retford Walking and Cycling audit has been prepared to help inform the Local Plan about the quality, quality and accessibility of the existing walking and cycling infrastructure around Retford. In addition, where new development can improve the network on and offsite it will be identified within relevant site allocation policies.</p> <p>Wider improvements identified will largely be delivered through external channels to this Local Plan and through external modes of funding.</p>
REF178	Councillors, East Retford South, Bassetlaw District Council	The ambition evident within the plan to ‘reduce the need to use of the car for everyday journeys’ is regarded as overly optimistic. The pinch points that funnel all journeys between Ordsall and Retford through a limited number of bridges and tunnels across the natural and man-made barriers of river, canal and railway, mean that journeys are extended beyond any crow’s direct flight. To establish a development beyond the extreme edge of the existing established settlement boundary, with a significant population of senior citizens and individuals with additional physical needs, will necessitate reliance on the car. The proposed extension of the bus service into the site will need to be a commitment that residents can rely on in order to access work, leisure and social activities 7 days, evenings and nights each week. Residents are also concerned about the retrofitting of cycle routes to busy narrow road systems in residential areas e.g. Brecks Rd. The impact for residential on-street parking is of concern and will need to be addressed at an early stage if established residents are not to be negatively impacted by these additions to the local cycle network.	<p>A Transport Assessment for Retford has been produced to identify what impacts arise from the proposed growth identified within the Local Plan. This assessment also looks at the necessary mitigation that is required to support the delivery of the proposed growth in Retford. Some of this will be onsite and offsite.</p> <p>Improvements to the existing walking and cycling network will also be required, particularly where development can connect to existing networks or enhancements are required to support the additional volume of usage.</p>
REF197	Resident	Working with NNLCRP, promote bus/rail/walk routes and produce leaflets and website/social media communications – to promote walks/cycle rides along the Chesterfield Canal including the town centres, accessed via public transport.	Thank you for your comments.
REF211	National Trust	National Trust supports Policy ST57.	Thank you for your comments.
1668503	Resident	I fully support the sentiments expressed in the above policy - particularly section B. 4. Encourage forms of active travel etc. With this in mind - particularly as the plan envisages increases in population who will need more opportunities for exercise propose the section of footpath in Elkesley Parish that runs from Brough Lane to the bridge across the River Poulter Grid Ref. 684742 could be changed to a bridleway to allow cyclists and horse riders to access the bridleway network on the other side of the bridge (known locally as stone bridge).It is a cheap fix as the path is only aprox. 100 meters or so - already wide enough to be designated a bridleway and the bridge will not need changing as the river is already easily fordable by horses on the west side of the bridge. This small change will provide cyclists and horse riders considerable safe connectivity to local routes enabling them to take exercise while avoiding routes like the A1 Trunk road.	In terms of the Local Plan, improvements or new walking and cycling infrastructure can only be sought to support the needs or to mitigate an impact for a new development site. Other, wider improvements identified will largely be delivered through external channels to this Local Plan and through external modes of funding.
REF058	Sport England	Policy ST57 – Active Travel supported	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST57 - PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL			
REF109	Resident	The Government's ambition to make cycling and walking the natural choice for all shorter journeys or as part of a longer journey by 2040 is only an ambition and should therefore not be the only course of action to reduce traffic. There are no details as to how the travel plan is expected to work and in some locations, it will not reduce traffic as the local plan predicts it will. Minimising single occupancy car travel will be difficult to implement as people travel at different times to various locations and with Covid, car sharing isn't advisable.	Where improvements to the existing road infrastructure are required as part of a new development in the Local Plan, then these will be detailed within the relevant planning policies for the proposed development site. Where a proposed development triggers the need for a Travel Plan to accompany a planning application, then this will detail how that particular scheme will seek to deliver or incorporate sustainable travel options.
REF110	Resident	The desire to improve links with other areas such as Goosemore recreation area and Retford Town is commendable but it shows no methodology of how this could be done Improvements for cycle traffic and pedestrians	The Retford Walking and Cycling audit has been prepared to help inform the Local Plan about the quality, quantity and accessibility of the existing walking and cycling infrastructure around Retford. In addition, where new development can improve the network on and offsite it will be identified within relevant site allocation policies. Other, wider improvements, identified will largely be delivered through external channels to this Local Plan and through external modes of funding.
REF176	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	It is very positive to see plans to encourage cycling and greener methods of transport.	Thank you for your comments.
REF170	A&D Architecture	12) Policy ST56 and ST57 should be modified to safeguard pedestrians against inappropriate cyclist speeds on shared networks by modifying the text of subsection B1 (Policy ST56) and B7(Policy ST57) as follows: Policy ST57: "B 7 Measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and foot including measures to calm cycle speeds where these might otherwise endanger pedestrians"	The technical specification of all new multi-use paths is agreed with the Local Highways Authority. This includes ensuring that the speed is appropriate. This is a detailed matter and will form part of the proposals considered at planning application stage.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST58 - SAFEGUARDED LAND			
REF214	Historic England	Policy ST58: Safeguarded Land - Historic England has concerns in respect of the approach to the historic environment in relation to the proposals and Policies relating to Peaks Hill Farm and Bassetlaw Garden Village which link to this policy. We note the policy requires proposals to have regard to other policies within the Plan which would include historic environment elements and that provision is welcomed.	Safeguarded land has been designated to support the implementation of new critical or strategic infrastructure or regeneration. These will be subject to review and other policies within the Local Plan. Any change to these designations will also be subject to public consultation through a review of the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST59 - DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE			
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	Page 174, para 12.2.6 Should read 'fibre to the kerb' not 'curb'!	Supporting text amended accordingly.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Policy ST59 - DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE			
1670589	Resident	12.2.1 Access to digital technologies is supported – and will be a significant strand to enable Small Rural Settlements to accommodate home working, supporting the need for increased expansion of housing in these settlements.	Thank you for your comments. Your support is noted.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	BDC must do all it can to support the roll-out of fibre in rural areas: the Coronavirus pandemic has shown how important it is for education, employment, leisure, and keeping in touch with relatives and friends (to name but a few). Rural communities have been disadvantaged in all of these because of poor services in their communities. Para 12.2.6 Should read 'fibre to the kerb' not 'curb'!	Comments noted. Supporting text amended accordingly.
REF208	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estate	Suggest that consideration must be given throughout the policy wording to the specific conditions and limitations presented within rural Bassetlaw to deliver the means of the policy requirements via conventional means. Heritage and landscape constraints are just two of the potential reasons. It is suggested that the policy must be written subject to the proof that they can be viably and practically delivered in the specific context of the proposals concerned. There must be an ability in the policy wording for the applicant to demonstrate if such conditions are unsuitable to deliver the policy aspirations (in part or full).	Impact of delivering the policy requirements in the rural area is addressed by A1c. Part B ensures that if the provisions of the policy are not practical or economically viable that an alternative approach can be considered. This would include for heritage or landscape reasons.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST60 - PROVISION AND DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE			
REF003	Canal & River	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 ST60 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.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
1656935	Resident	The planning around new housing developments in Harworth and Bircotes, with lack of consideration towards the infrastructure of the town, has been nothing short of ridiculous. On the recent consultation calls, we were informed that the already agreed housing developments had all been approved on individual merit, yet nobody has looked at the larger implications and needs that 2000 new homes will bring. We simply will not have enough school spaces for young children in our area, and post 16 provision is non existent. Yet the new school agreed for the development at the colliery site has been removed from planning. The council have also agreed to 3 new schools, none of which are in HandB. A delegate on the consultation call spoke of families having to transport children to separate schools in neighbouring villages. This is quite simply unacceptable and will drive people from the area, rather than attract and build what should be a great town to live in! As mentioned in another item, the leisure and retail opportunities in the town are not fit for purpose when considering all of the new housing as a whole, rather than individual developments. There are clear links between lack of opportunities and anti-social behaviour which we do not want to see increase in the town. It is abundantly clear to see that proactive actions must be taken NOW to support the growth of Harworth and Bircotes, rather than reacting to shortages in infrastructure down the line.	<p>The development around Harworth Bircotes has come via speculative planning proposals and have not formed part of a comprehensive Local Plan. This is the result of the Core Strategy being out of date and the Site Allocations document not being adopted by the Council back in 2011.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan recognises the recent development within Harworth Bircotes and does not seek to allocate any additional growth whilst other developments are still being built out. If further development is required in Harworth in the future then this can come through a review of the Local Plan once it is adopted.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST60 - PROVISION AND DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE			
1661418	Resident	<p>Policy ST60 requires developers to consider infrastructure requirements for all development. How can the council support large scale developments at Trinity Farm, Ordsall south and the garden village when the road system in Retford cannot support current traffic volume through the town, especially when there is a hold up on the A1. Traffic is regularly backed up on North Road, Arlington Way, Amcott Way, Babworth Road and London Road to name but a few. Without a major new bypass for Retford these hold ups will become a permanent feature of our town with this degree of concentrated new development.</p> <p>I am surprised that the council is supporting a new garden village which would adversely affect many Retford residents when the similar proposal for Gamston Airport failed to gain support. This proposal would just become joined to Retford. before we know it Retford and Worksop will end up merging thus losing our identity. Surely multiple small scale developments throughout the district including all villages would help dissipate traffic concentration?</p>	<p>Where development causes an impact to existing infrastructure, then it is appropriate for the Council to seek either physical improvements to infrastructure or through financial contributions.</p> <p>These will vary between development and depending on their impact. All infrastructure improvements as part of the Local Plan are detailed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
REF040	Misterton Parish Council	<p>Page 176, para 12.3.5</p> <p>Add other healthcare providers, e.g., Doncaster & Bassetlaw Teaching Hospital NHS FT and Primary Care Networks (as we move towards integrated care, and universities/colleges</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	<p><i>Written in reference to the January 2020 DLP</i></p> <p>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.</p>	The delivery of infrastructure will vary between developments depending on their impact to existing infrastructure and what is required to mitigate or improve issues caused by the development.
REF142	Retford Branch Labour Party	<p>Building Better Public Services</p> <p>In evaluating the Plan, we have done so under the following three principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Investing in education to ensure good school places for everyone ● Expand local health services for residents ● A Plan for better sports facilities, community spaces, broadband, leisure facilities. <p>Although we recognise that some areas may be beyond the immediate remit of Bassetlaw District Council, we strongly feel that the Plan must at least consider and discuss the implications of housing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policing numbers in Retford, recognising that the town does not presently have cells or a proper police station. - School places (both at primary and secondary level) - Health facilities - Transport infrastructure (see note above) - Leisure facilities <p>If the projected growth of Retford is to occur, then the Plan must require consideration of impacts on all public. Services. No development should be allowed to increase the strain on any of our services beyond that seen in 2020. We expect the Plan to be measured against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of police per person - The number of GPs per person - The number of school places per person <p>We do note provisions for Digital infrastructure. We insist however that minimum connection speeds for internet access be included in all future homes. This may include a requirement of fibre to the home (rather than fibre to the cabinet).</p>	<p>The Local Plan and its proposed development can only provide improved infrastructure as a direct result from its proposed growth. Infrastructure is often delivered in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through onsite or offsite physical infrastructure such as green spaces, new roads, schools, land acquisition; or 2. Through a financial contribution towards existing infrastructure – this often occurs for highways, health or education. <p>All infrastructure required to deliver the proposed growth in Bassetlaw id detailed within the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST60 - PROVISION AND DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE			
1671189	Resident	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, 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.	The majority of the larger development sites will be phased alongside the delivery of infrastructure. Affordable housing and other housing types will also be delivered in phases.
1671475	Resident	Retford has already seen large estates, such as the Kenilworth Nurseries Site off London Road, being developed without community facilities. Provision of a school, a meeting place and a play area is crucial in any future developments of this size. 230 houses in a cul-de-sac development without facilities is not a community.	These developments have provided contributions via a financial contribution. The details of which will be provided within a Section 106 agreement between the Council and the developer.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Page 176, para 12.3.5 Add other healthcare providers, eg Doncaster & Bassetlaw Teaching Hospital NHS FT and Primary Care Networks (as we move towards integrated care, and universities/colleges.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
REF054	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	School places. This has been discussed on many occasions however I feel I need to register my concerns about school places which are currently stretched and therefore will become more so in the life of the plan. I am aware that NCC have done work on this however I do think it needs to be challenged more robustly as we already know that children are being split in families where one child goes to one school and a sibling another. This is unacceptable now. I also have families where children are being driven out to the village schools as well as children coming and going from one of the town to the other due to ongoing short supply of places.	The Council consults with the education authority on the proposed growth and allocations throughout the process. The education authority provide details of where additional education provision is needed. This is not always delivered via a new school, it can come through financial contributions towards providing additional capacity at existing schools across the District.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	We welcome that the November 2020 plan recognises the requirement to make sufficient provision for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • physical infrastructure: including for flood risk, transport, telecommunications, security, water supply and wastewater; • social infrastructure: including that for education and health; and • green infrastructure: including open spaces, habitat and wildlife creation and measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation. Appreciating the plan identifies that the 'Council will work with partners such as the Local Highways Authority, Highways England, the Local Education Authority, the utility companies, Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, and neighbouring local authorities to anticipate and bring forward the necessary infrastructure that is required in order to deliver Policy ST1'. However Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust are just one health partner that delivers community services, Doncaster and Bassetlaw Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust delivers secondary care, and GPs delivery primary care commissioned by the CCG	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST60 - PROVISION AND DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE			
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments	<p>4.15.1 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.</p> <p>4.15.2 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>4.15.3 Furthermore, Gladman highlight that the regeneration of Bevercotes Colliery for employment uses offers the opportunity to deliver improved highway and junction access to the A1 network along the B6387 at the Twyford Bridge junction.</p>	Noted. Thank you for your comment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
GARDEN VILLAGE VISION AND MASTERPLAN				
REF202	Savills on behalf of land owner	Bassetlaw Garden Village Vision Document and Masterplan	<p>Draft Garden Village Vision Statement (Status) Note from the draft Vision Statement that it is not a detailed masterplan, but is the 'first step in providing certainty and confidence alongside the indicative density of different parts of the development' – to shape a design that is flexible whilst of a suitably high quality. This is welcome, albeit there are some essential amendments relating to phasing and flexibility which we will come on to make. The point here is the ambiguity over the status of the Vision Document and process involved. i.e. are the council envisaging a formal SPD process (as set out at paragraph 5.3.42) and adoption or will it instead form part of the evidence base for the plan/ a matter for discussion and agreement with the developer party which paragraph 5.3.41 appears to state. Our preference would be for the latter and clearly we would appreciate clarification before we proceed to marketing. We note that the timing for the masterplan framework has been given a target date for completion in 2025. Note the wording now states by 2025 picking up on our earlier comments so it supported and appreciated. The fundamental point to make is one of phasing. Throughout our discussions to date we have discussed that my client is only able to commit to the release of land north of the 'old' line of Mansfield Road pre-2037 due to the operational needs of the farm. A plan setting this out is attached: Figure 1 – Land release south of Mansfield Road pre-2037 (black line) c. 5Ha net developable. Secondly, we note that throughout the pretext of the policy there is a continued commitment to a number of design features, including reference to hitting a range of specific number targets. While we agree to these principles the wording seems to infer that these components will be delivered rather than the aspirational concepts they are at this stage. To better reflect the status of the masterplan it should be highlighted throughout that this is an 'initial' masterplan with explicit explanatory text stating that it is not prohibitive to other masterplans being developed as we progress the scheme in greater detail. This will allow flexibility to be built in to the scheme, which as detailed within the plan is a long term prospect which will adapt and change as we progress. The inclusion of the 'aspirational concept' masterplan to help better reflect the stage we are at. We do note however that the initial masterplan has been included within the Garden Village Vision Statement and that this document more frequently refers to the initial masterplan. It would therefore be useful to reflect this to a greater extent within the Local Plan itself and clearly clarify the status of the masterplan.</p>	The Vision Statement will be adopted as a Council policy document to inform the progression of the Local Plan. The Vision Statement is clear that only land to the north of the old line of Mansfield Road will be released in this plan period. Through the Bassetlaw Garden Village Consultative Group the design principles have been agreed as being necessary to deliver the additionality sought by a Garden Village. It is appropriate that these are reflected in policy. The policy states that a developer-led masterplan framework will be required providing the necessary detail to inform the decision making process.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
GARDEN VILLAGE VISION AND MASTERPLAN				
REF217	Sport England		Confirm Sport England's support. The statement specifically includes active Design and active travel. New strategy being launched in the next week or so will have as one of its main pillars the concept of an Active Environment which is a banner for all of the elements listed. The vision requires that the community is easily able to walk/cycle to a range of..... understand that you are already involved in pulling together a guidance document with the TCPA/SE and others on the 20 minute neighbourhoods which will be launched on 26th March. The vision also fits around this concept.	Support noted and welcome.
