

Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 - 2038

Submission Library

June 2021
Consultation Responses Schedule



Bassetlaw
DISTRICT COUNCIL
— North Nottinghamshire —

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST6: Worksop Central			
REF030	WSP on behalf of The Priory Shopping Centre	We previously submitted representations to the last draft Bassetlaw Local Plan consultation (dated 13 January 2021) and commented on draft Policy ST6 as the wording of the policy did not require a sequential assessment to be undertaken in respect of main town centre uses proposed outside of the town centre (ie in the Worksop Central area). We highlighted that draft Policy ST6 was, therefore, contrary to the NPPF and draft Policy ST14. As part of these representations, we urged the Council to make amendments to the wording of the policy to require a sequential assessment to be undertaken if main town centre uses were proposed in the Worksop Central designated area in line with draft Policy ST14. We note that the Council have taken into account our representations and included additional wording to ensure that main town centre uses proposed within the Worksop Central area are in line with draft Policy ST14. On this basis, we do not have any further comments on the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, however, if the Council undertake any additional consultations on the Development Plan and/or the draft Local Plan is submitted to the Inspector, we wish to remain involved in the consultation process.	The Council will continue to work on the detail of the policies moving forward. The DPD will be consistent with national and local planning policy.
REF052	NCC – Planning Policy Team	Section 5.4.7 (page 4) is supported: “Integral to the regeneration is the delivery of an integrated area wide transport strategy. It aims to reduce traffic in the area and improve the traffic flow to and through Worksop Central. Providing a well-connected network of walking and cycling routes will encourage greater use to reach everyday services, whilst the re-configuration of the road network in places will ensure that public transport routes are more direct and convenient promoting greater use. Strategic highways interventions will manage traffic flow more efficiently.” Section 10 of the Policy relating to public transport is supported: “The provision of an integrated area-wide transport network to improve the safe movement of people and vehicles through the area including; managing the impact of traffic on the local road network, enhancement of public transport connectivity, improvements to Worksop railway station, and a comprehensive network of walking and cycling routes to provide good connectivity for active travel”	The Council is currently preparing a Transport Assessment for Worksop Central. This will detail the necessary issues and mitigation required in relation to the proposed sites identified in the DPD area.
REF055	ID Planning on behalf of Lidl	<p>Lidl support the identification of the Worksop Central area and future Worksop Central DPD to guide delivery of regeneration and future development within the central area. We deal with the extent of the Worksop Central Area definition on the Proposals Inset Map for Worksop further below.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.5 – Lidl support the Council’s recognition of the issues facing the town’s core as experienced across the UK and the desire to re-focus and purpose the town’s core to provide a more mixed use approach to future development with a range of uses including commercial, leisure, tourism, education and cultural facilities.</p> <p>Policy ST6, Paragraph A - At the outset Lidl support the identification of Worksop Central, including their land interests off Carlton Road / Blyth Road, as a Priority Regeneration Area.</p> <p>Policy ST6, Criteria 2 – Lidl support the ambition to see a wide range of uses come forward within the Central Worksop area.</p> <p>Policy ST6, Criteria 3 – Lidl support the emphasis given to the re-use of underused or vacant land. Lidl’s land interests in Central Worksop incorporate a brownfield site which is in need of regeneration and is currently unattractive, run down in appearance and has been the subject of some previous development works to commence delivery of a new superstore, which was never completed. Consequently, the site (W53) is in need of investment and regeneration.</p>	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST6: Worksop Central			
REF063	CCG NHS Bassetlaw	<p>The provision of at least 660 dwellings by 2037 to provide an appropriate mix of house types, sizes and tenures to achieve a balanced and inclusive community;</p> <p>The provision of commercial, education, health, employment, retail, community and other main town centre uses and temporary uses, of a suitable scale to meet identified needs, subject to the provisions of Policy ST14. As per the original consultation the document 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, there re a range of other community providers, Doncaster and Bassetlaw Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust delivers secondary care, and GPs delivery primary medical care commissioned by the CCG. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out two key tests that should be applied when considering proposals for main town centre uses which are not in an existing town centre, namely the sequential test and the impact assessment. Both are designed to ensure that development does not undermine the health of existing town centres. Any developments in the Worksop area will put significant pressure on health services in Worksop.</p> <p>Worksop has two main GP practices delivering services to the local population, Larwood Health Partnerships and Newgate Medical Centre. Larwood Health Partnerships deliver services from five sites and have recently benefited from an extension to their main site premises, and investment in two of their branch sites). Larwood Health partnerships have practice bases at the main site in Larwood, Carlton, Langold, Harworth and Manton. Newgate Medical Centre deliver services from one main site in the town centre of Worksop, the practice is currently undergoing some internal reconfiguration to increase clinical space, however, using the NHS England space estimator this will only allow for meeting current demand and not for growth. The CCG is working closely with BDC NHS England and NHS Improvement to agree delivery of a new build site adjacent to the existing building.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work with the NHS through the development of the DPD. The DPD will be supported by and Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Schedule so further detail about new or enhanced infrastructure will be detailed within these documents.</p>
1857992	BDC Councillor	<p>I welcome the provision of safe cycling routes through the centre of Worksop. It is a priority for me to provide the North-South cycle route - roughly aligned with Carlton rd and along Bridge St and on to Sparkenhill. Ideally, a cycle way should be separate from the road way and separate from pedestrian paths. This is safer and limits potential conflict with traffic/pedestrians. However, where space is limited a shared use path could be provided - perhaps along Carlton Rd. I accept that one way to get a cycle route onto Bridge St could be by allowing one way traffic. There is an East-west route in form of NCN 6, however, this could be improved and development of the Priory Centre site could open up possibilities for a better canal side route and maybe a cycle/foot bridge over the canal into the priory centre car park.</p>	<p>The regeneration of Worksop Central will include improvements to Green Infrastructure which will include new and enhancements to footpaths and cycle provision across the area.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Strategy will be produced that will detail the enhancements moving forward.</p>
1859314	Resident	<p>Page 4-5: The provision of at least 660 dwellings by 2037 is unrealistic, we can not meet local need now in relation to resources required for a growing community, lack of medical care, health centres, school places . We do not have the infrastructure to deal with the increase in traffic. We can not manage our flooding issues currently. Putting housing on every available vacant space, carpark existing buildings is not the answer to town centre regeneration. The plan lacks vision and innovation which takes into account modern day living and the creased use of information technology which is affecting the small business growth in our town. Whilst we continue to increase the number of supermarket suppliers we introduce into one area we will effectively destroy our town centre small business regeneration.</p>	<p>The level of growth is seen as appropriate and a sustainable way to regenerate brownfield sites within Worksop. There is enough suitable land available to accommodate this growth and the Council will prepare an Infrastructure Plan that will detail what infrastructure is required and how this will be delivered throughout the plan period.</p>
REF005	Chesterfield Borough Council	<p>I have reviewed the focussed consultation document and have no specific comments other than to support the clear and positive reference to the Chesterfield Canal in Policy ST6 Worksop Central.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST6: Worksop Central			
		I look forward to the forthcoming consultation on the full Draft Plan, and to continue to work with you on strategic and cross boundary planning matters via the Local Plan Liaison Group.	
REF007	Resident	<p>This council are a joke you keep building more houses in a small town with no amenities to cater for all these extra people parents are struggling to get child places here even though they have been worksop residents all their life not enough schools not enough doctors and a hospital which is not used to it's full potential I am 62 with health problems and am constantly having to travel for treatment we have a town centre which is not being used to it's full potential and becoming a no go area this council need to start earning their big wages by doing what's best for worksop residents rather than ignoring them and going ahead anyway</p> <p>Yours sincerely a very angry lifelong resident</p>	The level of growth is seen as appropriate and a sustainable way to regenerate brownfield sites within Worksop. There is enough suitable land available to accommodate this growth and the Council will prepare an Infrastructure Plan that will detail what infrastructure is required and how this will be delivered throughout the plan period.
REF027	Network Rail	In relation to the above and the recent consultation Network Rail have only one comment to make. This is in relation to revised Policy ST6 (Worksop Central). We support the revised policy and the continued inclusion of a commitment to seek improvements to public transport connectivity and in particular improvements to Worksop station as part of the proposed DPD.	Thank you for your comments.