REF226	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		The text seems to cover what is needed, as are aiming for 40% GI, but should make it clear that wildlife habitats should meet the 30% of land for wildlife by 2030 target , and that GI figures should not count sports pitches in meeting 30%. Note that 20% BNG is also in there as a target. Believe the target could be more ambitious, as most of the land is currently arable and so low biodiversity value. Advocate 30% to be consistent. Do not think it is clear enough that the developer should put aside large commuted sums for the long term management of the habitats as wildlife-rich greenspace , in the same way as they have to put money up for a station for example, so that could be stronger. Wood pasture is an extremely important habitat in the area (like the SAC) and that this should form part of the habitats created as well as species rich grasslands and woodlands, to guide what would be suitable. SAC and SPA are recognising that they will need an HRA, but in fact it may actually be an AA.	The Council supports the Wildlife Trusts aspirations for nature recovery. The Garden Village will make a significant contribution to supporting the nature recovery network by providing for 40% green/blue infrastructure. However, it is an aspiration for at least 30% of our land and sea to be connected and protected for nature's recovery by 2030, and not a national policy requirement. This provision would lead to viability concerns. 20% biodiversity net gain is the level that is financially viable on site. The management and maintenance arrangements are still to be confirmed but it is a requirement of other policies in the plan that new green infrastructure is appropriately maintained. Wood pasture is recognised and the reference to appropriate assessment added to the Local plan policy.
REF193	Savills on behalf of land owner	Bassetlaw Garden Village Vision Document	The preparation of a standalone Vision document is welcomed and it is an important tool in explaining the Garden Village concept. The comments above about policies ST3, ST4 and ST5 are also relevant in the context of the Vision. It would be useful to clarify the status of the Vision document and its relationship with the Local Plan going forward to ensure that there is a clear and consistent message about the development of the Garden Village. This is essential to encourage delivery in a timely manner.	The Vision Statement will be adopted as a Council policy document to inform the progression of the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
REF016	Resident, The Friends of Sandhills	Open Space Assessment Update Nov 2020	Thank you to the team for producing a detailed and informative Draft Plan. It is obvious from the detail that this has been a mammoth task. Over the last five years, I have been part of a residents group, known as The Friends of Retford Sandhills. It is very pleasing to see that The Sandhills has been assessed as having benefit to the community as a semi-natural or open green space. It is noted that The Sandhills has 2* status. It is hoped that this can be improved upon in the future, possibly, assisted by voluntary community involvement.	Noted.
REF087	Highways England	Transport Evidence Base	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. The combination of the Bassetlaw Garden Village and the proposed strategic employment site being located either side of the A1 Apleyhead junction, together with the wider increase in housing and employment allocations, will have significant implications for traffic demand on the highway network across the District. To ensure the growth aspirations are not limited by the capacity of the transport infrastructure, there is a need for a robust transport evidence base to provide the basis for assessing the impacts on the SRN and suitably informing and developing the infrastructure delivery plan. By necessity, a transport evidence base should include the SRN roads and junctions within the District and immediately nearby, with the plan's effects assessed on a site specific and cumulative basis. This will be instrumental in identifying the need for and form of any highway mitigation required. Any proposals for new SRN	Noted. The Bassetlaw Transport Assessment has undertaken a series of traffic assessments to links and junctions that are likely to be impacted from new development. These include Local and Main roads. Links to and from the A1 have also been assessed particularly in relation to the Bassetlaw Garden Village and other strategic allocations.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
			junctions or significant amendments to the SRN required by the Plan should be identified through the local plan making process and reflected in the supporting evidence. We have no further comments to provide at this stage but reiterate that Highways England is committed to continued engagement 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.	
REF092	DHA Planning	Most Recent EDNA	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	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
			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.	
REF153	Natural England	Habitat Regulations Assessment (November 2020) & Sustainability Appraisal for Bassetlaw Local Plan (November 2020)	Pleased to note that the HRA has now made a wider assessment of the recreational impact of the Local Plan for both the Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC and the Sherwood possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA), following our previous advice. In particular the screening assessment now acknowledges that the Sherwood visitor centre potentially draws people from a wider area and the need for further consideration in the Appropriate Assessment has been followed through. The Appropriate Assessment is comprehensive and examines the recreational impact for both the SAC and the ppSPA explaining that the Local Plan could result in adverse effects on the integrity (AEoI) on both of these sites as a result of recreation. The Recreational Impact Assessment, commissioned by the Council will identify potential management and mitigation measures, which will feed into future iterations of the Local Plan. Natural England will continue to work with the Council and the RSPB to ensure that these mitigation measures are appropriately integrated into the Plan. Concur with the conclusions of the HRA that with the additional policy safeguards now provided and the ongoing Recreational Impact Assessment work, adverse effects on the integrity of the Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC should be able to be ruled out at the next stage of the Plan, both as a result of the plan alone and in combination with other plans and programmes. Agree with the	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
			conclusion of the shadow HRA which requires the submission of further information relating to traffic AADT figures and air quality modelling, before the Plan is finalised. Acknowledge that the Sustainability Appraisal has now been updated to refer specifically to the potential impacts on Clumber Park SSSI, as advised in our previous response.	
REF160	Autism East Midlands	November 2020 Spatial Strategy Background Paper (Update)	The Settlement Development Limit for the area around South Lodge and London Road as proposed in the emerging Regulation 19 consultation local plan takes 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 development boundary then crosses London Road to enclose properties to the west of London Road. The council's response to our 2020 representation is that the development boundary has not been adjusted as it does not meet the criteria of the November 2020 Spatial Strategy Background Paper (Update) development boundary methodology. That document was prepared after the 2020 consultation. Not aware that future plan users were offered opportunity to consider the scope and methodology of that update paper on which this case is now unreasonably dependent. Section 8 of the Update Paper relates to Development Boundaries. It states that: The role of the development boundary is to define the built limits of a settlement and differentiate between the built form of a	The development boundaries will only be amended if they meet the criteria as identified within the Spatial Strategy Background Paper. The development boundaries follow the existing developed footprint of a settlement. They'll only be revised where there is an agreed error or where a new development has since started construction beyond the line.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
			<p>settlement - where the principle of residential development is usually acceptable, and the countryside where housing is restricted. The development boundary defines what is countryside and therefore defines what planning policy should be applied to a particular development. It also notes that 'Development boundaries guide development to sustainable locations....' The paper also notes that the Development Boundaries were last reviewed in 2011 and so they have now been reviewed to: '...remedy any errors or inconsistencies in the original boundary. The paper states the review enables development boundaries to be assessed using a transparent and standard methodology, which takes account of the built development or change since the adoption of the Core Strategy. The specific elements of the review methodology is not clearly presented within Section 8 of the Update Paper. The review sets out with the premise that no change to the Retford boundary will be made unless the following has occurred: 'Development Boundaries will include: 1. Implemented (completed) permissions for sites, directly adjoining, but outside of the existing development boundary of Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick, Misterton, Langold and Tuxford. 2. Sites under construction of sites, directly adjoining, but outside of, the existing development boundary of Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick, Misterton, Langold and Tuxford which have either started construction or completed construction as recorded from 1st April 2018; 3. Brownfield sites, directly adjoining, but outside of, the existing</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
			<p>development boundary of Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick, Misterton, Langold and Tuxford. Confusingly the Update Paper then sets out an identical subheading: Development boundaries will include:</p> <p>1 Areas previously included that had planning permission to which has since lapsed and are not under construction or completed since 31st December 2011; 2 Areas of public or private open spaces or sports facilities, previously included, that are located on the edge of the existing built form of a settlement and relates more to the surrounding countryside; 3 Any existing errors or inconsistencies that are included within the existing development boundaries since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2011; and 4 Proposed housing allocations (within the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan directly adjoining, but outside of the existing development boundary of Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick, Misterton, Langold and Tuxford (unless otherwise stated in a made Neighbourhood Plan for these areas). The council is reliant on this unclear methodology (it is suspected there is an absent 'not' within the second sub-heading) to reject the logical and evidenced argument made in January 2020. The methodology does not allow for an objective and considered approach to review and adjust the development boundary when a sound case is offered which is not dependent on new or abandoned allocations, permissions, or historic cartographic errors. The case for the adjustment in this instant is being rejected not because it has no merit, but because the review methodology is artificially limited in scope. The arguments set</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
			out below, that there is a clear sustainable development and landscape character case to be answered remain valid – reflecting the supporting text to the methodology that the change would help ‘guide development to sustainable locations’....	
REF149	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>Land East of Markham Moor is considered on page 78 of the Sustainability Appraisal. These comments below were made at the previous consultation stage which were submitted to the Council but note that the SA remains unaltered. Reconsider 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. Consider that the assessment is an error which should be corrected. It skews the overall site assessment. 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 submitted three separate SHLEAAs with regard to site LAA263 - Land east of Markham Moor, Nottinghamshire. The 3 SHELAAAs 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. This should be clarified as the potential economic and skills benefits have been underscored in the</p>	The consultee refers to the SA findings for LAA263 (East of Markham Moor) but it is understood that they are in fact promoting a different site: LAA368 (South of Markham Moor). There appears to have been some confusion between the two options. However, the approach taken to the three sites identified will be confirmed in the SA. All sites have been assessed in line with methodology identified by the SA. The Council has revisited the Historic Environmental Site Assessment.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
			<p>assessment. The Site Plans for each are attached. 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. 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. Refer the Council to that submission. Paragraph 5.120 states the following site options are identified as having largely negative effects with regards to a higher number of the SA objectives and therefore, if allocated, suitable avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be required within the accompanying site allocation policies: • • East of Markham Moor (LAA263). • • South of Markham Moor (LAA368) • • High Marnham Power Station (LAA369). • • Carlton Forest (LAA468). The High Marnham Power Station site is being pursued as an allocation and see no reason why LAA263 should not. Adaptation and mitigation can be undertaken at LAA263 as it can at LAA369. Further review Sustainability Appraisal to Site LAA263 - Land east of Markham Moor. It is our firm belief that the site is highly sustainable when assessed against the SA objectives. Furthermore, its location is also commercially attractive to investors such that it is deliverable. Mitigation of any negative impacts set out in the SA can be dealt with and adaptation considered.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
REF214	Historic England	Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Heritage Statement (November 2020)	<p>Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Heritage Statement (November 2020) In our earlier consultation responses we indicated it was not clear how the historic environment had been considered in respect of the Plan process. We note that additional work has been undertaken but this concern has not been fully addressed. There are some disconnects within the SA itself, for example some sites are identified as having a negative or significant negative effect on heritage or archaeology but this is not addressed in the summary. The disconnects continue into the Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) where in a number of cases the impact sets out the SA position only with no further analysis or consideration of whether a site would be developable in the manner anticipated to achieve the expected housing delivery. Of particular concern is the Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) comment relating to Upper Morton Garden Village where it states that the 'County Council's HER should be consulted'. We would expect that to be undertaken for all potential development allocation sites as part of the Plan process and would welcome clarification as to whether that has been undertaken or not. If not it is of great concern that that some sites which are indicated in the SA as having potential for a negative, or significant negative, effect on archaeology are being take forward as proposed development sites since it is not clear whether the sites would be developable or deliverable in respect of the historic environment. The considerations are not helped through the separation of archaeology from heritage since archaeology is heritage. This stems from</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	EVIDENCE BASE DOC	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS				
			Objective 10 of the Draft Plan which is considered below. There are also inconsistencies in the SA with regard to the site assessments which would need addressing ahead of the next round of consultation. For example, NP18 Land south of Gilbert Avenue, Tuxford is shown as an allocation in the SA text, which also sets out it is not being taken forward. We recommend that further work is undertaken on the SA and the Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) document in relation to the proposed allocation sites and the historic environment ahead of the next round of consultation. In addition, the HER would need to form part of the evidence base of the Plan. Further to our earlier consultation responses, subsequent discussions and attendance at some of the Garden Village meetings we note that a Historic Environment Site Assessment (November 2020) document now forms part of the evidence base for the Plan. Notwithstanding the additional information Historic England maintains its concerns about the soundness of the draft Plan in respect of the historic environment.	
REF170	A&D Architecture	General comment on Evidence Base	The Council should supplement its Evidence Base by assessing the needs of the group in the community aspiring to living in a Park Home static caravan. The statement below in Subsection C offers both primary and secondary research data that the Council might use for this purpose without investing disproportionate resources	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT SUBMISSIONS					
1631220	Retford	LAA047	Land Owner	I am still interested in developing the land at Gringley Villa Farm for housing. The SHLAA found that it was unsuitable for housing for three reasons. These were that there were low pylons on it, there was possible contamination and there was flood risk. My response was to remove the pylons but retain the availability of electricity. Also there is no reason to think that my land is contaminated. It is disused former agricultural land not industrial land. A scheme of flood prevention is due to begin in the year 2200 to reduce the flood risk to an acceptable level for housing land. This would be to the South of Grove Lane about a minimum of 120 metres from my site. I want to build 15 to 20 bungalows with solar panels and heat pumps. My existing properties have solar panels.	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF120	Blyth (NP allocation)	LAA435	Barton Wilmore on behalf of the land owner	<p>We write on behalf of our Client, Heyford Developments Ltd and welcome the opportunity to respond to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (the 'draft Plan'). We respond in respect of our Client's land interests at Park Farm, Blyth ('the site', as shown on the appended red line plan). The site has been promoted through the Blyth Neighbourhood Plan ('BNP') for around 50 dwellings, which is anticipated to go to Referendum no earlier than the 6th May 2021 in accordance with the Coronavirus Act 2020.</p> <p>We welcome acknowledgement of our comments to Policies ST1, ST2 and ST3 in the previous draft Plan Regulation 18 consultation in January/February 2020. However, we do not consider to the revisions to the draft Plan address the concerns we have raised.</p> <p>The Council's assessment through the November 2020 Land Availability Assessment (LAA) concludes that the site (reference LAA435) has capacity for 54 dwellings and has "No significant constraints identified at this stage". We consider it is an appropriate site to allocate through the Local Plan to support the Neighbourhood Plan, flexibility of supply and to deliver much needed housing in a</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				sustainable rural large village. We set out our response to the current draft Plan consultation in chronological order below.	