REF028	Resident	<p>Thank you both for your very informed presentation to us in the Rotary Club last Tuesday. This rekindled somewhat my youthful past enthusiasm for my Planning professional working time in Sheffield and Private Consultancy, although I have been out of the loop now for over 25 years!! Still, as I now consider the present to be a unique and un-precedented time to promote many environmental ideals due to the major sea-changes in our lives due to Covid, changing shopping habits, and renewed demands for environmental improvements/ air quality, we maybe have a chance of making REAL changes to our WORKSOP TOWN CENTRE. I was fortunate enough to have met Patrick Lutyens, Wynne Thomas and other early Planning pioneers, promoting the need for greater environmental quality in our living and working environments, perhaps only really achieved in the New Towns where they worked, and where Planners could start from scratch and segregate quality environmental spaces from vehicular access pressures and needs! In existing towns and Cities the high cost of acquiring land, especially by Compulsory Purchase, really precluded the opportunity to make what I would call real environmental changes.</p> <p>Not any more! Land is only worth what you can use it for? Due to IT considerations, now many retail needs are being satisfied 'On-line'. People mostly prefer to do weekly food shopping in supermarkets by car for convenience, and you have here acknowledged this trend by approving new supermarkets on the periphery of the Centre in locations easily accessible to the Region. Also sadly, however, much 'Open Countryside' land has been allocated to new housing, a large part unsympathetic to the villages that have been expanded, and present a totally different character, with a large part of new residents now being commuters; traditional village community life is becoming severely compromised I would suggest from experience! BUT, although housing need/ land allocation has recently been a priority of government and the Council, brown field land should ideally always be used first, and I would contend that a major source could now be found or created in the Town Centre.</p> <p>I know you will have done a lot of work on current population demographics; the needs and aspirations of different groups within our present population? It is one in particular that I now can speak for with first-hand knowledge. The oldest end of the spectrum; the aged and retired. Many of this group have time on their hands and also, very importantly if they have made wise provision, more money to spend on everyday living. Their families have flown, need downgrading of their dwellings to something smaller, and many prefer to be less reliant on using private motor cars! With the large demise of department stores as a key function of the High Street, we need a new approach to regenerate the Centre as a major public asset or amenity? In your presentation you alluded to the need of more small 'boutique' or custom retail units, together with various forms of leisure outlets such as restaurants,</p>	<p>The level of growth is seen as appropriate and a sustainable way to regenerate brownfield sites within Worksop. There is enough suitable land available to accommodate this growth and the Council will prepare an Infrastructure Plan that will detail what infrastructure is required and how this will be delivered throughout the plan period.</p> <p>The DPD also include various interventions to help regenerate the town centre, including the retail area of Bridge Street. This is a comprehensive regeneration strategy and will be delivered through a combination of ways including working with the community, businesses and external organisations.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST6: Workso Central			
		<p>cafes, pubs and entertainments - all set in a high amenity Centre environment, perhaps with traffic limited to essential service only? Agreed, but we do not want all the periphery parking to the Centre to be developed for housing say, if visitors from the Region are going to then be denied easy access to this new Community Centre. A large part of the community, especially those with spending power, will not use public transport; the car is more convenient and fast. Other public assets such as the Library, cinema , Council offices etc. as you stated are all retained close to the High Street and easily accessible by foot (or other mobility forms). Why can't we plan, therefore, for some older persons' housing adjacent to this main High Street spine? The retail facade and character of the High Street could be retained and enhanced with infill to scale, some offices and banks retained as local services, and new housing over or behind, perhaps grouped around private environmental and pedestrian courts? Retail and housing servicing could be provided from the rear within a 'box' highway approach, and the High Street would then become a place to MUST VISIT, with its central space used for markets, craft displays/markets, entertainment, fairs etc. A great place for everyone to meet, especially the elderly, to natter with friends and occupy the cafes, etc., and also enjoy and spend time in the small shops. With our climate, however, some form of shelter would be necessary throughout street length for it to work!</p> <p>All right in theory you might say, but could it be done in practice? Well, despite all the development complexities of separate private ownerships, the value of this Town Centre land is perhaps now perhaps at its lowest ever in real terms, and owners/developers will be sympathetic to any sort of regeneration plan that will improve their current low returns. Charity shops, desirable as some might be in the right place, do not provide a satisfactory rental for what should be a Class 'A' frontage? Could a High Street Development Plan be devised that could sell such a radical strategy to the benefit of everybody? I suggest its a case of now or never - conditions have never offered such an opportunity before, apart from say specific Action Areas say in major Cities. What do you think? Fact or Fiction?</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites			
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>Policy ST11 p6</p> <p>A. The following Existing Employment Sites, as shown on the Policies Map, are important drivers for the District's economy and will be safeguarded for new or additional E(g), B2, B8 development or for small-scale ancillary uses required to support employment development:</p> <p>EES12 Randall Way, Retford</p> <p>EES13 Hallcroft Industrial Estate, Retford</p> <p>EES14 Thrumpton Goods Yard, Retford</p> <p>EES15 Thrumpton Lane, Retford</p> <p>EES16 West Carr Industrial Estate, Retford</p> <p>None of these existing sites are in South Ward, and no specific South Ward Employment Site has been earmarked.</p>	<p>Existing and proposed employment sites will serve the needs of the whole community.</p> <p>Although there may not be employment sites falling specifically within the Retford South Ward there are existing and proposed sites with good accessibility close, including within the built up area of the town.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites			
REF050	Stone Planning Service	<p>The need to safeguard existing employment sites is recognised but with changing trends it does not always present the right type of premises for all end users. As has been witnessed by both Brexit and COVID 19, customer attitudes can change quite dramatically and rapidly. For example the growth in online shopping has taken the industry by surprise such that new ways of working, particularly in logistics, are evolving rapidly. Other changes, such as the impacts of Artificial Intelligence, will evolve over the life of the Plan and inevitably some of the safeguarded employment sites will no longer be suitable. Hence, coupled with Policy ST11 there needs to be support for the wider employment prospects ie storage and distribution on A1 corridor, sites like Markham Moor that are infrastructure ready.</p> <p>The latest Quarterly Report by Deep Insights analyses trends and notes the forthcoming challenges and opportunities to raising economic prosperity. Transitioning to a low-carbon economy. Levelling up. Adapting for a digital age. Solving a housing crisis. Rethinking high streets. Reconfiguring for an ageing population.</p> <p>It also identifies a number of key areas and trends</p> <p>“With people returning to workplaces, the offices subsector saw a large bounce in activity in Q2. However high-street and out-of-town retail remains in the doldrums as Covid-19 cases increase again”.</p> <p>“The warehousing sector has now averaged £500m per month for 6 months as Brexit and the online revolution drive changing behaviour.”</p> <p>Economic focus will transform over the life of the Plan, and it needs to be adaptive to change. We consider that the suitability of some of the protected sites cannot be relied upon to engage in these changes. Other more flexible sites need to be identified.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw contains a wide variety of existing employment sites in a range of locations which provide a diverse stock of buildings in terms of size, type and condition.</p> <p>The Council is supporting the development at the strategic Apleyhead Junction site Situated adjacent to the A1/A57 junction at the eastern gateway to Worksop,</p> <p>Apleyhead junction provides a significant opportunity capable of accommodating employment uses. Given its location, the site would be attractive for logistics and distribution. It is capable of attracting high quality occupiers, or very large single occupiers with a choice of location, and/or large scale uses in the B2 or B8 classes.</p> <p>The Council is also supporting land at the former High Marnham Power Station as a long-term opportunity for specific 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 will aid the transition to a low carbon economy.</p> <p>Part C of Policy ST11 establishes criteria for assessing proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of an existing employment site or buildings to a non-employment uses.</p>