REF121 committee report of app is included	Land North of Bigsby Road, Retford	Part of LAA022	Harris Lamb on behalf of Muller Property Group	We are instructed by Muller Property Group ('MPG') to submit representations to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and welcome the opportunity to comment at this time. MPG are promoting land to the north east of Retford for residential development and have previously submitted two planning applications on the land to north of Bigsby Road, both of which were refused by the Council. The second of these applications, which was supported by Officers and recommended	This site is included as a reasonable alternative in the Sustainability Appraisal. It is considered unsuitable for allocation as there are other, more suitable sites available that can meet the housing need identified. The

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				for approval to the Council's Planning Committee, is now subject of a planning appeal with a Public Inquiry due to take place later in the year. MPG also control further land adjacent to the site that is now subject of the appeal and this is also proposed for residential development. In total, MPG control and are promoting approximately 20 hectares of land to accommodate in the range of 450 – 500 dwellings. It is with this objective in mind that these representations should be read. We set out our detailed comments below.	Landscape Site Allocations Study (2019) indicates that development would have an adverse effect on the quality of the landscape. This relates to important views and landscape features such as trees and hedgerows which add value to the character of the area. The open countryside, which the site forms an integral part of, is also an important feature, and development of this site would have an adverse impact on its landscape quality. Please see the Site Selection Report for full details.
REF132	Land to the west of the Great North Road, Ranskill	N/A	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estates	In order to support the above objection, we identify new sites that are available in the villages of Torworth and Ranskill to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development.	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
					development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.
REF132	Land to the east of the Great North Road, Ranskill	N/A	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estates	In order to support the above objection, we identify new sites that are available in the villages of Torworth and Ranskill to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development.	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.
REF132	Land to the west of the great North road, Torworth	LAA291	JVH Planning on behalf of Kilner Estates	In order to support the above objection, we identify new sites that are available in the villages of Torworth and Ranskill to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development.	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
					supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.
REF130	South Lodge, London Road, Retford	N/A	Autism East Midlands	<p>Summary</p> <p>For these reasons it is requested that the development boundary at South Lodge be adjusted as proposed in this representation for inclusion within the Submission Plan.</p> <p>Development in this area, either as an operational facility, or as a capital asset would present a very significant benefit to the charity and its service users into the future.</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to amend the development boundary in this location as there are currently no proposals for new development here.</p> <p>There are policies in the Local Plan and in National Planning Policy Framework which support business growth in rural areas. These would be taken into consideration if the business wishes to expand.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF135	Doncaster Road and part of Chestnut Road, Langold	LAA209 and part of LAA312	Pegasus Group on behalf of land owner	<p>Opportunity</p> <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 a number of principles on the site, including the principle access point. Parcel's B and C have been submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' and are identified within the SHLAA.</p> <p>Development Opportunity</p> <p>The above referenced 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 developed for residential use with associated works and supporting services. 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. It is understood that the local school, Langold</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. The Council supports the progress made towards the next stage of this development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • The consolidation of the existing primary school with larger premises that allows provision for the future expansion as necessary. <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF137	land north of Gracefield Lane, Normanton on Trent	LAA483? - did not attach redline boundary	Pegasus Group on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (November 2020). I write on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited in making these submissions, which specifically to their land interests at Gracefield Lane, Normanton on Trent. The Draft Local Plan sets out the Council's development strategy, planning policies and proposals, including site allocations, to guide land use and planning decisions in the District to 2037. Once adopted, the Local Plan will replace the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2011) in its entirety. I apologise for not submitting these representations via the online consultation portal, this response has however been prepared specifically in relation to Policies ST1 and ST2.</p> <p>The overall housing requirement has increased from 478 dwellings per annum from 2018 to 2037 (January 2020 Draft Local Plan) to 589 dwellings per annum from 2020 to 2037. This is informed by evidence in the Bassetlaw Housing and Employment Development Needs Assessment Update (2020) to support employment growth and meet local housing needs. Paragraph 5.1.23 confirms that in order to meet this housing requirement, delivery needs to remain at the high levels experienced over the last few years (which has averaged at 560 dwellings per annum). The Illustrative Masterplan proposals for land at Gracefield Lane, Normanton on Trent have been informed by a range of supporting technical</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site. Planning history indicates that an outline planning application was refused for residential development because it did not accord with Policy CS1 of Bassetlaw Core Strategy which seeks to locate development in sustainable areas. A further reason for refusal relates to the adverse impact it would have on the character of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>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 and services 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 ST2, 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.</p>	<p>the village (Planning ref. 18/01257/OUT).</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF149	Land East of Markham Moor, South of Markham Moor	Site promoter identified sites as 3 separate ones (Sites A,B and C) - LAA263, LAA368	Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	<p>It is not intended to repeat the SHELAA submissions; they are before the Council. The site's proximity to the A1 and position in relation to Worksop, Retford, Doncaster, Nottingham, and Lincoln provide excellent locational qualities. The success of similar sites further north on the A1 is testament to the attractiveness of this busy corridor to operators. We engaged with commercial agents to gain a better understanding of the local employment market. Innes England, who have considerable experience of the commercial market in Bassetlaw, concluded that the site presents an ideal opportunity for the provision of a B1, B2 and B8 with commensurate roadside facilities. However, a site without a planning consent or an allocation is extremely difficult to attract inward investment as occupiers require certainty. This junction has a light offering of quality roadside facilities within a very congested and unwelcoming site containing, to the south, a petrol filling station, two food outlets (KFC and Subway), Travelodge and the Markham Moor Truckstop. To the north McDonalds, a further petrol filling station and China Moon Chinese restaurant. Parking is at a premium throughout and access is confusing, creating a deterrent to customers. Initial work has been undertaken to identify the site's development opportunities and constraints. In terms of constraints we are mindful of the heritage assets to the south and the need to</p>	<p>The three sites submitted to the south of Markham Moor are all considered unsuitable due to the impact development would have on the setting of designated heritage assets. The Council's heritage officer notes that the site is located in the setting of various designated heritage assets, such as Milton Mausoleum (Grade I) and West Markham DMV (scheduled Ancient Monument). The Council's archaeology officer notes that there is no specific site information, but that the site lies close to shrunken medieval settlement of West Markham, a Scheduled Monument. Further information is required to evaluate the archaeological potential</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>mitigate with regard to this and landscape impacts. This was reflected in our initial thoughts regarding plot ratios.</p> <p>Standard site development normally equates to a development Plot Ratio of 40-45%. To achieve a sensitive whilst strategic employment site in an acceptable manner our Design Team considers a lower Plot Ratio is appropriate which would enable landscape mitigation and adaptation and allow for greater space about buildings. Reduced floor space delivery results but it is still of a sufficient quantum to be attractive to inward investors wanting to invest in the District and create employment opportunities. Development of the site would not require funding from the public purse.</p> <p>The site would not compete with the allocations at Bassetlaw Garden Village and Apleyhead Junction as they are better suited to the “Big Sheds” market. The site at Markham Moor will be substantially smaller in scale. The Table below demonstrates the potential job creation from each. In estimating the potential job creation we have built in a number of assumptions:</p> <p>a. Whilst average Plot Ratio for employment development is 40-45%, we have assumed a lower figure to take account of the sites’ context (33-39%).</p> <p>b. Job creation has been based on the following ratios which are set out in the HCA Employment Densities Guide and include elements of B1:</p>	<p>of the site in order to determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. As such, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to heritage and archaeology.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Use Jobs/sqm</p> <p>Roadside (A) 1/18 sqm</p> <p>B2 1/36 sqm</p> <p>B8 1/70 sqm</p> <p>c. Within any B2/B8 operation there will be B1 office jobs.</p> <p>d. Balancing Pond facilities will be provided for all options within Site C.</p> <p>Against these assumptions it is considered that the following range of jobs could be created across the identified uses if the sites were developed:</p> <p>Site A – 748-1,428 jobs</p> <p>Site B – 703 -1,340 jobs</p> <p>Site C – 373-699 jobs</p> <p>This would provide a significant boost to job creation in the District which would also result in an increase in ‘value added’ to the local economy in the construction phase and annually once operational. We anticipate a “value added” of £20m (gross) in the construction phase and between £25m and £50m per annum (gross).</p> <p>It is recognised that design, the juxtaposition of buildings and landscaping will need to be carefully considered to be consistent with advice set out in the Framework. Overall, in the balance we consider that the public benefits associated with the development of the SHELAA sites will outweigh the “less than substantial harm” to heritage assets taking account of paragraph 196 of the Framework. In terms of the tilted balance we consider that any adverse impacts would not</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>demonstrably and significantly outweigh the benefits. The job creation potential is particularly significant.</p> <p>The site is available and deliverable. Delivery is not dependent on the provision of front loaded large and costly infrastructure associated with the large strategic sites identified in the Draft Plan. It does not have to first wait for housing delivery. The point of access has been constructed and all services are available. It is deliverable now.</p> <p>The sites are located in the south of the District adjacent the A1/A57 junction at Markham Moor. This is a highly strategic location which could make a significant contribution to delivering a number and range of high-quality jobs. Our Commercial advisors are confident that this locality will be attractive to operators such that as the planning position becomes more certain delivery could take place quite rapidly. There are limited opportunities along the A1 Corridor within Bassetlaw, and it is important that optimum take up is made to ensure any such potential operators do not locate on alternative sites outside of Bassetlaw. In summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is deliverable now. Delivery is not contingent on high and complex levels of up front infrastructure. 2. The access point is already constructed and the site benefits from recent improvements to the A547/A1 junction. 3. All services and utilities are available. 4. With careful design and positing of 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>development any less than substantial impacts on heritage assets can be mitigated.</p> <p>5. The site will generate significant levels of employment.</p> <p>6. There is proven commercial demand in this locality.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above we consider that Land East of Markham Moor (LAA263) should be specifically allocated in Policy ST8.</p> <p>We trust that these representations are of assistance in moving the Plan forwards. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these comments, and in particular delivery at site (LAA263) prior to the Publication stage.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF155 - Heritage Statement included	land adjacent to The Sun Inn, Low Street, North Wheatley	LAA204	TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services on behalf of Hamlin Estates Ltd	<p>20/00245/FUL: Erection of 29 Dwellings, Comprising of 16 Houses, 10 Apartments and Bungalows on land adjacent to The Sun Inn, Low Street, North Wheatley</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The Applicant for the proposed development above has asked that I prepare a response to comments from the Conservation Officer (CO) on the 14th April, 2020, specifically concerns regarding the potential direct impacts of proposed development upon the character and appearance of the Wheatley Conservation Area. Concerns were also raised regarding the impact of the proposed development upon the contribution the Site makes to the wider setting of traditional buildings to the north.</p> <p>It is accepted by all parties that the Site, which comprises an open field, does not hold architectural interest but is of historical interest. Its historical role as an area of open rural land adjacent the village is also accepted to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, notably by providing a rural setting to traditional houses within the village.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) by Locus Consulting (2019) provided as part of the application indicates that the development will bring a less than substantial degree harm to the character and appearance of the Wheatley Conservation Area. The CO states that the degree</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>of impact is greater and, under the high-level parameters set out in the NPPF and PGG, sufficiently deleterious to be considered as 'substantial harm'. Legislation and Policy In relation to the framework of legislation and policy, the Conservation Officer's objection is based on the proposal being contrary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 • Paragraphs 184, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195 & 200 of the Revised NPPF • Policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy <p>Response to Key Issues</p> <p>Three issues including the applicable policy and legislation, the degree of impact brought about by the development, and the design of the proposed development, are considered below, with an overall conclusion provided at the end.</p> <p>Applicable Policy & Legislation</p> <p>Several of the policies referred to by the Conservation Officer are not considered relevant, and therefore do not present as grounds for an objection. In respect of Paragraph 189 of the NPPF, and whether the applicant has sufficiently described</p> <p>the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting, the HIA fulfils the Paragraph to the full and has been prepared according to prevailing guidance and the information available as well as empirical evidence gained through site visit.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Although there may be a difference in opinion over the degree of impact, this is not a concern of the specific NPPF policy, which requires a description of significance to be supplied only. Notwithstanding, local validation guidance requires impact to be considered and again the HIA satisfies this, albeit a difference of opinion exists regarding the degree of impact. Moreover, I refer to the statutory requirement, as set out within Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, for local planning authorities 'to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of any parts of their area which are conservation areas'. The current Wheatley Conservation Area Design Statement (WCADS) dates to June 2010 and is confined to less than a single page of text which offers little insight into the architectural or historical interest of the area and how this is manifest within its character and appearance, nor does it set out any proposals for its enhancement. Consequently, the statement falls some way short of the standards set out within Historic England Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management (Historic England, 2019). Concurrently, the council is deficit in its legal obligations in respect of its obligations under Section 71 of the Act. Paragraph 190 of the NPPF places onus on Local Planning Authorities to 'identify and assess</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise'. Whether the Conservation Officer wishes to implicate the council for not fulfilling the requirements of the policy is acceptably unlikely. As such it is presumed that policy's specific inclusion as rationale for an objection is erroneous.</p> <p>Paragraph 200 of the NPPF is aspirational, encouraging but not requiring, local authorities to 'look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance'.</p> <p>The policy goes on to state that 'Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably'. Whilst it is accepted that the proposed development does not bring any such enhancements, there is no specific requirement under the policy to 'enhance or better reveal', as suggested by the CO. Instead, in respect of the overriding legislation, S.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, requires that special attention shall be paid to the 'desirability of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of' conservation</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>area. As such, Policy 200 of the NPPF is not invoked this instance and forms no basis for an objection. The Applicant contests that Policies 189, 190 and 200 have either not been satisfied or apply, and therefore do not form grounds for an objection. Consequently, any weight afforded to them in decision-making should be discarded. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 alongside Paragraphs 184, 192, 193 of the Revised NPPF are accepted to apply.</p> <p>In respect of the application of Paragraphs 194 and 195 of the NPPF, the CO states that the degree of harm would be substantial and therefore the paragraphs apply. The HIA concludes that the degree of harm would be less than substantial, and that Paragraph 196 applies. The degree of harm attributable, and therefore the applicable policies, are discussed in detail in the following sub-section.</p> <p>Degree of Harm</p> <p>The CO concludes that a substantial degree of harm would be incurred to heritage assets based on the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct impact upon the character and appearance of the North Wheatley Conservation Area • Indirect impact upon the setting of historic buildings <p>The two issues are inexorably interlinked, with those designated and non-designated heritage</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>assets potentially indirectly impacted upon lying within the Wheatley Conservation Area.</p> <p>According to the CO's response, the main basis for the harm to all assets, either directly or indirectly, is 'the loss of long standing agricultural fields that form part of the historical context of the post medieval farmsteads and cottages of the village'. The HIA finds that the development would bring about a degree of harm for the same reason, but that the degree of impact would be less than substantial.</p> <p>According to Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723 of the PPG, 'substantial harm is a high test' and a key element (my emphasis) of significance must be seriously (my emphasis) affected. The guidance states that partial destruction of a heritage asset may have a considerable impact but may still be less than substantial harm. Equally small-scale harm can bring substantial harm. The PPG also states that 'It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed'.</p> <p>As such, the architectural and historical interest of the Site must be evaluated in order to understand its current contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area</p> <p>and the extent to which the development will alter its character for better or worse.</p> <p>It is accepted by all parties that the Site contains</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>no structures of architectural interest. As such, under the terms of S.69 (a and b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the contribution it makes to the character and appearance the conservation area is primarily historical.</p> <p>As an open space the field comprising the Site joins with others within the village's wider agricultural hinterland to provide a rural setting to the village. Open land of particular importance to the character and appearance of the area is flagged in the WCADS which states that 'land between North and South, especially from the Methodist Chapel to Corner Farm, provides an attractive connection with a strong archaeological, historic and rural character'.</p> <p>The field comprising the Site is not highlighted as such a key feature, although the statement does say that 'green spaces' combined with the village's historic layout, street pattern, architectural form, and attractive verges and hedges, create an area of special interest.</p> <p>The contribution made by the historical site to the character and appearance the conservation area is therefore considered to be positive, but not to a degree that would identify it as a 'key element'. Moreover, the conservation area comprises many other elements of elevated interest, includes those identified by the WCADS.</p> <p>The degree of change that is proposed to the historical qualities of the Site is also not fully</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>considered by the CO. The general open character of the fields, as defined and valued by the CO, will not be entirely eroded. Instead the layout and design of the low-density development prioritises large areas of open space and presents a landscaping scheme that draws upon the rural qualities of the site and the village's wider rural hinterland. Elements of the street scenes valued within the WCADS, including hedgerows and verges, are a core part of the scheme. As such, the rural character of the site is not entirely lost, and elements considered of value to the conservation area are promoted. Elsewhere, the village's wider rural hinterland remains.</p> <p>The CO usefully includes the 1840 Enclosure Map within their correspondence. The map shows the low density of the village, with open fields lying between Top Street and Low Street. The legacy of these fields, despite considerable infill of 'varying quality', as identified by the WCADS, remains apparent in the modern-day village, the character of which was considered of sufficient quality to merit designation as a conservation area. This evolution demonstrates the ability of open spaces within and around the village to accommodate well-conceived development whilst retaining its valued character and appearance. Court Judgement considered of relevance here is Dorothy Bohm v SSCLG [2017] EWHC 3217.</p> <p>The judgment indicates that the loss of a 'positive</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>contributor' to a conservation area's character and appearance, so long as it is not designated in itself, does not automatically conclude that it cannot be demolished/redeveloped without considering the impacts of the development upon the wider conservation area. In determining the degree of harm and less than substantial harm the Nuon High Court judgment (Bedford BC v SSCLG & Nuon UK Ltd [2013]) is also of relevance. The Judgement stated that substantial harm would be harm that would have such a serious impact upon the significance of the asset that it was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced.</p> <p>Although it is accepted that harm will occur through a reduction in the rural qualities of the Site, the open land is neither a key element of the conservation area nor will its rural qualities be entirely destroyed. The impact of its redevelopment must also be taken into account with regard to the entire conservation area, and not solely the change that will occur within the Site itself. Accounting for the contribution made by the field (the Site) to the whole character and appearance of the conservation area, and bearing in mind the contribution of the surrounding rural hinterland outside of it, the degree of harmful impact brought about by the proposed development will be modest and certainly less than substantial.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Correspondingly, the impact of the proposed development upon the contribution the Site makes to the physical and experiential qualities of the settings of heritage assets within the village will not necessarily be eroded. The layout of the proposed development prioritises open space and low density housing within the immediate settings of post-medieval buildings to the north, and site-based assessment set out by the HIA demonstrates that the ability to appreciate their significance will be unaffected.</p> <p>Matters of Design</p> <p>In respect of layout, design and scale, the CO also states that the 'use of a mix of building styles including barns, farmhouses and cottages, would generally reflect the character of nearby properties' but 'the proposal includes several dwellings considered to be a mixed-pastiche, combining both agricultural and a mix of residential styles' and 'This mixed-pastiche approach would fail to reflect historic architecture in the Conservation Area and would detract from its character and appearance'. The observations, both positive and critical, are welcomed and designs have been reviewed and resubmitted in light of them. Larger buildings of two or more units have been divided into detached and semi-detached houses, reducing their scale, massing and associated prominence within the landscape, integrating better with the existing</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>spectrum and hierarchy of buildings in North Wheatley.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Several of the policies put forward in support of the conservation officer's objection do not apply in this instance, and any associated weight afforded should be dismissed.</p> <p>Guidance from the conservation offer regards the layout, design and scale of the development are welcomed and have been satisfactorily addressed through a partially revised scheme.</p> <p>The substantial degree of harm arrived at by the conservation officer is not supported by the interpretation of policy or planning policy guidance, nor recent Court Judgement. Instead, the</p> <p>findings of the HIA are considered to stand in that the proposed development would bring about a low and less than substantial degree of harm to the character and appearance of the Wheatley Conservation Area and a neutral impact upon the setting of heritage assets within it. As such Paragraph 196 of the NPPF applies and the degree of harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF164	Land west of Cocking Lane, Treswell And Land south of Town Street, Treswell	LAA085 and unidentified site	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>These representations have been prepared by Fisher German on behalf of Mr P Hinds, landowner of two parcels of land known as land to the west of Cocking Lane and land off Town Street, Treswell.</p> <p>Previous representations to promote the allocation of the sites for residential development were submitted to the Council's Draft Bassetlaw Part 1 consultation in 2019 and the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan in early 2020. Figures 1 and 2 below show the location of the two sites. 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.</p> <p>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</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>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. Both sites are available and deliverable and can be delivered sensitively reflecting the village character. It is requested that the Council give serious consideration to increasing the percentage of growth assigned to Treswell as these available development sites demonstrate that the village could deliver a higher number of housing than currently proposed.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF166	Land south of Common Lane, Harworth & Bircotes	LAA226	Fisher German on behalf of land owners	<p>These representations have been prepared by Fisher German on behalf of Mr J Durdy, landowner of land at Harworth and Bircotes. These representations focus on the land south of Common Lane as shown in Figure 1 below. The land south of Common Lane has previously been submitted to the Council's Land Availability Assessment (LAA) and was assessed in the November 2020 version of the LAA under Reference LAA226.</p> <p>The LAA concludes that there is "potential for the site to become suitable subject to a review of Harworth & Bircotes NP". The land south of Common Lane (see Figure 1) is located to the south west of Harworth & Bircotes and extends to approximately 2.9 ha. Existing residential development is located to the north of the site, further residential development and a cemetery lies to the east. The south-western boundary is formed by the A1(M) and land to the west is currently uncultivated scrub land.</p> <p>The Bassetlaw Land Availability Assessment November 2020 (LAA) identified the land south of Common Lane (Ref: LAA226) as a potentially suitable site for residential development (approx. 78 dwellings). Within the assessment of suitability, the LAA states that the site is currently unsuitable due to Harworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy 6 which supports the redevelopment of the Harworth Colliery site and sites within the settlement</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>boundary only. As such, this assessment does not preclude the Council from choosing to allocate the site within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The LAA has also flagged the A1(M) as a potential constraint to development due to potential noise and air pollution issues. To address this, any future planning application on the site would be supported by a robust noise assessment and monitoring of air pollution levels to confirm the extent of these issues and how any negative impacts can be mitigated. Moreover, it is also considered that the development could provide an acoustic barrier (if necessary) plus open space/enhanced planting to buffer the A1(M) from the proposed and existing development.</p> <p>As a consequence, we believe that there are no overriding constraints which would prevent this site from coming forward for residential development. We therefore urge the Council to consider the site as an available, suitable and achievable site for residential development.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF167 - includes vision document	Land west of Tiln Lane, Retford	LAA071	Marrons Planning on behalf of Vistry Homes Limited	<p>The Vistry site at Tiln Lane, Retford (see Site Location Plan, Appendix 1) was first promoted for development as part of the initial Call for Sites. The site is immediately adjacent to the 175 dwellings currently under construction by Vistry (Linden Homes) (planning permission reference 14/00503/OUT) at Tiln Lane. Both sites are controlled by our client and the additional land could form a further phase of development, utilising existing and proposed improvements to infrastructure.</p> <p>20. The Land Availability Assessment (LAA) (January 2020) assessed the suitability of the additional Tiln Lane land for housing development (site reference LAA071). The LAA did not identify any significant physical or environmental constraints to development but raised concerns regarding the general relationship to the settlement boundary and landscape impact. The potential impact on non-designated heritage assets (Bolham Manor and the Bolham Water Pumping Station) were also identified as areas of potential concern.</p> <p>21. The updated Sustainability Statement (November 2020) reflects the initial findings of the SHLAA in identifying potential negative effects in these areas, as</p>	<p>The Council has reviewed this site taking into consideration the proposed landscaping/masterplan submitted. Whilst it has addressed some of the issues identified in the reasons for not taking the site forward for allocation (i.e. heritage), the site is still located quite a distance from a bus service and other services. The sites that have been taken forward have better access to services, or provide an opportunity for improvements to services. As such, the site has not been selected for allocation. This site will remain in the Land Availability Assessment and be considered at the 5 year review of the Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>well as transport and biodiversity and geodiversity. There are also potential 'significant negative effects' in terms of land use and soils and with regards to water. However, these negative effects are common to all of the greenfield sites assessed. The Local Plan acknowledges that greenfield land is needed to meet the development needs of the District.</p> <p>Additional Technical and Environmental Work</p> <p>22. Vistry Homes Limited has commissioned significant additional technical work and environmental assessments of the site to address the issues raised in the SHLAA and SA. 23. These include a detailed Heritage Setting Assessment; a detailed Landscape Assessment; a Transport and Accessibility Appraisal, including a vehicular, public transport, walking and cycling strategy; a Utilities Constraints Assessment; a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy; and an Ecological and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.</p> <p>24. The technical and environmental assessments identify that should be no 'in principle' objection to the site being allocated for development and that areas of concern can be addressed through careful masterplanning. The assessments have informed the preparation of a landscape-led masterplan for a sustainable</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>development that takes into consideration the site's constraints and opportunities.</p> <p>25. The Heritage Setting Assessment concludes that setting development back from the north eastern site boundary and carrying out additional boundary planting can reduce the impact on the Grade II listed Bolham Hall to the north of the site to negligible (less than substantial in NPPF terms). The same conclusion is reached regarding the non-designated Bolham Hall Park and Garden to the north east.</p> <p>26. Open space at the northern boundary would help to retain views of the Pumping Station, a non-designated heritage asset to the north, so that harm caused by the development is negligible at most. Meanwhile, Bolham Manor (a nondesignated heritage asset beyond the western site boundary) was designed to be viewed from the west. Whilst there may be minimal harm to non-key views from the east, the proposed development would have a minimal impact on the building's setting.</p> <p>27. The Landscape and Visual Overview notes there are no landscape designations that affect the site. The site would be contained by existing development to the south, west and north. Views of the site are mostly</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>limited to those from the immediate surroundings and east. 28. A sensitively designed proposal would not have a material adverse landscape and visual effect. Structural planting to the north eastern and eastern boundaries and setting back development would help to assimilate the new homes into the townscape and would respect the local character.</p> <p>29. The site is well located to existing facilities and services in the immediate vicinity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Carr Hill Primary School – 600m from the site · Retford Train Station – 2.9km from the site · The Elizabeth Academy (Secondary School) – 2.3km from the site · Retford Oaks Academy (Secondary School) – 2.8km from the site <p>30. Retford Town Centre is approximately 1.25km from the site and provides a range of convenience, comparison, retail service, leisure, financial and business services. The Bassetlaw Retail Study (2017) forms part of the Plan evidence base and noted the Town Centre was well provided for in terms of the variety of different uses and that the provision of convenience and comparison units sat well above the national averages.</p> <p>31. The nearest bus stop is within 500m on Tiln Lane and the site could be made</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>more sustainable by providing an additional bus stop on Tiln Lane. The adjacent housing development was due to make a Section 106 contribution of £130k to fund additional public transport provision, and the development of adjoining land would provide additional patronage.</p> <p>32. Additional highways work indicates that the existing site accesses off Tiln Lane are capable of accommodating a further phase of development, with significant spare capacity. The impact on the local highway network will be considered in detail as part of any future planning application. This will include a detailed capacity analysis of the local highway network identifying appropriate mitigation measures as necessary. 33. The Preliminary Flood Risk and Drainage Appraisal confirms the site is at a very low risk of flooding from all sources, with the exception of groundwater flooding which could be easily addressed through raised floor levels. Surface water could be disposed of by infiltration, or by discharging to the nearby River Idle, with surface water discharge restricted to greenfield runoff rates via on site attenuation. Potential foul water connection points are present nearby, the closest within 90m of the site. In summary, there</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>are no flood risk constraints that would prevent the development of the site, and surface water can be managed using sustainable urban drainage systems.</p> <p>34. At this early stage, a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been undertaken to identify potential constraints to development and to highlight opportunities for ecological enhancement. An initial Biodiversity Net Gain assessment has also been undertaken to ensure the proposed concept masterplan could deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF167 - includes vision document	Land west of Tiln Lane, Retford	LAA071	Marrons Planning on behalf of Vistry Homes Limited	<p>Vision Document and Initial Concept Masterplan 35. The findings of the technical and environmental reports are summarised in the attached 'Vision Document' submitted by Vistry, which demonstrates how the site can be brought forward as a sustainable, high quality neighbourhood of circa 120 homes, and as a logical extension to the 175 dwelling Tiln Lane scheme.</p> <p>36. The Vision Document demonstrates there are no technical impediments that would preclude development and that areas of potential concern can be mitigated through careful masterplanning to create a sustainable development.</p> <p>37. Vistry Homes Limited is confident that the Initial Concept Masterplan could form the basis of a policy compliant planning application, and welcomes the opportunity to discuss the allocation of the site with officers further. Conclusion</p> <p>38. This submission has highlighted that land at Tiln Lane in Retford is both available and suitable for residential development during the plan period. A Vision Document has been produced with a Concept Masterplan to show how landscape, townscape and cultural heritage concerns can be positively addressed.</p> <p>39. There are no 'in principle' issues to prevent the</p>	See above response.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>site from being delivered. The site is in a suitable location for housing development, is available now and is readily deliverable, being under the control of a 5-star national housebuilder. It can make an early contribution to housing supply in Bassetlaw District and to the Council's five year housing land supply.</p> <p>40. The Council is asked to consider the Land west of Tiln Lane in Retford as part of a sustainable approach to meeting the development needs of Retford and the wider District.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF013	Land off Grove Road Retford	LAA097	Land Owner	Map title is NT465762 I have attached an outline map. The land is available and I would be looking for residential planning. I believe this land is in line with the current outline plans of Bassett Law to develop land to the South of Retford.	Whilst the site is potentially suitable for development, the proposed allocations are closer to services and facilities. The Council has is proposing to allocate well in excess of the land needed to meet the housing need at the current time. This site will remain in the Land Availability Assessment and be considered at the five year review of the Local Plan.