REF070	Rapleys on behalf of Dooba Development Limited	<p>The draft Policy ST11 proposes to allocate the Sandy Lane Industrial Estate - within which the Vesuvius site is located - as an Existing Employment Site (Ref. EES002), whereby land is to be safeguarded for development that either falls within Use Classes E(g), B2 and B8, or is small-scale and ancillary in supporting such development. While it is encouraging that Policy ST11 does seek to allow non-conforming small-scale ancillary development on Existing Employment Sites, the policy in more general terms is considered to be too restrictive and in conflict with the Government’s intention of amending the Use Classes Order. This concern is elaborated on below.</p> <p>As Officers will be aware, the Government introduced the new ‘Commercial, Business and Service’ Use Class E in September 2020 in order to simplify the system of Use Classes in England. The intention behind this was to provide businesses with the additional flexibility to enable them to adapt and diversify, in order to meet changing demands. The amendment to the Use Classes Order was, however, brought forward at great pace more directly as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and the consequent need to support businesses and stimulate economic activity. Despite this, and prior to the pandemic, the principle of Use Class reform was mooted for many years, as it was evident that the established Order was both incapable of capturing current and future retail models, and inadequate in allowing businesses to diversify and incorporate ancillary uses.</p> <p>Whilst wider in scope than anticipated, the new Class E has provided businesses (which includes, as in the case of our client, the owners and managers of commercial property) the opportunity to adapt to changing market conditions, with the benefit of greater planning certainty, helping them to remain</p>	<p>Policy to be revised to take into account changes to UCO, abolition of Class B1 and introduction of the new E Class.</p> <p>To enable flexibility for business operation, it is recognised that complementary and ancillary uses to support employment uses can be appropriate where they provide employment, adding to the character, mix and vitality of the designated employment areas.</p> <p>As offices, research and development and light industrial uses now fall under use class E together with retail and other main town centre uses, this may result in unintended consequence where they could undermine the Local Plan policy objective to protect the retailing function of the town centres. A proliferation of retail uses on existing employment sites will therefore will be resisted, with the exception of small scale ancillary uses supplementing the predominantly employment provision.</p> <p>It may be necessary to impose planning conditions to restrict movement within use class E. Determination will be made on a case by case basis.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites			
		<p>viable against a number of challenges that include the growth of online shopping and the consequent impact on footfall and trading. Therefore, by embracing the flexibility that Class E offers, especially by embedding its principles in planning policy, it is possible to add to the vitality of an existing business or property asset, thus improving on its overall viability in the long term.</p> <p>While high streets and town centres are likely to benefit the most from the changes to the Use Classes Order, the potential opportunities for edge of centre and out of centre locations should not go unrecognised. Rather, there should be provision within policy to enable opportunities in these locations where appropriate. It is with this premise in mind that the proposed draft Policy ST11 is not supported as it seeks to sustain an age-old approach to employment land, that can no longer be considered relevant in the context of the new Use Classes Order. In its current wording, the policy makes the outdated assumption that only uses falling within the former Class B (B1/B2/B8) are employment generating and are thus 'employment' uses, which is plainly not the case in an economy that is so heavily reliant on the commercial, business and service sectors.</p> <p>In addition to this, the policy neglects the fact that there are many uses that fall within Class E (beyond Class E(g) which the policy allows, consistent with the former B1/B2/B8 grouping) that are complementary to, and more typical of - in terms of their space and access requirements - the former B Class uses. Such uses include the public sale of niche bulky goods, for which specific access and parking arrangements are required to allow for unincumbered trade and delivery; and sports and fitness facilities, for which often modern premises with generous ceiling heights and a continuous floorspace are sought over premises within the town centre. Notwithstanding the provisions set out at part C of the policy, under the current wording, the principle of these uses would not be accepted on Existing Employment Sites, despite them likely being the most appropriate sites on which to be located. This is the inherent flaw of the policy that our client wishes to emphasise. Contrary to what is suggested at paragraph 6.4.2, the policy could therefore potentially hinder the long-term viability of Existing Employment Sites as such a rigid approach is applied in terms of the Use Classes permitted, meaning flexibility is not afforded against unprecedented economic events that dictate market conditions.</p> <p>The amendment to the Order coinciding with the preparation of the new Local Plan, and fundamentally, this Focussed Consultation, presents an opportune period following which the Plan's approach to Existing Employment Sites can be reviewed. It is recommended that the policy is reworded in such a way that the extent of permitted uses falling with Class E is expanded, save for where there are obvious and reasonable concerns surrounding principle and the harm to the District's town centres. In doing so, builds in flexibility for Existing Employment Sites against fluctuating and challenging market conditions over the 15-year plan period to 2037. This approach would still accord with paragraph 20 of the NPPF (which requires strategic policies to make sufficient provision for employment development), as well as the spirit of the Government's intentions in amending the Use Class Order, to introduce the new Class E.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST11: Existing Employment Sites			
1858552	BDC Councillor	Page 7&8- To ensure that well paid jobs remain in the District we must continue to develop our high end vocational training. I am pleased to see that major developments will have to ensure they are involved in a skills plan. Perhaps we need to think imaginatively how we ensure the people undertaking these training posts are genuinely local and not simply apprentices of contractors based in other locations. In terms of supporting local businesses in rural communities I would like to see more emphasis/support for businesses based at home that can also support community infrastructure e.g. I'm aware in local villages of bakers who sell cakes etc from home (and make a living from the endeavour). How do we encourage them to take the next step and physically open a premise in a rural community where other products could also be stocked. This in turn would hopefully reduce car journeys and help vulnerable persons retain community links.	Proposals for small scale rural enterprise from the home that deliver local employment opportunities and diversify the rural economy are supported providing there is no loss of residential amenity to surrounding properties.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST14: Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Services			
REF029	BDC Councillor	The Plan does note that the development will be so huge (comparing it with the Worksop Peaks Hill - with its new road, and the A1 Morton Garden Village - with its network of new roads and a new railway station) that a new local centre will be created, but shows that no local employment site has been proposed, and there is no significant improved road or rail infrastructure promised.	Although not providing employment specifically in the B use classes the Ordsall South proposal will provide many community benefits including a new local centre, health care hub with services and facilities, a primary school. All these will generate new employment opportunities. The housing will also meet the wider needs of planned employment growth in Retford and other identified areas, such as strategic growth at Apleyhead.
REF055	ID Planning on behalf of Lidl	Policy ST14 – Criteria F –states as follows: <i>“Development in the local centres will be supported where they would, on their own or cumulatively with other permitted development, generate no significant harm upon the vitality and viability of that centre, or any other centre in within the hierarchy”</i> We object to the wording of Criteria F as the policy test is whether ‘significant adverse impact’ would arise and not whether a proposal would generate ‘no significant harm’. In addition, and provided a proposed development is ‘within’ the local centre, trading impact on other facilities in that ‘local centre’ is not a material planning concern as it is located ‘within’ the centre and therefore in a preferred policy location. In light of the above, the following element should be deleted from the policy wording <i>“generate no significant harm upon the vitality and viability of that centre”</i> and replace that with: <i>“on their own or cumulatively with other permitted development not lead to significant adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of other centres within the hierarchy”</i> .	Criterion F has been amended to more accurately reflect Policy in the NPPF.
1859314	Resident	You will not support future retail and leisure as you suggest whilst you continue to ignore the growth in IT and the support for bigger stores outside of the town. Our town centre needs investment in crime and disorder if there is any hope of attracting people to it.	Out of town retail development which would have an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of town centres is not supported. A key objective of the Local Plan is to support the vitality and viability of the District’s town centre, and this is very much reflected in the town centre policies.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST14: Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Services			
1858084	Resident	Whilst Retford does have an ongoing Town Centre Neighbourhood Policy just getting off the ground, it is extremely concerning that in terms of Bassetlaw there is a large discrepancy in the level of support and monies given to each town. The Worksop Town Centre Master Plan has in the region of £20 million in the budget/proposals, whereas Retford has zero. This is certainly not conducive to ensuring that Retford Town Centre grows as a result of BDC and/or the Bassetlaw Local Plan. I would like to bring this to the attention of officers and the inspector when he/she begins their face to face inspection of the plan.	The Council is equally committed to supporting the vitality and viability of all town centres and communities within the District as considered appropriate in accordance with council objectives and priorities.
1858552	BDC Councillor	Pages 12 & 13- Why does Retford itself not have a master plan in line with Worksop? Although I accept Worksop is larger it is clear from the retail spaces currently unoccupied within Retford Town Centre that a more strategic approach with the full support of Council officers is required.	The Town Centre Masterplan for Retford when made will have the same status and carry the same weight as the Worksop Central DPD. Both will form part of the Development Plan for the District. The Council is supportive of the Retford Town centre NP, which could also draw government funding and support.