REF022	Former Fairy Grove Nursery, Retford	LAA127	Land Owners of Fairy Grove Allocation site - Represented by Brown and Co	1) Intentions for the site - If the site does make the final plan we will consider offers to develop it.	Comment noted and welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF028	Ollerton Road, Tuxford	Part of LAA476	Land Owners of Ollerton Road Tuxford - W H Bett and Sons	<p>of the proposed development site in Tuxford on Ollerton Road. We support the development of the site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tuxford has had little development recently and there is a need for new housing. Building new houses in Tuxford will give more opportunity for people to live in the rural area rather than lack of housing forcing them to live in Retford or Worksop. It is important for young people, who have grown up in Tuxford and the local area, to have the option to live in Tuxford. 2. Tuxford is an ideal site for development because it has facilities such as good schools, shops, library, community centre and a doctors surgery. The village has good road links with the A1 and A57 close by. 3. The site has no flood risk. 4. The site is only a short walk to shops, café, the library and the primary school. 5. Access to the site from Ollerton road is good. 6. Houses only border the site on one side, the other sides are farmland, and therefore only a small number of people will border the development. 7. The site could expand beyond the area currently marked should further housing be required in Tuxford. 8. We support the development of the site. The site only forms a small part of the land we farm and we will be able to continue to farm when the 	Comments noted and welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>site is developed.</p> <p>We live close to Tuxford and farm all around the town with two farm yards in the centre of the town. We have many friends and family members who live and run businesses in the town. As local people we are appreciative of the beautiful and historical area and welcome the opportunity to help to ensure that the development enhances Tuxford.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF036	Turner Road, Worksop	N/A	Barton Wilmore and Warrior Developments on behalf of BDC - will be assessed in the DPD LAA	<p>SUBMISSIONS BY WARRIOR DEVELOPMENTS</p> <p>We write on behalf of our client Warrior Developments and in respect of both the Draft Local Plan and the Worksop Central Development Plan Document ('call for sites' exercise and Masterplan). We understand that the Council is consulting on both of the above documents and that the Worksop Central Development Plan Document (DPD) is aligned with the development strategy in the emerging Draft Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, this single set of submissions is made to both of these Council consultation processes. Background Warrior Developments is in control of land at Turner Road, Worksop (see attached Site Location Plan). This land is owned by Bassetlaw District Council, which has entered into a contract with Warrior Developments to bring forward this land for development. As such, our client is legally obliged by the Council to pursue this Site for development purposes.</p> <p>In 2020, our client held several discussions with the Council in its capacity as both landowner and local planning authority with a view to progressing a revised residential project. Those discussions followed a previous application for residential development on site in 2019/2020. The status of the Site is vacant, brownfield land within Worksop's urban area. The Site lies immediately to the north of the Central Worksop area boundary. It is available now for development. Given this context, our client finds it surprising that land</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council is proposing to include the site in the Worksop Central DPD (DPD 001) as a housing allocation to deliver 80 dwellings (see Policy w52 Site Ref. DPD0010). This formed part of the Worksop Central DPD (Regulation 18) Consultation in June 2021.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>north of Turner Road has not been identified as a residential development allocation the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and, that the Site is not included within the Worksop Central Area DPD boundary. It is vacant, brownfield land which the Council wishes to see developed. As such, it represents an 'easy win' in development and regeneration terms. Accordingly, we wish to make the below submissions. Submissions to the Draft Local Plan & Central Worksop DPD Our client is generally supportive of the spatial approach to development, the Council's housing distribution model and strategy set out under Policy ST1 of the Draft Local Plan. Policy ST1 requires 'about 700 dwellings' to be provided for within the Worksop Central Area (Policy ST6 relates). Policy ST6 differs slightly from Policy ST1 in that it refers to Central Worksop providing for 'at least 660' dwellings. The red line boundary of Central Worksop area is provided for at page 50 of the Local Plan. To achieve both the Policy ST1 and ST6 objectives, the Council needs to be confident that there is sufficient land available and developable within Central Worksop. Warrior Developments considers that the Council has overstated the ability of Central Worksop to deliver in the region of 700 homes. As part of the evidence base, the Council has prepared a Land Availability Assessment (November 2020). The conclusions at paragraph 4.5 states that "the Council is seeking to identify land for a minimum of 660 dwellings in Worksop</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Town Centre” (our emphasis). This clearly implies that the actual capacity of the Town Centre at the point of this consultation is presently unknown. The LAA includes an accompanying map which suggests that there are in fact only 5 available sites that lie within Central Worksop Area. Having reviewed the LAA, we make the observations set out in the table below. It is clear that Central Worksop does not have sufficient land available to deliver the homes the Council aspires to in the Draft Local Plan. Whilst holistic redevelopment of the Central Area is one option, this is a costly and time-consuming process that would probably involve compulsory purchase. The Central Worksop DPD does not set out whether this can be achieved or whether it is the intention of the Council to pursue a redevelopment project. As such, the Council needs to find more land to achieve the regeneration of Worksop. This should include a review of the stated Central Area boundary. Furthermore, to the north of Turner Road and east of Carlton Road lies North Nottinghamshire College. This is a substantial learning institution that generates considerable footfall. Such educational facilities are widely utilised to ‘anchor’ town centre strategies. Again, it is therefore unusual for this important town facility to be excluded from the Central Area strategy. Based on the above facts and evidence, Warrior Developments requests that the following changes are made to the Draft Local Plan and</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Worksop Central DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Central Worksop DPD Boundary is extended to include land north of Turner Road and North Nottinghamshire College; · The Central Worksop DPD allocates land north of Turner Road for residential development; and · The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan allocates land north of Turner Road for residential development. <p>We would be grateful if you would keep us informed as to the emerging Local Plan and also the Worksop Town Centre DPD.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF045	Retford Golf Club	N/A	Retford Golf Club	<p>We would wish to comment on the above development. In July 2017 Retford Golf Club applied for a pre-planning application for residential development on the 7.6 acre practise field adjacent to the proposed development for Ordsall South, as marked in blue on the attached plan. Your letter dated 2nd November 2017 stated that ' in principle the proposal for residential development may be acceptable'. We would therefore request that this be included on your updated proposals. The development of Ordsall South, which we fully support, would provide clear and unrestricted access to this development. The significant decline in membership over recent years has jeopardised the viability of the club, the latest financial results show a deficit of £47,000, the development of this land would not only safeguard 12 jobs but sustain the only golf club in Retford and the health and wellbeing of its older members. Furthermore, we would wish to include the club house, 1st and 18th holes in the Ordsall South development, as marked in red on the attached plan, total approx. 12.5 acres, this would have the advantages of:- 1. Providing dwellings closer to local amenities; 2. Safeguard the golf club for the long term by allowing development of two holes and a club house to the west of the course; 3. Safeguard 12 jobs; 4. Create a further 15 jobs; 5 Increase local GVA by £500k 6 Convert the club house into a care home, its design was based on plans for a care home.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council is proposing to take part of this site (the practice range) forward for housing and associated infrastructure. The golf course is considered unsuitable due to the loss of open space/sports facilities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF053	Old Webbs Service Station, North Road, Retford	N/A	Land Owner (also own Station Road site in Retford)	<p>I would also like to mention our other site, the old Webbs service Station on North Road Retford Notts and the land that we own directly behind approximately 5 acres. We would love to see this put forward also as " available and deliverable "as a site for redevelopment.</p> <p>I have included two attachments from our deeds of the North Road site the first one shows the approx 5 acres and the second one shows the adjoining Webbs Garage on the Great North Road of which we own both. The approx 5 acres backs onto Tarmac Road. It is adjoining the land which previously had planning permission for a car Auction which is owned by Bawtry Motor Auctions. We would love to see this put forward also as " available and deliverable "as a site for redevelopment.</p>	The site is detached from the settlement boundary in an isolated area. It is considered unsuitable for development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF065	Land off Eldon Street, Tuxford	N/A	Land Owner	<p>We have recently purchased the business of Platts Harris Limited which is based within the town of Tuxford.</p> <p>A copy of the Title Plan is attached, the business operates from the area accessed from Eldon Street and shown on the plan edged in red with our boundary to the housing development marked in green.</p> <p>We operate a farm and groundcare machinery business from the site and although access is good the size of the equipment we sell and work on continues to increase with the majority of movements requiring HGV1 movement.</p> <p>We operate 11 sites across the country with many of these sites being located on industrial estates or away from built up areas for ease of transportation.</p> <p>We understand that the previous owners of the business had engaged with a residential house builder to put together a scheme and that plans had been produced. The plan was to develop the existing site with the business moving to industrial premises at Markham Moor.</p> <p>We were contacted by Tuxford Parish Council and made aware of the Local Plan.</p> <p>We have only been in Tuxford since November, but we plan to investigate further the opportunity to relocate the business and develop the site and as such wanted to register our interest so that this maybe considered within the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The site provides an opportunity for a well located housing development on brownfield land on the edge of Tuxford town centre. However, it is currently in operation as an agricultural supplies business and there is no developer interest at the current time. The company has not identified an alternative site to relocate the business and it has not been demonstrated that there would be no loss of employment. The access from the public highway has poor visibility and a solution would need to be identified to address this. The site could be potentially suitable for allocation for housing if these issues can be satisfactorily addressed.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				Please feel free to make contact if you need any further details at this stage.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF069	Land at Laneham	N/A	Land Owner	<p>On the call today you mentioned getting in touch if we had hopes/plans to develop some land that is not recognised in the current plan.</p> <p>I have looked at the previous plans for Laneham that identifies two sites that are in the flood plain. I have a three acre site at the other end of the village which is not subject to flooding and which I am planning to seek consent to develop. My idea was to have a mixed development (a bit like Blossom Grove in Retford) which can have starter homes, space for people downsizing, etc., with a small shop and playground.</p> <p>Please let me know if this is something you would consider and what further information you need at this stage. We have only just started thinking about it which doesn't really work with your deadline.</p> <p>I have attached an image which shows the approx. 2.96 acre field and derelict barns that we would like to develop.</p> <p>Do let me know if you would like any more information. Also, whether you recommend we allow for other facilities that you mentioned, e.g. a doctor's surgery, although the village would still be very small. We are really keen on the idea of a mixed development built in the local vernacular along the lines of Blossom Grove, but with more features, e.g., a layby for a bus stop, etc., especially for a school bus as we would like to attract young families.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF111	Land at Saundby, west side A631	N/A	Land Owner	<p>Following a conversation today, I write to propose a site for consideration for allocation in the Bassetlaw Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is marked in red on the attached plan and is the village of Saundby, on the west side of the A631.</p> <p>The site is currently a grass paddock. There are currently two means of vehicular access in situ. There is water, electricity and gas connections in close proximity to the site.</p> <p>The site is available for development immediately and we would be seeking to develop residential properties.</p> <p>The land is in the sole ownership of myself, George Barton.</p> <p>If you require any further information, please do let me know.</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Local Plan Policies relating to the rural area of Bassetlaw would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.
REF131	Land off West Moor Road, Walkeringham	N/A	Hubble Architecture on behalf of land owners	<p>On behalf of my client, I would like for the site accessed off West Moor Road, Walkeringham to be included once again for consideration for site allocation/ development site. The site is available for immediate development subject to planning permission. I have attached a site location extract for your information with the site highlighted in red.</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
					development of this site.
REF154	Land off Low Street, Gringley on the Hill	N/A	Hubble Architecture on behalf of land owners	On behalf of my client, I would like for the site accessed off Low Street, Gringley on The Hill, Doncaster to be included once again for consideration for site allocation/ development site. The site is available for immediate development subject to planning permission. I have attached an image of the location for your information with the site highlighted in red.	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF181	<p>Land At Freemans Lane Sturton Le Steeple Nottinghamshire</p> <p>Land At Gainsborough Road Sturton Le Steeple Nottinghamshire</p> <p>Land between Roses Farm and Four Paws, Station Road</p>		Rural Solutions on behalf of Foljambe Estates	<p>The utilisation of the three sites within Sturton-le-Steeple for residential development forms part of the estate's strategic plan to release land for development where it can contribute to enhancing the vitality of the community and at the same time providing additional income for the Estate to invest in its assets which includes historic buildings.</p> <p>Each of the three sites are all well connected to the existing settlement and are all Suitable, Available and Achievable to accommodate small scale housing development that will facilitate the sustainable growth of the Sturton-le-Steeple. It is our view that each of the three sites should be included within the site allocations of the local plan and they can contribute towards maintaining the council's five-year housing land supply.</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF188	Former High Marnham Power Station, Fledborough Road, High Marnham		Emery Planning on behalf of J.G.G Pears Property Ltd	<p>In response to the consultation, we make the following representations on behalf of J G Pears who are a significant local employer and owners of the Former High Marnham Power Station, Fledborough Road, High Marnham as well as other nearby sites. The site is a major previously developed site with a lawful use for employment purposes. Planning permission exists at the site for erection of a storage building (application reference: 19/00818/FUL).</p> <p>Emery Planning made representations on behalf of our clients to the previous two Regulation 18 consultations on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan initially promoting the site as a major previously developed site with potential to be developed for employment purposes and latterly supporting its proposed allocation as a GreenEnergy Hub. Throughout this time, we have worked collaboratively with the planning policy team to enable the delivery of the site which is identified in the most recent iteration of the Draft Plan as “High Marnham Green Energy Hub” (Policy ST9, Site reference EM008).</p> <p>We welcome this allocation and look forward to working with the LPA and other stakeholders to secure delivery of this site.</p> <p>Since the previous round of consultation, J G Pears</p>	Comments noted and welcomed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>have completed the purchase of the whole site from the former landowners, E-on. This is a significant investment for our client's and serves to demonstrate their commitment to the delivery of the site as allocated and to provide certainty that it can be delivered and assist the Council in meeting its aims and objectives as set out through the Plan.</p> <p>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. 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.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, we reserve the right to make further representations, including oral representations to the Examination in Public, if so required.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF194	Worksop College - Worksop Site and Ranby Site		P&DG on behalf of Woodward Schools (Nottinghamshire)	<p>P&DG seek the District Council's full consideration of the above comments made on behalf of Woodard Schools (Nottinghamshire) Limited to ensure soundness of the plan, and ultimately so it is positively prepared. We also hope that consideration of the opportunities raised in the enclosed masterplan will assist the rationale we have made. To support this further going forward, it is the College's intentions to demonstrate the technicalities of the masterplan further by way of a vision document supporting both the Worksop and Ranby sites. By way of introduction, Woodard Schools (Nottinghamshire) Limited has a particular interest in the emerging Local Plan because of its key importance not only in the educational provision of Bassetlaw, but also because of its role within the community, as an employer, service provider and supporting local knowledge and skills. The sites are already actively used by a large variety of local firms whose operations depend on the school. This includes the hiring of sports facilities on the site including the swimming pool, sports hall, cricket and AstroTurf pitches, and the wider grounds of the school. A similar operation exists at the Ranby site, particularly supporting sports clubs and hosting music festivals for the Retford and Ordsall area.</p> <p>It is also the College's intention to seek to open its venues up to further groups, including utilising other areas such as Churchill Hall, the Theatre and</p>	The Council has assessed this site through the Land Availability Appraisal which concludes that it is not suitable for the scale of development proposed mainly due to the impact it would have on heritage assets. As such, it has not been taken forward for allocation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>the Chapel for the likes of local theatre/drama groups, choirs, dance groups, for networking and business events, baby and toddler groups, and for the community and charity sectors. In turn, those particular services will be instrumental in the near future for enhancing the promotion of the school as well as the event and sporting facilities offered at both sites.</p> <p>The sites at Worksop and Ranby thus offer significant potential for the regeneration of the Town and District and it is paramount that this potential translates to additional development opportunities to be secured by the new Local Plan, so that the position of the school can be strengthened, its future secured and more local businesses can benefit from its facilities. Spatially, the Worksop site is located close to the town, and near connections with green infrastructure and Clumber Park to the south. There are a number of land and property assets within the college site that are enclosed with these representations as a wider masterplan that would benefit from further discussions with the Council following this consultation of the plan, and by way of a site-specific policy being made as recommended below.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan does include numerous allocations at this stage, but it does appear to be placing reliance upon a relatively low number of</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>strategic sites and the prospective Garden Village to deliver its overall housing estimates. The plan is positively forecasting growth above Government household projections, but we would have concerns that focusing too narrowly in this way not only increases risk in a plan should the development trajectory lapse, it also downplays the importance of other commitments that could arise in the plan that are important to the overall spatial strategy. Such proposals could come forward in addition to the minimum requirements set by Government and the NPPF. Having secured a number of allocations in this way across the East Midlands, most recently in the Bolsover and Mansfield Local Plans in 2020 we are of the view that this would be beneficial to the Bassetlaw Local Plan through the inclusion of site-specific policies for the Worksop College sites to realise their true regenerative potential, abilities to potentially meet a significant number of objectives raised in the plan and increase choice of development sites in the plan.</p> <p>It is profound that despite the significance and potential explained above, there is currently not a single reference to the College site within the Draft Local Plan, nor a coherent policy that focuses upon the role of the planning system to support the short- and long-term future of educational establishments, investment in their excellence and growth and diversification of their estate. It is</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>accepted that in the context of both the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy and the emerging Local Plan, the Worksop College sitesuch investment and growth can be in part covered by other policies of the Draft Local Plan, namely ST12 'Rural Economic Growth & Economic Growth outside Employment Areas' and ST13 'Visitor Economy'.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Worksop College site lies less than a mile from the existing settlement boundary of Worksop, as the principal settlement in the adopted and emerging Local Plan. Contextually, this area is already partly characterised as a gateway to Worksop along the B6034 containing a number of residential properties and businesses beside the school, including both the College Pines and Worksop Golf Clubs, Hannah Park and one of the town's cemeteries, and a depot site. Housing exists this side of Worksop along Windmill Lane, along with those for staff dispersed among the College site (including Sparken Hill Farm) and there are properties south of the A57 when entering the town along Sparken Hill. The college site is also only circa two miles from the centre of Worksop and bears both a key spatial and strategic relationship to it and its surrounding settlements.</p> <p>The benefits of including a site-specific policy in Local Plans is regionally well proven. For instance, P&DG orchestrated a dedicated policy (SoAP 2) in the Amended Newark and Sherwood District Local</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Plan Review 2019 focused with the future growth of Nottingham Trent University's Brackenhurst Campus. This then evolved into Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and the University. We consider a similar approach would be beneficial to the Bassetlaw Local Plan in respect of the College sites and their full potential to contribute towards Local Plan objectives. We believe that the Worksop site can contribute to all of the remaining 12 objectives. The remaining two are not applicable to the site.</p> <p>In principle by focusing on the policy it provides a greater focus on the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting existing businesses to grow and diversify to their full potential; • Enhancing skills gaps and supporting a higher skilled workforce; • Making the best use of previously developed land and buildings; • Broadening the District's housing tenure; • Addressing health inequality in the District through access to improved links to recreation and amenity space; and • Addressing environmental constraints and building in climate change resilience. <p>On the basis of our reasoned planning justification, the suggested policy for the Worksop site is as follows: The District Council will work with Woodard</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Schools (Nottinghamshire) Limited and other partners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development of new educational and research facilities and additional staffing and student accommodation at the Worksop College site; • Support the diversification of land uses on the site that deliver the objectives of the Local Plan for both the rural and visitor economies; • Encourage the development of businesses and companies locally which harness the education potential of the Worksop College site or local community; • Ensure that new development, where permitted by this policy, does not prejudice other policies of the Local Plan. <p>Also important is ensuring the long-term future of the College's site at Ranby within the plan period. Again, should this site need to evolve during that time it is a sound planning basis to ensure that there is a specific policy for the site in place should it become an additional site commitment during the plan period. The Ranby site also has great potential to deliver many of the objectives in the Local Plan, including the delivery of the eventual housing requirement for the village. It is our view that the proposed cap should not restrict further growth in this settlement if it were to create other opportunities for land uses that meet the requirements of the Local Plan.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Our suggestion for the proposed policy at the Ranby site is as follows:</p> <p>The District Council will work with Woodard Schools (Nottinghamshire) Limited and other partners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development of new educational facilities and meeting identified housing needs at the Worksop College (Ranby) site; • Support the diversification of land uses on the site that deliver the objectives of the Local Plan for the rural and visitor economies; • Ensure that new development, where permitted by this policy, does not prejudice other policies of the Local Plan and the setting of the Ranby School Unregistered Park and Garden. 	
REF195	Peaks Hill Farm, North of Worksop		Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land Management	We are instructed by Hallam Land Management to make representations to the Bassetlaw Local Plan in respect of the Regulation 18 Consultations regarding land they control at Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop. This representation is in addition to our previous representations under Regulation 18 dated 21 February 2019 and 25 February 2020.	Comments noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF179	Land at Saundby	is this same land as REF111 above	George Barton on behalf of land owner Mr W E Barton	As discussed earlier here is a plan of proposed areas of development interest. I believe some or all areas were entered previously. We would be interested in either infill in areas or larger scale development. The ownership of land is Mr W E Barton. There are services close to all sites. Residential property would be the intended change of use. If you require any further details please don't hesitate to let me know.	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Local Plan Policies relating to the rural area of Bassetlaw would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.
REF042	Land at Thorpe Road, Mattersey	N/A	Land owner	Please see scanned "call for sites pro forma" in folder for more details.	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Local Plan Policies relating to the rural area of Bassetlaw would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF196	Land in Clayworth	N/A	Savills on behalf of The Henry Smith Charity	Savills (UK) Ltd represents The Henry Smith Charity who own land around the village of Clayworth which is within the north eastern part of the District. Clayworth is a village with facilities which include a church and two public houses. It also served by public transport, and buses provide connections to Gainsborough and Retford. It is therefore considered that Clayworth is a sustainable location for a proportionate amount of growth.	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Local Plan Policies relating to the rural area of Bassetlaw would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF099	Site off Harworth Road, Blyth	LAA494	K Wallis, Trustees of H.S. Wallis	<p>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 which in the event of it being developed access would be taken.</p> <p>The north-east boundary is defined by a very deep surface water drainage dyke with long established dwellings beyond.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There are no known ecological or environmental issues raised by the development of the site and the site is not subject to flood risk.</p> <p>The site fits very well into the pattern of existing development of "North Blyth".</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>The site extends to about 2 hectares but not all of the land could be developed. That is partly</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Local Plan Policies relating to the rural area of Bassetlaw would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The developable area possibly extends to no more than 1.6ha about 4 acres but that 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 1.5 ha or about 3.5 acres - perhaps some 35 dwellings.</p> <p>The total would represent an appropriate density in this location, offers scope for a variety of dwelling design and satisfies both the need to</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				make the most effective use of land and remain sustainable.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF205	Chainbridge Lane, Lound		Heatons on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd	<p>Tarmac also benefit from freehold ownership of land at Chainbridge Lane, east of Lound, approximately 4km north of Retford. Tarmac would like to submit 17.5 hectares of land at Lound for employment uses over the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan period. The land itself consists of a Charcon precast concrete facility and associated adjoining land, as shown on the accompanying Plan (Drawing No. L023-00288-1). The employment uses a Chainbridge Lane are long-established and have expanded in recent years.</p> <p>The land hereby promoted is located adjacent to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve, with Local Wildlife Sites (Draft Local Plan Policy ST36) located to the north and east. However, the Charcon precast concrete facility benefits from a permanent planning permission. Furthermore, permission ref. 13/00874/COU for the change of use of land adjoining the precast facility to land for the storage of HGV trailers and precast concrete products in connection with the precast facility was issued in September 2013. This permission was also without any 'end date' and represents a permanent planning permission.</p> <p>We submit that Tarmac's freehold landholding a Chainbridge Lane currently contributes to the portfolio of employment sites within the District and should be recognised within Policy ST11 'Existing Employment Sites' within the Local Plan. Given the presence of a wider Tarmac landholding,</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to include the site within existing employment sites. Policies in the Bassetlaw Plan and the NPPF support sustainable business growth in rural areas.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				the site retains the potential for expansion/diversification of its uses to support economic growth for the area in accordance with the objectives of NPPF and Policy ST12 'Rural Economic Growth and Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas' of the Draft Local Plan.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF073	Gateford Park	LAA491	Grace Machin on behalf of H Machin, J.V.Machin, H.V.Machin and R.G.V.Machin	<p>In response to the February 2020 representations, we have identified the Councils response to our submissions within the Land Availability Assessment Appendices (November 2020) on the 'Workshop' Plan. The site is referenced as LAA491. A copy of this plan accompanies this submission as it appears that the LPA have wrongly referenced the wider land holding as the 'development area'. Accordingly, LAA 491 should be split up into parcels to reflect the development areas identified and not that of wider Estate ownership. It is important that the Council do not term the development areas as Gateford Park* (see below). A more accurate description for the wider area would be Gateford Hall Farm. The land is 'farmland' rather than as currently described, 'park and garden' which is clearly mis-leading. If the matter is in any way unclear, we would like to discuss further with the LPA to clarify. Accordingly, the comments below have been made on the wider Estate and not those identified as Potential Development Areas. They are: A (Housing) – B (Extension of adjacent residential area) – C (Development consistent with the character of the Conservation Area). The LAA Appendices – Appendix G: Workshop LAA – sites without planning permission currently state the following:</p> <p>LAA Ref: LAA491 Location: Workshop Site Address: Gateford Park*</p>	The Council has reviewed the separate parcels of land submitted through the Land Availability process. All three sites are considered unsuitable due to impact on heritage assets and highways constraints (see LAA conclusion for full details).

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Size (ha):94</p> <p>Capacity / desired number of dwellings:1500</p> <p>Boundaries: The site adjoins countryside to the north, east and west, and residential development to the south and south east.</p> <p>Current Land Use: Unregistered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Area Character: Open countryside / main gateway to Worksop from the west.</p> <p>Physical Constraints: A development of this scale would require supporting by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance. It is likely that major off-site highway infrastructure improvements would be necessary to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the development and that contributions would be sought towards public transport. The site would require multiple access points.</p> <p>Environmental Constraints: The proposed site has triggered the impact risk zone for Lindrick Golf Course SSSI3 and may also impact Anston Stones Woods SSSI4 depending on the level of air pollution generated. The SSSI occupies what was formerly common land, allowing the survival of a natural flora away from the greens and fairways. The SSSI supports the largest, and one of the most diverse, areas of Magnesian limestone grassland in South Yorkshire. Additional habitat includes gorse, scrub, woodland and the marshy fringes of the River Ryton. There is also a small pond with associated fen vegetation. The scale of the</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>proposed development could result in recreational pressure, any potential impacts would have to be assessed and the mitigation hierarchy followed. Air quality impacts must be assessed as Anston Sones Wood SSSI has a number of features that are sensitive to air pollution and the site is above it is critical load. The scale of the development may generate over 2000 AADT during the operational phase and over 200 AADT for HGV's during the construction phase. Impact on Ancient woodland should also be assessed if the site is taken forward</p> <p>Policy Compliant (national and local)? NPPF: 'Planning policies and decisions should 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.' And Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national, and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where</p> <p>Proximity to services and facilities: The site currently has poor access to services and facilities. This could be addressed through the incorporation of services and facilities on site given the size of the site.</p> <p>Assessment of suitability: Unsuitable for residential development due to the adverse impact on heritage assets. Other constraints</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>include potential impact on nearby SSSIs, on site Local Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland.</p> <p>Appropriateness and market attractiveness: The site adjoins a popular residential area.</p> <p>Contribution to regeneration priorities: N/A</p> <p>Potential Impact on landscape, heritage, and nature conservation: Heritage A large part of this site, to the south and west, is within the Old Gateford Conservation Area and the area of open space contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the setting of several Listed Buildings (including Gateford Hall, grade II*, and Gateford Hill, grade II). Development within the Conservation Area boundary, or immediately to the north west adjacent to Owday Lane, would not be supported. With regard to the northern parts of the site, this is within the Gateford Hall & Gateford Hill unregistered park & garden and within the setting of the Conservation and nearby Listed Buildings. Again, development there would not be supported as it would irrevocably harm the significance of the heritage assets mentioned, even having in mind the existing housing developments. Archaeology Iron Age settlement activity and medieval moated sites are located within the site boundary. Cropmarks noted to the east of the east on NMP. Likely to be significant impact to both archaeology and built heritage (listed buildings, Gateford Hall, California Farm and Gateford Hill House). The Council's Archaeologist would not support plans</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>for development in this area until a full site-specific geophysical survey followed by targeted evaluation trenching and a heritage impact assessment for all identified archaeology and buildings has been undertaken. This is needed to provide an informed planning recommendation; however, refusal would still be a high possibility given the likely impact to designated buildings and heritage assets.</p> <p>Availability: Available</p> <p>Conclusion: The site is unsuitable for residential development as it would irrevocably harm the significance of the heritage assets mentioned in this assessment.</p> <p>Take forward for consideration as a housing allocation? No</p> <p>Reasoned Justification: Unsuitable</p> <p>As we have set out this commentary above is reflective of the wider Estate ownership and not the development parcels we have previously identified as A, B and C.</p> <p>We consider that the LPA should re-appraise each of the individual sites to make their Land Availability Assessment robust.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDC has incorrectly labelled my clients land ownership plan as a development area – LAA491. The site address of Gateford Park should be changed to Gateford Hall Farm. • There is a requirement for BDC to assess each of the three previously submitted development areas 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>individually and cumulatively (the identified areas are re-submitted with this consultation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sustainability appraisal has not accurately recorded and assessed each of my client's development sites so that a comparative analysis with the only other greenfield site on the edge of Worksop can be undertaken – Site HS1 – Peaks Hill Farm. • We do not consider that the allocation of a single large site on the edge of Worksop to be a robust strategy to ensure a consistent supply of new homes in the most sustainable location in the District. • Peaks Hill Farm is outlined to be a 'complex site to deliver'. • We seek to reserve the right to submit further representations at the Regulation 19 Consultation Stage promoting the suitability of my clients of land for development and to question the Housing Distribution Strategy which promotes just one single large green field allocation on the edge of Worksop to meet housing needs to 2037. • We shall seek to undertake further work and form a robust evidence base to support our future representations at the Reg 19 Consultation Stage and ultimately Inspector led hearing sessions. • We shall consider matters relating to heritage, highways, ecology, archaeology, etc. • We question many of the points as set out in Appendix G of the November 2020 LAA and shall 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				seek to address them by way of professional and technical assessment in the coming months.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF215	Gringley Road, Misterton	Previously identified as Policy 9 NP03 in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan	Land owner	<p>DID NOT SUBMIT A RED LINE BOUNDARY I wish to make representation for the Draft Local Plan as a land owner and and former resident in Misterton.</p> <p>The Misterton Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) was prepared by and for the Misterton Parish in an open and democratic procedure over a period of time to project Misterton in it's capacity as a Rural Service Centre.</p> <p>In S10 Housing of the MNP 6 preferred sites were selected and recommended for the future housing allocation.</p> <p>Policy 9 (NP03) Land at Gringley Road (south) was supported by BDC. When the MNP was subjected to an Independent Examiner's Report (during which period supportive comment was clear) democracy was lost and recommendation for deletion of P9 (NP03) resulted which was against the spirit of MNP. There was no opportunity for further representation(s) prior to or during the Full Council vote on 27th June 2019.</p> <p>Since the approval of MNP into planning policy the projected number of new dwellings for Misterton as a Large Rural Settlement has been reduced by site(s) approvals for less dwellings than had been projected thereby producing a shortfall.</p> <p>2020 (the COVID year) has been a defining year</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>due to recognition of changes in people's working and lifestyle habits and preferences (including home based working some of which being enforced).</p> <p>Provision of additional sites allocations can be justified (ST1 and ST2) especially in Misterton as a Large Rural Settlement and especially sites of less than 1 hectare and those suitable for Self and Custom Built Housing (ST27 B).</p> <p>In order for the democratic wishes of the Parish MNP) to be honoured and the Large Rural Settlement of Misterton viewed as "a whole" it is strongly suggested that the Development Limit be extended to include Gringley Road (south) south of Cooper's Bridge which is one of three bridges over the Chesterfield Canal in the village.</p> <p>The site allocation I am proposing for this invitation for comment on the Draft Local Plan is the frontage land east of 38 Gringley Road Misterton DN10 4AP a vacant infill site of 0.3 ha (previously identified as Policy 9 NP03 in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan)</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF200	Land at Top Farm, South of Coalpit Lane, Elkesley		Savills on behalf of the landowners of Top Farm, Elkesley	<p>SEE LAA FOLDER FOR MASTERPLAN/VISION DOCUMENT Land at Top Farm, South of Coalpit Lane, Elkesley</p> <p>This submission has been prepared by Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of the landowners of Top Farm, Elkesley, in response to the new Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Consultation and in support of the land to the south of Coalpit Lane, Elkesley identified on the attached site location plan.</p> <p>The thrust of these representations is to share the specific concerns we have over policies ST1 and ST2 in so far as the categorisation of Elkesley as a small rural settlement and the reduction of housing growth attributed to the village as a consequence. For the reasons set out within this letter it is clear that it should be recategorised as a large rural settlement and relevant growth apportioned to ensure the long term sustainability of the village and that any future growth is not stifled.</p> <p>Further as set out on our scheme website (www.elkesleyfields.co.uk) the land south of Coalpit Lane represents an opportunity to deliver essential growth within the village of Elkesley. The landowners are willing and able to develop their land with the aim of creating a world class exemplar of rural development - maximising benefits back to the village for generations to come.</p> <p>The Site</p> <p>The site is located to the western edge of Elkesley</p>	<p>The Rural Settlement Study sets out the reasons for designating 'Large Rural settlement' . Elkersley does not meet the criteria for a large rural settlement which is defined as: Large Rural Settlements play a role as a 'service centre' for other settlements, have individually 500 or more dwellings and have all of the following; a primary school, doctors surgery/health centre, a community centre/hall, a convenience store, a church and a public house.</p> <p>The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>village, with the general settlement boundary bordering the site on the majority of sides. Their development would therefore not impact on the core shape and form of the village.</p> <p>The sites currently comprise a number of vacant greenfields associated with Top Farm. The site is largely contained by existing vegetation. The site is currently accessed off Coalpit Lane to the north and Brough Lane to the south.</p> <p>Elkesley village is situated approximately 9km south Retford town centre and circa 10km south east of Worksop.</p> <p>The A1 and Coalpit Lane/ High Street are directly accessible via the site. The site benefits from direct access on to the A1 from the recently completed new Elksley Bridge Road infrastructure project.</p> <p>Elkesley village benefits from a Primary and Nursery School, coffee shop and Post Office. Further afield there is also Thaymar tea room and School Farm shop.</p> <p>The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (the lowest risk of flooding) as set out on the Environment Agency's Mapping.</p> <p>There are no major statutory ecological designations on or near the site.</p> <p>There are no listed buildings on or near the site, the closest listed building is located in the western part of Elkesley village, separated by intervening built form.