REF072	Retford Business Forum & Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group	<p>I am responding on behalf of Retford Business Forum (RBF) and the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group (RTCNPG), and you have been kind enough to attend both of our groups, you will have had some direct interaction to give you a flavour of our views.</p> <p>The focus of both RBF and RTCNPG has mainly been on the impact of the Plan on Retford Town Centre and its local area.</p> <p>On the positive side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTCNPG, and RBF especially, welcome increased levels of housing in the local area, which would increase the potential customer base for the retail and hospitality organisations in Retford. • RBF also welcomes potential investment into improving local businesses opportunities and infrastructure • RBF and RTCNPG would look forward to receiving investment funds from the developers of the housing relevant to Retford Town Centre in order to enhance the town centre to moderate the potential negative impacts. <p>On the negative side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RBF and RTCNPG are concerned about large scale residential developments which bring with them the potential for social issues which will play out in the Town Centre. There have been examples of satellite population developments without sufficient social services investment, especially amongst young people, leading to disruptive anti social and criminal consequences for nearby town centres. • Large population increases are likely to provide increased traffic levels to the town centre and this will require investment in highways, car parking and communications to avoid gridlock effects at peaks. • Part of the direction of thinking of RTCNPG is to promote the Green Agenda in the future development of the town, which might include traffic restrictions/exclusions from parts of the town centre, specific cycle and walking tracks, air pollution monitoring, preferential electric car and motorcycle promotions, and car size restrictions along with an ecology corridor and green space developments. • Retford Town Centre provides significant levels of support to the health agenda in both corrective and preventative procedures across the physical, mental and spiritual elements. These services will be put under further pressure by increased levels of population in the surrounding area 	<p>House building is recognized as a key driver of economic growth, as well as providing much needed housing to support sustainable communities. It offers a lifeline to communities that need investment to modernise and thrive. Developer contributions help to provide new facilities, road improvements, and new schools. All this improves the quality of life for residents.</p> <p>The policies in the plan support design of external spaces (such as highways parking areas, gardens and areas of open space to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour and facilitates the safe use of these areas by future residents, service providers or visitors.</p> <p>The policies are designed with national guidance in mind. conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>In accordance with government agenda housing development in appropriate locations in town centres and upper floors is supported.</p> <p>One of the key objectives of the Local Plan is the regeneration of the District's town centres by attracting new uses and investment opportunities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST14: Town Centres, Local Centres, Local Shops and Services			
		<p>and would benefit from a strategic investment perspective. This may include the creation of relevant zones, adjacencies and repurposing.</p> <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTCNPG is seriously considering the potential to encourage commercial companies, currently located within the town centre, whose business could be better located out of town on an industrial estate to relocate. This would free up land space which could be used for high quality accommodation, hospitality, green spaces and affordable housing as well as assisted housing for senior citizens. It is unfortunate that , because of the timing of the plans, this potential will provide housing in excess of the number required for the District. An accessible town centre would seek to reduce the distance between home/work/hospitality/retail. Retford Town Centre is often not considered for town centre development funding, possibly because it is considered to be in a good state of repair generally. Both RBF and RTCNPG feel that investing in the town centre before it falls into serious disrepair would be more effective and efficient use of funds. There are many buildings and areas in the town centre that would benefit from funding support for refurbishment and others which could be rebuilt appropriately to provide services relevant to the increased future populations. Education and training ‘ladders’ from local schools to employment, especially self employment, within the Town Centre area will significantly improve the prosperity of the town and will reduce the potential for anti social outcomes from the population increases. This requires investment in these processes and opportunities in the town centre area. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST15: Management of Town Centres			
REF008	Retford Civic Society	<p>The revised wording of Policy ST15 is welcome, although the phrase ‘non-Ea use’ will be meaningless to many. Better wording here is desirable. The revised Policy would have only a marginal effect on the introduction of uses within Class E of the Use Classes Order as most central premises are already in such uses. However it should help protect the vitality of the centre by restricting residential use of ground floor premises.</p> <p>This protection should be extended to all the premises around Canon Square by extending the Primary Shopping Area slightly. Canon Square is a very distinctive and attractive part of the town centre and its commercial character should be protected.</p>	The Council will clarify this within the updated version of the Bassetlaw Local Plan
REF043	Resident	<p>Page -14, Para - 2 c</p> <p>The present wording, although welcome, is vague and insufficiently specific.</p> <p>Is it intended to include the improvement of pedestrian and cycle links in Retford town centre similar to those in Harworth & Bircotes (para. 3 c), plus links to adjacent residential and employment areas and community facilities (including schools)? In any case, given that such improvements are vital, an appropriate item should be added.</p>	<p>To improve connectivity and enhance the District’s network, including pedestrian and cycle links the Council will, work with its partners, neighbouring authorities and utilise developer contributions in order to achieve this.</p> <p>Increasing opportunities for accessible and safe walking and cycling is a key priority for the Council. As well as providing walking and cycling routes to and through the larger site</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST15: Management of Town Centres			
			a local improvements, such as measures to enhance connectivity within Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes town centres by active travel will be taken.
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy ST15 – D. 1. c) – "providing public realm and green infrastructure improvements" • Policy ST15 – D. 2. b) – "Improving existing public realm and enhancing green infrastructure connectivity; " • Policy ST15 – D. 3. b) – "Improving the public realm and enhanced green infrastructure connectivity" 	The Council will clarify this within the updated version of the Bassetlaw Local Plan where considered appropriate.
1859314	Resident	You will not support future retail and leisure as you suggest whilst you continue to ignore the growth in IT and the support for bigger stores outside of the town. Our town centre needs investment in crime and disorder if there is any hope of attracting people to it.	A key objective of the Local Plan is to enhance the vitality and viability of town centres. Proposals f will be determined in accordance with the policy criteria, and those which will have an adverse effect upon vitality and viability will not be supported.
1858658	Resident	6.8.8- page 12- The plan makes no provision of funds to support the Retford Town Centre plan. That was provided to Worksop.	The Council is equally committed to supporting the vitality and viability of all town centres and communities within the District as considered appropriate in accordance with council objectives and priorities.
REF072	Retford Business Forum & Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group	<p>I am responding on behalf of Retford Business Forum (RBF) and the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group (RTCNPG), and you have been kind enough to attend both of our groups, you will have had some direct interaction to give you a flavour of our views.</p> <p>The focus of both RBF and RTCNPG has mainly been on the impact of the Plan on Retford Town Centre and its local area.</p> <p>On the positive side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTCNPG, and RBF especially, welcome increased levels of housing in the local area, which would increase the potential customer base for the retail and hospitality organisations in Retford. • RBF also welcomes potential investment into improving local businesses opportunities and infrastructure • RBF and RTCNPG would look forward to receiving investment funds from the developers of the housing relevant to Retford Town Centre in order to enhance the town centre to moderate the potential negative impacts. <p>On the negative side:</p>	<p>House building is recognized as a key driver of economic growth, as well as providing much needed housing to support sustainable communities. It offers a lifeline to communities that need investment to modernise and thrive. Developer contributions help to provide new facilities, road improvements, and new schools. All this improves the quality of life for residents.</p> <p>The policies in the plan support design of external spaces (such as highways parking areas, gardens and areas of open space to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour and facilitates the safe use of these areas by future residents, service providers or visitors.</p> <p>The policies are designed with national guidance in mind. conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST15: Management of Town Centres			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RBF and RTCNPG are concerned about large scale residential developments which bring with them the potential for social issues which will play out in the Town Centre. There have been examples of satellite population developments without sufficient social services investment, especially amongst young people, leading to disruptive anti social and criminal consequences for nearby town centres. • Large population increases are likely to provide increased traffic levels to the town centre and this will require investment in highways, car parking and communications to avoid gridlock effects at peaks. • Part of the direction of thinking of RTCNPG is to promote the Green Agenda in the future development of the town, which might include traffic restrictions/exclusions from parts of the town centre, specific cycle and walking tracks, air pollution monitoring, preferential electric car and motorcycle promotions, and car size restrictions along with an ecology corridor and green space developments. • Retford Town Centre provides significant levels of support to the health agenda in both corrective and preventative procedures across the physical, mental and spiritual elements. These services will be put under further pressure by increased levels of population in the surrounding area and would benefit from a strategic investment perspective. This may include the creation of relevant zones, adjacencies and repurposing. <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTCNPG is seriously considering the potential to encourage commercial companies, currently located within the town centre, whose business could be better located out of town on an industrial estate to relocate. This would free up land space which could be used for high quality accommodation, hospitality, green spaces and affordable housing as well as assisted housing for senior citizens. It is unfortunate that , because of the timing of the plans, this potential will provide housing in excess of the number required for the District. An accessible town centre would seek to reduce the distance between home/work/hospitality/retail. • Retford Town Centre is often not considered for town centre development funding, possibly because it is considered to be in a good state of repair generally. Both RBF and RTCNPG feel that investing in the town centre before it falls into serious disrepair would be more effective and efficient use of funds. There are many buildings and areas in the town centre that would benefit from funding support for refurbishment and others which could be rebuilt appropriately to provide services relevant to the increased future populations. • Education and training ‘ladders’ from local schools to employment, especially self employment, within the Town Centre area will significantly improve the prosperity of the town and will reduce the potential for anti social outcomes from the population increases. This requires investment in these processes and opportunities in the town centre area. 	<p>infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>In accordance with government agenda housing development in appropriate locations in town centres and upper floors is supported.</p> <p>One of the key objectives of the Local Plan is the regeneration of the District’s town centres by attracting new uses and investment opportunities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF008	Retford Civic Society	<p>The Society remains of the view that the proposed extension to Ordsall is not needed and could be simply removed from the Plan if a more sensible housing target were adopted. Even if house building on the District-wide scale proposed by the Council is needed, putting so many more houses into Ordsall is unacceptable.</p> <p>Ordsall has already expanded a lot in recent years with minimal improvement to the local infrastructure. What is now proposed would see its population double relative to what it was in 2011. This would lead to a very considerable increase in traffic on local roads. Improvements to a few junctions would not off-set the narrowness of many of these roads or remove the pinch-points at the river bridge and where West Carr Road crosses the railway. The extensive provision of cycle lanes proposed in the 2020 draft Plan has already been scaled back. The cycle lane proposed along Brecks Road is impractical as the road is too narrow. A cycle lane along West Hill Road may be possible but would adversely affect local residents who need to park in the highway. The increased traffic would inconvenience local people, making the area a much less pleasant place in which to live and this is unacceptable when there are alternatives available. The Society also commented in January that if the Council decides to proceed with the proposed Ordsall development, it must not start unless and until there are arrangements in place to secure the funding and timely provision of all the additional retail and community facilities referred to in the Draft Plan. This concern has not been addressed. The only specific built provision required in the revised draft Plan is one community shop. There is nothing to indicate how and when the other facilities proposed would be provided. Would the District Council be able to run and maintain the country park? If not, who would? Who would provide and run the health care hub, built community facility, school and sports pitches? For how long would the subsidy for bus services last and would these services be viable in the long term? The Ordsall allocation should not proceed unless and until all this provision is secured as otherwise there is a very real risk that what would be provided would be just another big housing estate with inadequate infrastructure. The Society asked for a specific requirement to be added to the Plan requiring that that employment land on North Road be serviced before phase 2 of the housing there is started. This has not been done, but is essential if employment provision in Retford is to grow. Without such a requirement there will be no incentive for the landowner to invest in servicing the employment land or to accept a lower price for its housing land in return for someone else carrying out the servicing. They may well just maximise their income from the housing land sale and invest it in more profitable ventures elsewhere.</p>	<p>The Council's evidence base has identified the need for new homes and employment over the plan period. The Council assessed a number of alternatives to its proposed spatial strategy and the locations for growth since 2016. These alternatives have been subject to public consultation.</p> <p>For Retford a number of locations have been assessed. It is important for the Plan to provide a balance between the level of growth and the need for new or enhanced infrastructure. The Plan has allocated a combination of brownfield and Greenfield sites to accommodate this growth. The redevelopment of smaller brownfield sites will help regenerate underused or vacant sites within the town and the allocation at Ordsall South will provide a new sustainable neighbourhood that delivers new homes along with new community infrastructure such as a new school, health facility, public transport, shops and parks. Offsite enhancements to the existing road and footpath network will also be provided where the developments make an impact. These are detailed within the Council's Transport Assessments.</p> <p>Due to its scale, the delivery of the site will be phased over and beyond the plan period. The implementation the new or enhanced infrastructure will be detailed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The pieces of infrastructure are identified as policy requirements and therefore must be delivered to support the sustainability of the development.</p> <p>The employment land at North Road is not linked to the delivery of Ordsall South as it is a site in its own right and employment delivery is linked to the employment market.</p>
REF015	Severn Trent	<p>As previously detailed within our responses regarding this site, there is a high likelihood that sewerage capacity upgrades will be required to accommodate the flows from the development. It is noted that section 7.14 details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need to create multifunctional green / blue infrastructure, • ensure development is located within the areas of the site in flood zone1, • integrated surface water routing through green / blue infrastructure, • maximise the use of permeable surfacing, • utilise grey water reuse, • utilisation of sustainable drainage to manage flood risk, and delivery water quality, biodiversity and amenity benefits. <p>Severn Trent are supportive of these aspects, we would however recommend that the policy also highlights:</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your recommendations have been included within the revised Policy for Ordsall South where appropriate.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water efficient design (Water Efficiency Standard - Building Regulations Part G 110 l/h/d) • utilisation of the drainage Hierarchy (Planning practice Guidance Paragraph 80). <p>The addition of these two points would support the reduction of flood risk and mitigate some of the impacts on the sewerage network, in a more sustainable way. It is recommended that these aspects are also incorporated into Policy 29. It is noted that Section 7 identifies that there are watercourses on the east and west boundaries of the site, therefore no connection of surface water to the sewerage system shall be permitted.</p>	
REF016	Barton Willmore on behalf of Howard Retford Ltd	<p>As authors of the Preliminary Concept Plan, our client does not wish to comment upon the content of the document which has been produced to help the Council understand the potential of Ordsall South and the development parameters. Our client is, however, keen to point out that the document does not represent a ‘fixed scheme’ at this stage. It is the firm view of our client that Ordsall South will be a consultative and dynamic process, with the design evolving in consultation with the community. The aim is to create a new neighbourhood in Retford which provides much needed new homes, homes for young people and the elderly, community facilities and local employment opportunities. This is to be set within an attractive and publicly accessible network of green infrastructure which includes new footpaths and bridleways, community growing and woodlands, formal and informal open spaces and playing pitches. As the project evolves, our client is producing a number of evidence-based reports to support the scheme including a drainage and flood risk assessment, transport and access reports and ecological impact studies. These will enable the further evolution of the designs for the site. It is noted that the current Council consultation is ‘Focussed’ towards specific themes of the Local Plan and this particular site only. In taking this approach, the site is not being considered in comparison with other development locations and will be the sole focus of attention. Our client wishes to note that we support Ordsall South as it represents the best option for development in Retford which is most accessible to both the Town Centre and A1 corridor. Development of this site will negate the need for multiple other sites around Retford in less sustainable locations. Our client notes that in addition to the allocation boundary, the Policies Maps seeks to wash over the proposed allocation with a ‘Green Gap’ designation (Policy ST40 refers). We refer to our client’s representations to the November 2020 consultation. We do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to support such a designation around Retford. Also, if proved sound, the designation of the allocation as lying within the Green Gap would cause a policy tension. We fully recognise that the Council has stated its intention to ensure separation of Eaton from south Retford. We believe that this can be better achieved via the creation of good design and strong defensible boundaries via the allocation. The Council could add a criterion to Policy 29 and HS13 to that effect. Our client has reviewed the June 2021 focussed Consultation document subject to this consultation. The following comments are provided: (4.2 -> 4.8)</p> <p>4.2 Paragraph 7.14.2 states that “a condition of the redevelopment is that revenue generated by the scheme should be reinvested in the quality of the sports offer at the golf club”. For the avoidance of doubt, this statement needs to be qualified as it relates only to the parcel of land which is controlled by Retford Golf Club, not the wider site. Clarity is sought from the Council as to how that would be achieved.</p> <p>4.3 Paragraph 7.14.3 states that the Council will approve a masterplan prepared by the promoter. Whilst we accept this general proposition, the Council will need to engage with the consultant team to ensure that the masterplan can be prepared and agreed in a timely manner.</p> <p>4.4 Paragraph 7.14.4 states that construction of the first homes is not expected until at least 2027. Our client disagrees with this timetable in the Trajectory. A more realistic trajectory would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan reg 19 stage - Autumn 2021; • Local Plan Examination – Early 2022; • Plan adopted late Spring 2022; 	Thank you for your comments. We will continue to work closely with you through the planning for the site and the necessary infrastructure requirements, masterplan and any other related issues concerning the delivery of the allocation.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan developed Autumn 2021 (as evidence to the EiP) – adopted by the Council Spring 2022; • Planning application (part outline, part detailed for phase 1) – submitted late summer 2022; • Application approved end of 2022; • Preliminary infrastructure works – Spring 2022; • First homes commenced – Autumn 2022; • With an anticipated build out rate of 50 homes per year thereafter. <p>4.5 Paragraph 7.14.7 refers to a Retford-Eaton Green Gap. As we set out in our submissions to the November 2020 consultation, we do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to warrant a specific policy on a Green Gap around Retford. However, our client fully accepts the need to ensure that, through good design, places retain individual identity and character. We believe that the intentions of the Council to ensure distinctiveness between Retford and Eaton can be achieved via good design and landscaping rather than a policy tool.</p> <p>4.6 Our client supports the helpful suggestions in paragraphs 7.14.8-7.14.13 relating to the provision of green infrastructure.</p> <p>4.7 At 7.14.14, we refer to our comments above in relation to the policies maps. The location of the school and health hub needs to be further discussed with the County Council. Whilst we agree that it needs to have the very best connectivity, this might be restricted by inclusion of the ‘safeguarded land’ part of the Council’s strategy. We believe that a criteria-based Policy in HS13 would be better.</p> <p>4.8 Paragraphs 7.14.15-7.14.17 relate to transport and access. The text suggest that a new dual roundabout will be required on Ollerton Road. We have yet to discuss this with Nottinghamshire County Council and therefore the text should refer only to new access arrangements to be provided. We note that roundabouts can be expensive and even unsightly, so early discussions with the County Council is essential.</p>	