</p> <p>Deliverability and Developability</p> <p>The land at Coalpit Lane represents a deliverable</p>	<p>would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>and developable site in accordance with the definitions contained with the NPPF. There are no known technical constraints (for example ecology, flood risk, drainage, ground and heritage) that would preclude this site coming forward. The landowners are willing and able to develop their land.</p> <p>Design Principles</p> <p>The landowners are keen to create a legacy, working with the residents to avoid a conventional' housing scheme to create a world class exemplar of rural development - maximising benefits back to the village for generations to come. The landowner is also committed to providing Elkesley with a new village pub with input from commercial colleague noting its attractive location adjacent to the A1(m). During early discussions with the landowner, the following will aim to be incorporated in to any future scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A residential development which has the ability to create a unique and exceptional place making opportunity, creating a legacy for the village; · Provide circa 60 new market and affordable houses with associated infrastructure to help meet Bassetlaw's rural housing numbers and Elkesley's local housing need; · Ensure that it was in keeping with the history and character of Elkesley and look to enhance the built environment in the village; · Encourage a low carbon lifestyle through the 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>careful design of the scheme to include where possible low carbon design principles;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Retain and enhance connecting green infrastructure corridors and build upon existing footpath links around the site to establish sustainable pedestrian and cycle access to local facilities; · Provide local areas of open space for people to meet and play and retain views to the surrounding countryside; · Provide significant tree planting across the site to mitigate the loss of any existing trees on site and to provide a strong street scene; · Design development so that it is well related to the existing settlement from long range views, minimise 'cut and fill' of existing topography to retain the unique sense of place. <p>Public Response</p> <p>To set out or initial thoughts and design principles we had intended to run a face to face public consultation event however given the current pandemic we were unable to hold the event as planned and instead we launched the website and Facebook page to gauge initial views of the proposal from residents in lieu of a traditional physical consultation event, which we are hoping to arrange and carry out as soon as it is safe to do so. We did however draft up consultation boards in preparation for the event and so have submitted these alongside the letter for your information.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>We are able to repeat a number of comments received via the website and/ or Facebook page from the village residents as detailed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · “The area for the houses appears to be of a size that would allow for large properties and gardens though some more modest and starter homes would help the younger, first time buyers who would like to stay in the area”; · “Fantastic news – if can meet needs of people in the village” · “Will be good for the village, school and good news it includes a pub” and · “Not a cluster of homes but good sizes with a least a garden space for each would be great” <p>INFO FROM POLICY COMMENTS The site, south of Coalpit Lane could help to alleviate the housing pressures and concentration of older generations and provide ‘starter homes’ to help affordability and home ownership within the village whilst also safeguarding the social infrastructure of the village.</p> <p>The landowners of the site are also keen on maximising benefits back to the village including providing a new pub and opportunities for other onsite facilities in agreement with the residents and Parish Council such as amenity greenspace. Further, the land south of Coalpit Lane ‘Elkesley Fields’ represents an opportunity to deliver essential growth within the village of Elkesley. There are no known technical constraints (for example ecology, flood risk, drainage, ground and</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				heritage) that would preclude this site coming forward. The landowners are willing and able to develop their land with the aim of creating a world class exemplar of rural development - maximising benefits back to the village for generations to come.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF198	Former Bevercotes Colliery site	LAA431	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>SEE VISION DOCUMENT IN FOLDER Gladman are promoting the former Bevercotes Colliery site through the local plan making process. The emerging Plan's consideration of the site to date has been focussed on its potential development as a Garden Village, however notwithstanding the judgements reached in that regard to date, the plan making process should also actively consider alternative options for the future of the site, focussing on its significant economic development and regeneration potential. In doing so, it will be important for the plan making process to fully consider the specific locational requirements of different sectors and the ability of this specific location to accommodate businesses with specific locational needs. The regeneration potential of the site should be supported through a positive and proactive approach within the Local Plan that fully recognises its ability to support the sustainable economic growth of the area.</p> <p>These representations provide details outlining the site's development potential for the delivery of a new, green economy enterprise zone comprising of a state of the art sugar beet processing facility, waste to energy facility, educational centre and electric service station, with supporting leisure and recreational features. Further information is set out in the appended Vision Document produced by Fallons. In this regard, Gladman looks forward to engaging further</p>	The site currently benefits from outline planning consent for employment uses. It is not considered necessary to allocate the site as it is currently not an existing employment site. Once developed, this can be reconsidered through the review of the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>with the Council as the plan preparation process progresses. (SEE SPECIFIC POLICIES FOR REPS RELATING TO SITE SUBMISSION)</p> <p>5 SITE SUBMISSION – FORMER BEVERCOTES COLLIERY</p> <p>5.1 Land at former Bevercotes Colliery</p> <p>5.1.1 Gladman are promoting the former Bevercotes Colliery for B(8) and aligned B(2) employment 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.</p> <p>5.1.2 Bevercotes Colliery is a long-standing employment location and offers the opportunity to deliver a range of adaptable business uses, in line with the requirements of the Framework, along a strategic highway network¹⁷. Indeed, the</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>principle of employment development is further accentuated through the extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for B(8) storage and distribution uses.</p> <p>5.1.3 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 employment to secure social, environmental and landscape improvements and deliver positive amenity benefits for all including ecology mitigation.</p> <p>5.1.4 The carefully considered developable area of employment proposals on the site would be largely consistent with the extant permission allowing for ecology mitigation and ensuring sensitive consideration of the wider landscape character through employment of the existing 25 metre tree boundary cover. Additionally, the site lies alongside the B6387 which has direct access to the A614 to the west and A1 in the east, at the Twyford Bridge Junction. The delivery of employment development at Bevercotes Colliery would offer the opportunity for highway and junction improvements to the A1 benefitting the wider area.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>5.1.5 Gladman submit that Bevercotes Colliery should be included within the Local Plan as an aspirational Priority Regeneration Area providing conditions required in order to secure sustainable development which regenerates previously developed land. Similarly to Cottam Power Station, the Council would not have to place reliance on the site for meeting the currently identified needs for employment, or housing but rather provide a framework to deliver regeneration while safeguarding important aspects of the wider site area, including ecology. Indeed, a coordinated, plan-led approach to achieving such development would support the Council's long term ambitions regarding economic growth and sensitive regeneration of the district.</p> <p>5.1.6 A vision document is appended to this document which illustrates the opportunity to deliver a new, green economy enterprise zone comprising of a state of the art sugar beet processing facility, waste to energy facility, educational centre and electric service station, with supporting leisure and recreational features.</p> <p>5.1.7 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</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>complements its wider vision, objectives and spatial strategy.</p> <p>6 CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>6.1.1 These representations have been prepared by Gladman in response to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (November 2020). Gladman welcomes the opportunity that has been provided to make comments at this stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>6.1.2 Gladman are broadly supportive of the positive and proactive approach taken by the Council in identifying a housing requirement above that required by the standard method to help fulfil its economic ambitions, alongside the inclusion of 'Priority Regeneration Areas' as a strategy to promote previously developed land and support long-term economic growth in Bassetlaw.</p> <p>6.1.3 As set out through these representations, Gladman are of the firm view that the Bevercotes Colliery site should be identified for employment development within the Local Plan to reflect the significant potential that the location has to support the economic growth of the area and the Government's ambition to 'Build Back Greener'. Indeed, we consider that there would be considerable merit in identifying the site as a further 'Priority Regeneration Area', reflecting the fact that it is an underused previously developed site that is available and suitable for a mix of B use classes as demonstrated through an existing planning permission and current market interest.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Furthermore, the proposals set out in the appended vision document demonstrates the ability of the site to support economic prosperity, inward investment and job growth in the district, alongside responding to the climate change crisis.</p> <p>6.1.4 In addition, Gladman have highlighted areas where we feel that policy should be amended or improved as the Plan is developed further. We consider that these issues can be fully addressed by way of changes to the emerging Plan prior to its publication under Regulation 19 in due course.</p> <p>6.1.5 Gladman look forward to continued cooperation and engagement with the Council as the Local Plan process progresses.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF177	Carlton Forest, Worksop	Part of LAA468?	Axisped on behalf of FCC Environment	<p>1.0 INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1 Introduction</p> <p>1.1.1 Axis PED Limited (Axis) has prepared these representations on behalf of our client FCC Environment (hereafter 'FCC'), in relation to their 8-hectare site at Carlton Forest.</p> <p>1.1.2 FCC's site should be allocated for employment uses within the Local Plan, planning permission has already been granted for employment use on part with development to commence late 2021. All of the site is previously disturbed land, part is previously developed and the entire site is underutilised and of low value since the site's former use as a quarry ceased</p> <p>1.1.3 The site is suitably located to deliver additional employment development as such the decision to not allocate the site represents a significant failing of the Local Plan as discussed within this statement. The allocation of FCC's site for employment uses would deliver significant benefits including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Economic growth · Inward investment opportunities · Job opportunities · Sustainable development on an underutilised and low value site <p>1.1.4 Figure 1 below and enclosed show the site's location. The site is located to the north off an existing employment site EES10 (Carlton Forest) (shown in green), allocation HS1 (Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop) and EM005 (Carlton Forest) (shown in</p>	<p>This site was a designated Local Wildlife Site (5/3361 Biosinc: Sand pit supporting a notable acidic flora) Allocating this site for employment uses would have been contrary to Policy ST40 which seeks to protect Local Wildlife Sites. It is understood that the LWS has been reviewed by Notts Geological and Biological Records Centre and it has been de-designed.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council Highways has indicated that the site would not provide a suitable access for an extension to the existing development. The Land Availability Assessment provides full details.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>purple). 1.9.1 This document has been prepared on behalf of FCC in relation to their site at Carlton Forest Quarry. 1.2 Background</p> <p>1.2.1 The east of the site benefits from planning permission (reference 18/01093/OUT) for employment uses. Positive pre-application discussions have taken place with the Council regarding employment uses on the western part of the site which is available for development. These two areas are shown on Figure 2 which is provided below and enclosed. All of the site is previously disturbed land, part is previously developed and the entire site is underutilised and of low value since the site's former use as a quarry ceased.</p> <p>1.2.2 The site is in a sustainable location on the edge of Worksop. It has been demonstrated through the existing planning permission that employment development would not have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, residential amenity, highway safety or flood risk. 1.2.3 Although the site lies just outside the development boundary of Worksop, to the north east of the town, development at the site presents an opportunity to deliver new commercial and industrial facilities in line with the Council's aspirations for the regeneration of the locality.</p> <p>1.2.4 Paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies what is required for a plan to be considered sound. To be sound it must be positively prepared; insofar as it is providing a</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>strategy which, as a minimum, provides for the objectively assessed needs, justified; the plan should be based on an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, effective; the plan should be deliverable over its plan period and consistent with national policy.</p> <p>1.2.5 Our submissions set out why we believe the Plan in its current form to be unsound, along with measures required to make it sound.</p> <p>1.9.2 This document makes several recommendations which are considered to be necessary to make the Plan sound. In accordance with paragraph 35 of the NPPF, plans are 'sound' if they are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. As set out above, we believe that the current draft Local Plan is not sound because it is not justified.</p> <p>1.9.3 Planning policy should provide support for economic development which brings forward significant, good quality inward investment opportunities to the District. The Plan as drafted does not do this.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF091	Church Farm, Hayton - The Old Farmhouse, Main Street	Part of LAA159	Leonard Design Architects	Submitted master plan of 20 dwellings and conservation of farm building on site - was assessed as part of the Jan 2020 LAA	Comments noted. The Local Plan's Strategy is seeking only to allocate land in Worksop, Retford, Tuxford and Morton (for a new settlement). Policy ST2 supports sustainable development in certain rural settlements. This would be taken into consideration if a planning application was submitted for development of this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF204	Land near Tuxford		Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant on behalf of Mrs E Jubb	<p>We lodged objections to this policy on behalf of our Client Mrs Jubb at the previous consultations stage. The policy remains unchanged and our objection is therefore repeated with the same background information/justification. Please see our letter of 26th February 2020 and attachments which set out the basis of our objection.</p> <p>We continue to object to the non-allocation of our Client's land as identified and for the reasons set out in our letter of 26th February 2020 and appendices.</p> <p>In the alternative we seek a more generous policy for the development of land for business purposes outside areas defined in the Plan where there are no overriding technical or environmental objections – also as set out in our letter. This would be consistent with the NPPF which confirms that all forms of business are acceptable in rural areas (subject to the specially protected areas identified in the Framework).</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA findings indicate there are several negative scores in relation to the proposal for employment on this site. It finds that there would be a significant negative impact on heritage, biodiversity (loss of a local wildlife site and potential impact on a neighbouring LWS), land use and soils (loss of Grade 2 and 3 soil), water (the site is within Source Protection Zone 3). The Heritage Assessment indicates that the site would not be suitable for allocation due to the impact on several heritage assets, including the setting of a Grade II Listed Building. Part of the site is a LWS. Allocating this site for employment uses would be contrary to Policy ST40 which seeks to</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
					<p>protect Local Wildlife Sites. The Policy states that proposals having a direct or indirect adverse effect on a Local Nature Reserve, Local Wildlife Site or Local Geological Site and their buffer zones or other biodiversity/geodiversity asset, will only be supported where there are no reasonable alternatives; and the case for development clearly outweighs the need to safeguard the ecological, recreational and/or educational value of the site. One of the main aims of the Local Plan is to deliver a net increase in biodiversity in Bassetlaw. The loss of this site would be contrary to this objective.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
1671323	Mansfield Road, Worksop	LAA206		<p>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. It is also noted that in other Green Gaps (especially GG3: Carlton in Lindrick- Worksop North) the boundary of the designated area has been drawn to take account of the proposed Peak Hills Farm. This does not appear to have been a consideration for GG4 despite the potential for LAA206 to create a more defensible long-term boundary than the current footpath Our original objections remain as follows:</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 	<p>The site is considered unsuitable for allocation due to the impact development would have on the setting of Manor Lodge (a Grade I Listed Building). With regard to comments relating to the Landscape Study: This supports the Landscape Character Assessment and provides more detail regarding the impact on this particular landscape.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>the findings table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Green Gap Report (November 2019):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference is made to the land around St Anne's 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 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	DOC/EVIDENCE BASE	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS				
REF009	Resident	Unknown	Why are you asking you know you will just do what you want, SHAME ON YOU	Noted.
1653147	Resident		The document does fail to point out the very significant pressure on housing caused by the influx of very large numbers of EU workers to work in the logistics and food processing industry. This has caused significant rent inflation in Bassetlaw largely due to the model of single tenancy but with multiple occupants which the workers use. The development of largely low skilled work has done little to improve work opportunities for the local population and has acted as a draw to EU workers.	Noted.
1653147	Resident		The plan seems largely predicated on using Developer contributions to fund or part fund most of the plan: How will the risks of developers finding ways of avoiding paying be managed? What is the likely overall scale of the developer contributions and the likely public cost?	Developer contributions form part of the wider Infrastructure funding for the local Plan. The IDP is identifying a funding gap which will only be partly funding by developer contributions and CIL.
1653147	Resident		To date National policy has not made any significant impact in closing the gap between the demand and supply of affordable housing. Based on the draft plan what are the best, worst and most likely impacts of the increased supply of affordable housing against the current and projected demand including those on social housing waiting lists and awaiting an alternative to poor quality housing.	The Local Plan is proposing 10% affordable housing for Brownfield Land and 20% for Greenfield sites. Affordable housing percentages are based on the viability of land.
REF026	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	Stylistic Point on the LP	As a final stylistic point will the authors please refrain from the excessive use of positive adjectives. Examples include but are not restricted to Councillor White's Forward where planning frameworks have to be "ambitious, innovative and positive", changes can't just be changes but have to be "step changes" and people will not just have more access to jobs, but they have to be "better paid, higher skilled jobs". It is not just a case of being irritating to read. Good writers of both fact and fiction know that the secret to writing well and effectively is to use words sparingly but with precision to engage the reader and this is especially true of adjectives. An excess of "happy, clappy" adjectives is the sign of a writer not convinced that the bare facts of their argument will sell themselves to the reader. As our criticism shows, there are substantial problems with this proposal.	Noted.
REF041	Retford Civic Society	Adoption of the LP	Retford Civic Society is pleased to see that progress is being made towards the adoption of a Local Plan. This is 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 as quickly as possible subject, of course, to full consultation and, where appropriate, amendment.	Noted.
1662645	Resident	Accessibility of LP	Why is this Draft Plan regarded as (Public Access) I can't navigate this site and a good many more struggle , your IT department are so out of touch with everyday people and how we communicate .	Noted.
REF064	Resident		Do you not feel like there is a little too much development in Bassetlaw? There's development in torworth, Ranskill, a potentially large one in ranskill on the way to Scrooby. There's a huge one trying to happen in hall Croft. There's development around the mattersey area and past serlby on the way to Blyth services. There's also a large one just going into worksop. It's literally in every direction. And a lot of my friends are starting to say it's ruining the local area. The countryside is starting to look like a large town and it's upsetting a lot of people. Especially people who grew up here. Isn't it about time you guys capped it? Maybe let another constituency bare the brunt of it?	The level of Growth proposed in Bassetlaw is in line with that recommended within the Council's evidence base.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	DOC/EVIDENCE BASE	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS				
REF133	Scrooby Neighbourhood Area Plan	General comments	<p>There appears to be some, minimal, typing errors (e.g. Minecroft vs Milnecroft) and the Policy Titles do not always follow the same conventions (some have “Policy ST21: Bassetlaw....” Some do not have the number cited, e.g. “Policy 32” not ST32).</p> <p>In general the document is reasonably easy to read and follow, although the myriad of references do make it difficult to maintain the train of thought. It would have been helpful in some sort of introduction (or separate document) to have discussed why the major change from Gamston to the Garden Village, accepting the Garden Village idea was discounted in 2019</p>	Noted.
REF156	Babworth Parish Council	General comments	Babworth Parish Council (BPC) has a number of concerns in relation to the emerging policy approach and site allocations set out within the 2020 Draft Local Plan. The Parish identifies a number of matters which it considers require further attention from Bassetlaw District Council as it progresses with its Local Plan. The Parish wishes to stay involved with the Local Plan preparation process and welcomes the specific consultation BPC and Bassetlaw District Council have had up to this point.	Noted.
REF027	Resident	General comments	<p>Thankyou for providing the opportunity to comment further on the updated plan.</p> <p>I would reiterate my original comments in general but maybe emphasise the lack of autonomy enjoyed by local councils in the face of Government targets that inform the decisions of the Inspectorate at times. Also, the ‘presumption in favour of development’ makes plans somewhat difficult to adhere to no matter how well thought through.</p>	Noted.
REF033	Resident	General comments	Please please more things for school's more houses more kids. Thank you	Noted.
REF037	Resident	General comments	More houses more kids. Need to make sure schools are taken care of.. And please more police. This town of ours is going up to around 12000 people. Thanks	Noted.
REF197	Resident	General comments and queries	<p>The Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan is currently in initial consultation – it might be helpful to include a map and some extracts from the constitution etc to show the direction being taken and see it as part of the overall Local Plan approach. Are there opportunities to consider private/public consortia to develop town centres where a strategic approach could be taken to ownership, rentals etc?</p> <p>The plan contains many positive ideas and actions – does the Council have the resources to ensure that there is compliance to their planning stipulations and recommendations?</p>	The emerging Retford Neighbourhood Plan is a separate document to the Local Plan and therefore will sit outside the Local Plan documentation.
REF201	Severn Trent	Information Regarding Severn Trent	<p>Position Statement</p> <p>As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills.</p>	The Local Plan requires all new developments to be in line with the latest water and drainage legislation. The Council will continue to work with water authorities through the production of the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	DOC/EVIDENCE BASE	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS				
			<p>Sewage Strategy</p> <p>Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works.</p> <p>Surface Water and Sewer Flooding We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer.</p> <p>We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers.</p> <p>To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website</p> <p>https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</p> <p>Water Quality</p> <p>Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that water quality of supplies are not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Water Supply</p> <p>When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts.</p> <p>We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands.</p> <p>Water Efficiency</p> <p>Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations.</p> <p>We recommend that in all cases you consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres. • Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute. • Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres or less. • Water butts for external use in properties with gardens. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	DOC/EVIDENCE BASE	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS				
			To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/ We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day.	
1666086	Resident	Query	Frederick Milner School This undeveloped site has been empty for several years but does not feature on your plans. Why? Could this site be developed as some kind of community or sports facility as it is near the town centre and transport facilities.	Noted.
1670589	Resident	General Comment	The Bassetlaw Local Plan is comprehensive and sets out the framework for the next sixteen years. Reference should be made to renewable energies such as solar power and the overall policy when these developments come forward. The plan would benefit from taking stock of the changes in working practices and home working, which will be a lasting legacy of the current situation. Houses and digital connectivity to accommodate these changes are needed.	Noted.
REF034	Nether-Langwith Parish Council	General Comment	"The Parish Council has no objections to the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan as it currently stands"	Noted.
REF052	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Importance of Neighbourhood Planning	As a member of the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, I commend the importance attached to neighbourhood plans throughout the document. Once made, neighbourhood plans hold legal weight and their inclusion in this Local Plan (and the finished document) is important: inclusion recognises the efforts communities have made to develop a neighbourhood plan and, in Misterton, with over 91% of the votes supporting the Neighbourhood Plan in the September 2019 referendum, it really does have popular backing.	Noted.
REF054	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Query	I am aware of BDC lack of capacity to ensure that developments meet their conditions now and I do have concerns that any developments in the future rely on developers meeting the conditions set. How can we be sure that we can enforce this?	Noted.
REF077	Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council	Support of Councillor's comments	Finally, the Parish Council supports the additional comments submitted by District Councillor David Pidwell and although current circumstances have meant that we have been unable to convene a meeting to discuss alternatives to CIL Monies we do request that appropriate consideration be given to Councillor Pidwell's enquiry on compensatory action being incorporated at the appropriate time.	The proposed revisions to the CIL Charging Schedule are available to view on the Council's website.
REF080	Resident	General Comment	Thanks for your time at Wednesday's Consultation (13th Jan 2021) meeting. I thought it was a really well structured meeting and the team were very knowledgeable and helpful.	Noted.
REF082	Resident	General Comment	<i>In reference to Ordsall South</i> Thank you for the online consultation before Christmas. It was interesting to hear what is planned for this site. Although the finer detail was very much lacking.	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	DOC/EVIDENCE BASE	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS				
REF093	Resident	Support of Council's comments	I wish to endorse the comments and proposals of Dunham and area Parish Council.	
REF102	West Stockwith Parish Council	No major comments to be made	Following a briefing at our recent meeting, I have been authorised by West Stockwith parish council to state that they have no major comments to make on the above consultation.	Noted.
REF134	Resident	Referring to previous comments	I had decided not to write again but for clarity, I would refer to my detailed comments made in February last year, regarding the proposed development off Thievesdale Lane/ Blyth Road, ref. nos. 1195325 and 1195889	Noted.
REF140	Resident	Length of process	I approve of the draft local plan and the site allocations for Retford & Ordsall but this is getting no where I sent approval of the last 2 but instead of getting on with it all we get is more drafts. Until you move on and get an approved plan developers will keep speculating on none approved sites. Please move on and get this finished, do not do another draft.	Noted.
REF189	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	Referring to previous comments	As you will be aware we provided a response to the previous consultation; given the constraints around resource and time constraints due to public sector response to the pandemic I have not read all associated documents with the plan and focused on the plan itself, therefore building on previous comments, where they remain valid I would like to submit the following:	Noted.
REF224	Sheffield City Region	General opening statement	The Draft Plan sets out ambitious proposals for growth in both housing and employment for Bassetlaw which will complement those of South Yorkshire. In particular, the MCA and LEP welcome the Draft Plan's emphasis on new and developing opportunities such as renewable energies and low carbon technologies, reflecting themes in the new South Yorkshire SEP. Proposals for a new Garden Village in the Draft Plan as well as the Renewable Energy Hub are also supported. These are exactly the type of innovation needed to help close the divide between north and south and level up our areas.	Noted.
REF229	Barnby Moor Parish Council	General comment	Barnby Moor Parish council wish to register no concerns for the latest iteration of the Draft Local plan.	Noted.
REF187	iba Planning	Referring to previous comments	We submitted representations to the previous version of the Local Plan published in January 2020 (see attached email dated 26/02/2020 for completeness) but our concerns/objections were largely unaddressed. Rather than remedying those concerns, the latest draft version of the Local Plan is considered to depart even further from a system which will support the vitality and prosperity of the District's rural settlements and a proportionate and fair distribution of housing. As such, our objections to the Council's approach to Small Rural Settlements set out in our email dated 26/02/2020 remain valid and should continue to be taken into account in the further preparation and examination of the Local Plan. However, we write now to outline our additional objections to the latest iteration of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020.	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	DOC/EVIDENCE BASE	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS				
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	Referring to Bassetlaw Local Plan production timeline	The Bassetlaw District Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) was adopted at a Full Council meeting on 22 December 2011, however national policy is clear that local planning authorities should review their plans at least every five years to ensure that they remain robust and up-to-date. The Council previously were working towards a Site Allocations Plan; however, the Council took the decision to withdraw the Plan and began working towards a new Local Plan. Gladman supports the Council's commitment to commence work on the new Local Plan and the timescales outlined in the updated 2020 Local Development Scheme.	Noted.
REF198 Bevercotes	Gladman Developments Ltd	Conclusions relating to submission	<p>6 CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>6.1.1 These representations have been prepared by Gladman in response to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (November 2020). Gladman welcomes the opportunity that has been provided to make comments at this stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>6.1.2 Gladman are broadly supportive of the positive and proactive approach taken by the Council in identifying a housing requirement above that required by the standard method to help fulfil its economic ambitions, alongside the inclusion of 'Priority Regeneration Areas' as a strategy to promote previously developed land and support long-term economic growth in Bassetlaw.</p> <p>6.1.3 As set out through these representations, Gladman are of the firm view that the Bevercotes Colliery site should be identified for employment development within the Local Plan to reflect the significant potential that the location has to support the economic growth of the area and the Government's ambition to 'Build Back Greener'. Indeed, we consider that there would be considerable merit in identifying the site as a further 'Priority Regeneration Area', reflecting the fact that it is an underused previously developed site that is available and suitable for a mix of B use classes as demonstrated through an existing planning permission and current market interest. Furthermore, the proposals set out in the appended vision document demonstrates the ability of the site to support economic prosperity, inward investment and job growth in the district, alongside responding to the climate change crisis.</p> <p>6.1.4 In addition, Gladman have highlighted areas where we feel that policy should be amended or improved as the Plan is developed further. We consider that these issues can be fully addressed by way of changes to the emerging Plan prior to its publication under Regulation 19 in due course.</p> <p>6.1.5 Gladman look forward to continued cooperation and engagement with the Council as the Local Plan process progresses.</p>	Noted.
REF015	Resident, Friends of Sandhills	Removal of Sandhills	Dear Planning Team BDC, I just wanted to register my overwhelming approval regarding the 'removal' of the Retford Sandhills from the NEW 2020 draft plan. It's a victory for common sense & the green future we all must embrace in Bassetlaw. A big thank you to the forward thinking, sound practice & impartiality of BDC planning. My additional thanks to both Karen & Will who spent time engaging with us (as a group) and the wider public (along with other members of the planning team) regarding this valued 'open space'.	Noted.
REF101	East Markham Parish Council	Referencing January 2020 Plan	7.8 and 7.10. East Markham Parish Council is concerned that each of these proposed developments remove a valuable open space in Retford to the detriment of local resident's health and wellbeing. Each sites will also need major alternations for vehicle access and transport links.	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	DOC/EVIDENCE BASE	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS				
REF222	Resident	Removal of Sandhills	<p>Re: The Sandhills off Manvers Road, Jubilee Road, RETFORD</p> <p>We have made representation regarding the development of the Sandhills. We are delighted that it will remain a natural greenspace because we were only too aware of the intensive leisure use that the Sandhills was put to. The pandemic has shown just how wise this decision is. We walk in the Sandhills most days and since the first lockdown the area has shown increasing value to dog walkers, joggers and families with children for example. People of all ages will be found at all times of day at the Sandhills and the area is clearly helping physical and mental health. Even now in the cold, third lockdown the Sandhills are being extensively used and are a real natural asset to this area of Retford.</p>	Noted.
REF206	Derbyshire County Council, Economy, Transport, & Environment	Involvement of surrounding councils	<p>Thank you for consulting Derbyshire County Council on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. In consultation with my colleagues, the Draft Local Plan has been reviewed for its potential cross boundary strategic planning and infrastructure implications for Derbyshire. I write to confirm that following that review, the Draft Local Plan raises no significant strategic planning or strategic infrastructure issues or concerns for Derbyshire County Council.</p>	Noted.