REF020	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>In our previous response we pointed out that housing estates such as the Ordsall South and Bassetlaw Garden Village were a lazy, outdated, inappropriate and very damaging response to a twenty first century housing crisis. There is some acknowledgement of this in the document e.g. limited support for the use of upper floor shop premises for housing. It is a lazy response because for developers it is far easier and cheaper to build uninspiring patten book houses on greenfield estates than provide unique solutions required in adapting existing structures for residential use. New builds are also environmentally damaging because they require more building materials than adapting existing structures. This point has been reinforced by the recent report from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) https://www.architecture.com/knowledge-and-resources/knowledge-landing-page/can-your-designs-be-sustainable-without-adopting-a-whole-life-approach. This report argues, with absolute logic, for the reuse of existing structures and materials rather than new builds pointing out both the economic and environmental advantages. The authors report out that some local planning authorities have already adopted this as a policy and argues that other authorities will soon follow. The question is will Bassetlaw be part of this trend?</p> <p>It is outdated and inappropriate because the practice of zoning residential areas separate to industrial and commercial areas was a nineteenth and early twentieth century response to the noxious and toxic environment associated with heavy industry. We are now in a post-industrial age in this country, and it is no longer necessary to separate residencies from places of work. It is damaging for a number of reasons. Greenfield land is a finite and very precious resource. With global warming food shortages are certain and Brexit has produced its own problems in importing food from the EU. Indeed, food shortages in the UK are predicted for later this year. In addition, there is increasing trend to convert agricultural and horticultural land into solar power generation sites. While we whole heartedly support the increase in green energy production it should not be at the expense of the countryside and we must safeguard what agricultural and horticultural land that is left for food production. The countryside is also of</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford’s growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>A new “health-hub” facility will be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>major importance for recreation and contributes to both physical and mental good health. It is nothing short of a scandal to squander this precious resource for housing when other locations are available. The zoning of residential accommodation has other environmental and social damaging effects. It inevitably results in more and longer car journeys for employment, shopping and other purposes which will only be slightly mitigated by proposed public transport provision. Where will the residents access health care, schools? Currently our local surgeries are working at capacity and with predicted severe staff shortages in the NHS new surgeries are unlikely to be staffed. This will, off course, be especially true if specific provision is made for the elderly in these new estates. There is also a predicted shortage of teachers, so the same issues apply to schooling as health care. We do not question the need for more housing in Bassetlaw and nor do we doubt the estimates of the size of the need. However, this need can and should only be met by dispersing the new accommodation into existing areas and specifically by the adaption and reuse of existing structures. In this way the added burden on primary care services, schools and other services will also be dispersed and more bearable. Meeting this need by the construction of new housing estates on green field estates is the cheap, lazy but very destructive solution to the problem though very profitable for the developers. The alternative of adapting existing structures is more demanding and require both intelligence and imagination but it is the appropriate response for this century's housing crisis.</p>	<p>Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p>
REF021	Resident	<p>Whilst I am in favour of the plan for housing and community facilities, in principle, the HUGE FLAW in the plan are the totally inadequate plans for increased traffic. The following are the reasons and suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Because of the River Idle, the main route into Retford will be via High Street Ordsall. At least 20 properties on High Street have no off-street parking. Cars are parked all day along one side of the road reducing the carriageway to a single carriageway. This is on a main bus route with 4 buses an hour attempting to travel along plus delivery vehicles. Currently a problem, NOW, but potentially a disaster with the plan. 2) At the end of High Street traffic has to cross the river bridge. Although we were told that £500,000 was spent recently on the bridge, only one vehicle can use, at a time, if a bus, Lorry or large van is crossing. 3) The proposed, enlarged island on the London Rd/ Goosemoor Lane junction is not a solution for this, or any other problem. 4) Another alternative route into Retford is via West Carr Road where again, cars are permanently parked on one side of the road due to terraced houses with no off-road parking. The road also has a secession of speed calming bumps. 5) Ordsall Road is another alternative route into Retford with cars often parked on one side of the road and no facilities for meaningful road widening. The proposed enlarge roundabout at Babworth will achieve little. 6) The other route to Retford is via Eton village with a very old narrow bridge over the river, again not a solution at all. <p>The main shopping area, with 2 mini markets has very limited parking. The council has recently installed yellow lines in the area of the shops, so shoppers now park on the pavement! There is only one expensive solution. A new road would be needed, south of Ordsall, crossing the river, and coming out on London Road between Eaton College and Grove Road. With a potential of AT LEAST 1000 more cars using the Ordsall roads the current plan would be a DISASTER. Also, when the A1 is blocked due to an accident, the vehicles often divert through Ordsall. I note that Councillor Richards, a long time Ordsall resident and councillor for the ward has resigned over what may be her view that the decisions are already made and that the "consultation" is actually "window dressing" I hope, for the sake of our future that this is not the case.</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF023	Natural England	<p>We would like to comment in particular on the amendments to the Ordsall South site allocation.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England welcome the amendment in paragraph 7.14.8 to ensure the use of species of local provenance in GI proposals. We also welcome paragraph 7.14.14, which supports provision of active travel, as well as connections to and extension of the PRoW network. The Covid-19 pandemic has brought to the fore the critical role that time in nature plays in supporting health and wellbeing. We recommend inclusion of green footpaths/cycleways throughout all new developments, to allow for common commuting routes to be more scenic and thus provide an easy, accessible way for everyone to spend time in nature. We note the omission of the suggestion for community orchards in Policy 29, 3. V. ‘Edible Space for allotments and community planting’. We would advise that community orchards could be beneficial to the development. There are various areas of traditional orchard priority habitat nearby, to the east of the site, thus, their inclusion would be in keeping with local character and could improve the network of priority habitats in the locality. <p>Biodiversity Net Gain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We still welcome the requirement for a 10% net gain in biodiversity for this development (Paragraph 7.14.11). We would also like to note that the new Biodiversity Metric (3.0) has just been launched; we recommend this is utilised for this development. The advantage of using a recognised metric to deliver net gain is that it provides a clear, transparent and evidence-based approach to assessing a project’s biodiversity impacts that can assist with “de-risking” a development through the planning process and contribute to wider place-making. We are happy to see an amendment to recommend the expansion of the nearby lowland heath priority habitat into the country park, which will help to strengthen the mix of habitats on site, as well as improve the network of priority habitats in the locality. 	Thank you for your comments.
REF026	Resident	<p>Section 1. Questions, in no particular order.</p> <p>How many allotments are proposed and what is the size of each allotment?</p> <p>Are these allotments to be available to others not living on the Ordsall South development?</p> <p>How many people are on the current waiting list for allotments in Retford?</p> <p>How many Council allotments currently exist in Retford, excluding the proposed allotments on the Ordsall South development?</p> <p>How are the wetland areas going to be sourced with water?</p> <p>Are the tree lined roads planned as per the picture in the Barton Wilmore literature?</p> <p>Are the roads going to be tree lined both sides?</p> <p>The Barton Wilmore literature shows a picture of a private drive. Where are these planned on the development? I couldn’t see them on the map/diagrams produced by Barton Wilmore.</p> <p>What sports pitches are proposed and are they full size or reduced size? Are Barton Wilmore adhering to the areas allocated to the sports pitches and other green spaces as proposed in the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan?</p> <p>From the Draft Bassetlaw Local plan, page 18, Policy 29, section 3, point v) what is “Edible space for allotments and community planting”? Does this mean it can be taken away for development later?</p>	<p>The details of the development are yet to be finalised. The Local Plan identifies the area, level and type of development and the necessary infrastructure needed to support the development. The developers have proposed a concept plan which provides further detail on particular issues, but this will continue to be altered as it moves forward.</p> <p>The concept plan has to be policy compliant, so it is important to have a look through this when the plan is next publically available.</p> <p>The sites is large in scale so it provides multiple opportunities to create a high-quality development what provides benefits to local residents. The density of the site will vary, with higher densities around local community hubs and lower densities around the outer edge of the site which is adjacent to the countryside.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>Are the green spaces including the sports area, woodland and landscape buffer protected from possible future development? Section 2. General comments.</p> <p>From the Bassetlaw draft Local plan, 7.14.6 Ordsall South was to provide the opportunity that the older people of Retford could 'age well in place'. I don't think the Barton Wilmore proposal applies this principal in their plans. Yes, there is a woodland area, some allotments, and local amenities but is there not more that can be done? Are there not development examples in this country and others that have benefited the elderly that ideas can be taken from? Could the residents of Retford be consulted for ideas?</p> <p>The Barton Wilmore proposal seems congested with housing for the amount of land available. The point 1 iii) under Policy 29 in the Draft Local plan on page 17 suggests the development should be "interspersed with appropriate use of shared spaces". I don't think the Barton Wilmore plan addresses this point. I can't at present comment on whether too many houses are planned. But whatever number is finally decided upon I would propose taking some of the landscape buffer and making green areas within the areas proposed for houses and maybe even interlink those green areas if possible. Part of the idea of this is to encourage the residents to use the green spaces and I believe that it has been shown that proximity to such spaces is a factor. So instead of an elderly resident having to walk through the roads and houses to a landscape buffer or woodland area, smaller green areas would be available much closer if the housing was fragmented and interspersed with green areas. This use do to proximity would I am sure apply to all age groups and not just the elderly. From the past demand for allotments, I would consider that better value to the residents would be gained from giving up more housing or landscape buffer or woodland to the provision of allotments. I would suggest other allotment schemes in this country and abroad be studied to get ideas for most beneficial use. For example, allocating allotments for a fixed term period (possibly just 1 year) and then allocating to the next on the waiting list, public or community allotments where all can help and providing access to enable those with a disability to benefit from the joy of growing on an allotment. The proposed location of the school, I presume is close to the sports pitches to enable them to make use of those facilities. Could the school not be adjacent to the Sports facilities proposed? Also, could an allotment or rough area be reserved for the school to enable them to use it for Outdoor learning or Forest school, or relocate the school so that they have easier access to the landscape buffer and woodland area and permission to use that area for their outdoor learning and or Forest school? From the Draft Local plan, Policy 29 section 3. Green infrastructure and biodiversity seems good in promoting green spaces, sports facilities and access for people to get out and use it but what about access and sports facilities for the older generation or those with a disability. There seems to be no mention of them. Will those in a wheelchair be able to traverse the landscape buffer around the rural periphery of the site? What about sports facilities for the elderly and those with a disability. In the Draft Bassetlaw Local plan the Ordsall South project is to have "Appropriate off road parking provision for vehicles an cycles ...". What parking provision does the Barton Wilmore plan propose? The tree-lined roads are nice, but from my experience without sufficient parking provision those lovely tree lined roads become tree lined roads interspersed with cars parked on the verges between the trees.</p>	<p>The site will provide a good mix of housing types with a particular focus for older peoples housing and family homes. These areas of development will be interspersed with green space and public rights of way to encourage greater connectivity and opportunities for walking and cycling. The road network will be legible and the access into the site will be served by a regular bus to and from other parts of the town.</p> <p>The site will be landscaped and the country park and green infrastructure on the site will help provide a green buffer between it and the countryside.</p>
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>Situated on the southern edge of Ordsall, Retford; Ordsall South is adjacent to an existing residential area. The site (108.7ha) provides an opportunity to create a sustainable and well integrated extension – for 1250 dwellings, open space and community uses - to significantly contribute to Retford's housing needs in this plan period, and the next. The site will <u>have good access to a range of employment</u> and other local services within the wider planned development and Retford itself.</p> <p>The underlined section is the crux of the matter; it is not true to say that the site will have 'good' access to either</p>	<p>The Local Plan proposes employment growth as well as housing. The employment growth doesn't always benefit from being located with housing. The employment types in Bassetlaw are often logistics or distribution and these need to be located near the main road network. Ordsall South is a largely residential scheme, but with improved public</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>Retford or further afield. This is a serious access problem which needs a detailed commitment to resolve - this commitment will have to come from NCC, The UK Government, BDC, Highways England and Network Rail and without it, the Plan is weak and not sufficiently forward looking to meet the needs of a growing town in the first half of 21st Century. There is a fundamental issue here which can be resolved as the Plan develops but needs an honest and truthful admission that the current proposals are not fit for purpose now, and will certainly be weak and of limited value in 25 years time. It would appear the Planners and the politicians are choosing to fudge the Retford South issues now in the desire to develop and complete a District wide Plan.</p> <p>This is what will happen -</p> <p>a) The 1250 houses (and possibly more) will appear here and in smaller numbers elsewhere in Ordsall</p> <p>b) These houses will have residents who require work</p> <p>c) There are no work locations identified in South Ward - either existing or new</p> <p><u>Therefore the residents will have to travel to work</u>, and they will continue to travel by car be it electric or fossil fuel driven, until 2050 at least. Some its true will use buses – but only if the buses can get them to work locations, for a town centre shuttle is no use for 6am shift workers in Worksop, Retford or anywhere in Bassetlaw. This development will inevitably present problems, and whilst mitigations have been proposed they will be woefully inadequate for the reasons detailed here -</p> <p>It appears that this latest Plan offer and the corresponding analysis misses some quite severe potential problems - for example:</p> <p>In order to travel NORTH for local work at Bircotes/Harworth, or on the Trinity Farm area of Retford ALL such traffic, buses, cars, bicycles, (& scooters if you wish) will have to pass through Retford Hallcroft roundabout - there is no other way, unless you choose the A1 for the more distant locations. To choose the A1 to go NORTH requires the use of a quite narrow West Hill Road and Ordsall Road (past a Primary school), leading to the A620 roundabout at Ordsall Woods - an already 'full' section of road as indeed noted by NCC recent traffic data. This route will also be used (as it is now) to carry virtually all the work traffic intending to travel WEST to Worksop and Sheffield area. There are work opportunities to the EAST of Retford - the Hospital is a major employer, and Gainsborough and Lincoln offer work opportunities; traffic heading EAST from Ordsall has an option to use the historic narrow bridge at Ordsall (already the site of extensive work, but still not a safe as it could be) or queue with everyone else to cross the railways, the canal and river via Hallcroft roundabout, or zig-zag through the town or Eaton on narrow streets. There is a little bit of good news - the route South from Ordsall leads to the A1 at Markham Moor, and connection to the A1 with its good links to Lincoln, Newark, Nottingham, Worksop, Sheffield and Doncaster could help ease the burden on other 'via Retford' routes. We know that even now because drivers cut through pretty, picturesque (and totally unsuitable for volumes of traffic) Eaton to get to the A1; cutting through Eaton village is presently really well used - so much so that the Plan has already identified it as a problem. This Plan is offering in the main a few marked cycle lanes on already busy narrow roads, plus a cycle route out to a yet to built 'Garden Village' that might not happen anyway, and might not get a Station and is a disappointing cop-out of responsibilities for the future - we are facing a climate and energy emergency and we need to be building safe dedicated routes for cyclists all over Bassetlaw, and that the paucity of commitment to high quality lit separate bike routes away from a development that will increase the population of Retford by at least 10% is unacceptable and, as referenced earlier a critical weakness of the Plan. For example, there's still no suitable bike route from Ordsall to the Railway Station – despite local groups and Councillors repeatedly calling for it the only route for cyclists to the Station is via a 'Cyclists Prohibited' route, even though there's scope for excellent cycle access nearby.</p> <p>*The reference to a junction of Ollerton Road/Whitehall Road junction is a typo – no such junction exists.</p>	<p>transport to and from the site, it will help local residents access key transport infrastructure and employment opportunities further afield.</p> <p>A revised Transport Assessment for Retford has been produced in response to your feedback. This has looked at the uplift in development to 1250 and the other sites around the town. The assessment also looks the proportionality in terms of which development should contribute towards what scheme or mitigation proposals.</p> <p>The assessment doesn't identify the need for a new dual road from the site to the A1. This would be unfeasible in terms of impacts from development and unjustifiable in terms of cost and business case.</p> <p>The assessment also looks at Public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure from the site to the wider area.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult and engage with the County Council through the rest of the Local Plan process and during its implementation.</p> <p>The Council will also work with Network Rail to agree a level crossing closure programme as part of the development of the Garden Village.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>So how can we improve the Plan? Here are offered some solutions -</p> <p>Unless the Plan can contain an agreement in principle to produce a new road leading (dual carriageway standard?) SOUTH to the A1 - effectively a major improvement to the full length of Ollerton Road/Brick Yard Road/Jockey Lane - the current plan condemns Retford residents to a further 30 years of traffic congestion, with all the incidents and losses that come with that.</p> <p>Such an improved road could also provide a <u>safe adjacent cycle route</u> to and from Elkesley, and at last allow Retford cyclists a safe route <u>South to the National Cycle Network Route 647</u> via Crookford.</p> <p>A grander Plan altogether would be to encourage further employment and residential development inside a carefully planned perimeter of tarmac around our beautiful historic town. This is a Plan for 50 years that we are putting together and we want to ensure that 50 years from now, it won't just be the developers and their shareholders that look approvingly at Retford.</p> <p>Network Rail have already stated that they want to see Level Crossings disappear because of the risks they bring - the two near Mansfield Road are actually referenced in the Garden Village Transport vision. The East Coast Main Line (ECML) has three level crossings near Retford - two of which (Botany Bay and Barnby Moor/Sutton cum Lound) could be closed with minimal disruption (and no bridges!), and the 'parcels' of land thus created could be used for residential and or employment opportunities.</p> <p>Such parcels of land around Retford would be ideal for the District Council to (perhaps compulsorily purchase if needs be) plan for more building of 'council houses' in the town – Retford has no land presently earmarked specifically for such work, though it is much needed and already planned elsewhere in Bassetlaw. Dozens of 'pocket' hectares would be released with such a Plan, and the Council/Developer could choose the most appropriate house/hectare density between 25 to 50 to suit the evolving needs.</p> <p>The third ECML crossing on Grove Road would require a railway bridge to eliminate it, but the resultant highway would create another 'pocket' and would also invite a strategic but challenging link road to Ordsall South across the Idle flood plain - a carefully designed improvement like this would protect the environment over which it passes, allow cycle routes to built at the side of the new carriageway, further protect Eaton, provide a better route to the East for Ordsall residents keeping them away from the historic narrow bridge, and as an added bonus create more potential triangles of housing development or employment land adjacent to the railway and London Road. ECML will be pleased with all of this – just 1 bridge required and 3 Level Crossings eliminated - and they have committed in their 2025 Plan to agree assistance with costs – it is disappointing that the current Plan lacks this kind of future commitment in black and white.</p> <p>The Plan also neglects to deal with the particular and well documented issues of overdevelopment of housing already being sought in some parts of the East Ward of Bassetlaw District Council. The Planning Inspector recently agreed with BDC Planning Committee and <u>rejected</u> an appeal from the Developer in connection with new housing in the Tiln Lane area of Retford. Traffic issues of various kinds were noted as a problem, and the one which will remain so is whilst large vehicles seek to travel on the A620 East from Retford and pass under two railway bridges, one of which is a bridge about 11ft at Welham, and has caused fatal accidents and been struck into a number of times.</p> <p>This particular issue could be solved in a number of ways, including the fabled Retford by-pass.</p> <p>However there are other good options - and one such option would be to create a single carriageway road that simply 'hugs' the existing railway line, eliminating at a stroke the need for A620 traffic to use both railway bridges.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		It's not a particularly useful infrastructure improvement with regard to additional housing, but it would solve some social issues including the removal of LGVs passing a school (where fatal RTAs have occurred) and a duo of bottleneck junctions. What it would do is create a safe cycle route with no through traffic into and out of Welham, and open the possibility of a well made cycle route from the A620 across the Leverton Road and into Bracken Lane and then through to Ordsall South and the national network. Retford people will definitely want to, and may even need to travel by other than personal car in the future - we should be planning and detailing these ideas in this Plan now so that in the future the safe cycleways all over town will be available for all to use.	
REF041	Resident	<p>I am not a resident of Eaton Village but have been a regular worshiper at Eaton Church since 1967. Obviously traffic has increased during this time but traffic flow presently is really heavy, considering the narrow bendy road and bridge in Eaton Village. In recent times there have certainly been three collisions with the bridge necessitating considerable repairs. On two other occasions vehicles ended in the river. Whenever you re in church I guarantee you will hear the squeal of breaks as vehicles have to stop very suddenly at the bridge.</p> <p>With the development of housing and increase in traffic at Ordsall South, I am extremely afraid that there are accidents waiting to happen through Eaton Village, particularly at the bridge. Let us hope they do not involve fatalities. Considerable road improvement will be required to avoid this impending scenario.</p>	The Council's Transport Assessment has identified that there would likely be a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. This can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.
REF043	Resident	<p>HS13 Ordsall South: the wording continues to contain several proposals (including Brecks Road) to provide a "marked cycle lane" along connecting streets, despite comments during the November 2020 consultation. Construction of this forwards-looking major greenfield development with cycling provision from a previous era (on-road marked cycle lane[s]) would be a serious failure of planning and design. Rather, it must be future-proofed from the outset. Where possible, the principal active travel (walking and cycling) routes should be on paths separate from road alignments, particularly the east-west spine route connecting the country park (7.14.8) [and the future route to the Garden Village (5.iii.3)], the community facilities (7.14.14), crossing Ollerton Road and continuing towards the River Idle. The Department for Transport's design standard LTN 1/20 may be appropriate for this. Shared-use paths (pedestrian and cyclist) alongside roads should be considered only where unavoidable and on-road marked cycle lanes should be excluded. In addition to the benefits to active travellers of cleaner air and lower noise levels, this would also avoid conflicts with vehicles parked wholly or partially on roadside paths and verges. As also mentioned in November 2020, this Policy should extend to making provision for a new cyclepath bridge over the River Idle, perhaps in the vicinity of Bank Side in Ordsall (from East Retford FP1), linking to a safe crossing of Goosemoor Lane and giving access to the recently improved bridleway (East Retford BW34) to Thrumpton Lane. I have been informed by Nottinghamshire County Council [NCC] that such a bridge has previously been considered, so a feasibility study may already exist.</p>	A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any alterations to existing cycle ways are likely to be improvements to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting.
REF045	Resident	<p>i) Para 7.14.13 - what exactly is meant on flooding? You say matters should be explored – surely a matter that should have been done before promoting this site. Residents gardens flood. More tarmac/hard landscaping is likely to mean more flooding.</p> <p>ii) Para 7.14.16 - "junctions requiring improvements including the Ollerton Road/Whitehall Road junction and Goosemoor London Road mini roundabout at Whitehouses" There is no junction of Ollerton Road/Whitehall Road – indeed they are on opposite sides of the East Coast Railway line and the River Idle with no road connection. There is a mini roundabout at Whitehouses but there is no mini roundabout at the junction of Goosemoor Lane and London Road. These are elementary mistakes either through a lack of knowledge which must raise doubts on how well Bassetlaw Council knows the area and how many other mistake are in your paper. You still have no firm proposals on traffic management, through what you call Ordsall Old Village and at Eaton. Why not? There has been plenty of time to undertake a study, consult and publish recommendations. A comment - "The Ordsall South Concept Plan is the promoter's initial draft vision for Ordsall South. Please note that this vision has been produced by an external site promoter, Barton Willmore and we accept no responsibility for the content included within this document." - a</p>	The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the proposed Ordsall South development, as well as all relevant sites across the District. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the highest flooding risk occurs when high rainfall events result in water running off fields in to existing developments. The Flood Risk Assessment has indicated that new on-site water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into both the new development and existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>meaningless document doing nothing to address concerns and not worth you putting it on your website.</p>	<p>drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the development's Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.</p>
REF052	NCC – Planning Policy Team	<p><u>Strategic Highways</u> <i>Paragraph 7.14.15</i> Roundabouts are proposed to serve the site. The Highway Authority has had sight of the draft Retford Transport Assessment 2021 (RTA) being prepared in support of the allocation of sites in Retford, albeit for 800 dwellings on this site rather than the 1250 now included in the consultation. Comments have been provided with respect the content of the RTA separately. The RTA confirms that the roundabouts will have a 40m ICD. On balance that would be a reasonable choice of junction arrangement. However, there is no junction capacity assessment to demonstrate that the junctions would operate within capacity. Furthermore, the land available for the southern of the two roundabouts has necessitated the sharpening of the bend to the south of the boundary of the site and a tortuous northern junction exit as the roundabout is offset westwards from the Ollerton Road centreline due to land not being available on the east side. It must be demonstrated that this layout could be achieved in accordance with geometric standards. The acceptability of the proposed roundabouts is therefore not certain.</p> <p>The western parcel of land benefits from a junction with both proposed roundabouts. This could provide a convenient bus route through the site. However, the eastern parcel would only have one junction with Ollerton Road. Bus operators are generally reluctant to enter cul-de-sacs as this often necessitates a need to track back. Therefore, to facilitate a bus serving, the internal layout must be designed as a loop that picks up as much of the site as possible and which minimises the need to cover the same streets twice when returning to the wider road network. This should be reflected on the Ordsall Concept Plan Vision.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 7.14.16</i> The Highway Authority would expect an outline planning application to be supported by a Transport Assessment (TA). This must identify each junction that would experience capacity issues and propose a suitable scheme of mitigation. The agreed mitigation measures should then be secured by planning condition rather than financial contribution. Whilst the RTA goes some way to demonstrate which junctions may have capacity issues following the development of 800 dwellings, this does not demonstrate how these capacity issues could be addressed. There</p>	<p>A revised Transport Assessment for Retford has been produced in response to your feedback. This has looked at the uplift in development to 1250 and the other sites around the town. The assessment also looks the proportionality in terms of which development should contribute towards what scheme or mitigation proposals. It also looks at Public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult and engage with the County Council through the rest of the Local Plan process and during its implementation.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>therefore remains uncertainty as to whether the wider highway network could be suitably improved to address capacity issues should this site come forward, particularly as there could be another 450 dwellings above those currently included in the RTA.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Eaton is unlikely to be subjected to such an increase in traffic that would then raise highway network capacity concerns. However, the route through the village is not considered appropriate for a material increase in traffic. Main Road is a single carriageway with limited footway provision and limited street lighting. Main Road is also narrow in places with reduced visibility.</p> <p>Furthermore, the existing bridge over the River Idle is only wide enough for one-way vehicular traffic. It therefore may be appropriate to seek a financial contribution in this instance towards measures to deter traffic from using Main Road as a through route and to discourage vehicle speed. It is likely that the introduction of any measures would be best done following engagement with the local community.</p> <p><i>POLICY 29 A.1.iii</i></p> <p>The Policy includes references to the use of shared spaces. The DfT publication “The Inclusive Transport Strategy: Achieving Equal Access for Disabled People – July 2018” recommends that local authorities pause the development of shared space schemes whilst the DfT review and update their guidance due to concerns raised about shared space and navigability.</p> <p><i>POLICY 29 A.5.a)iii.1. and 2.</i></p> <p>DfT LTN 1/20 “Cycle infrastructure design” should be applied to all changes associated with highway improvements, new highway construction and new or improved cycle facilities (paragraph 1.1.1), including those on other rights of way such as bridleways and routes within public open space (paragraph 1.3.1).</p> <p>The LTN states that on urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with them. Shared use routes in streets with high pedestrian or cyclist flows should not be used (paragraph 1.6.1 2). On roads with high volumes of motor traffic or high speeds, cyclist routes indicated with only road markings or cycle symbols should not be used (paragraph 1.6.1 3). To allow faster cyclists to overtake, and make room for non-standard bikes, cycle tracks should ideally be 2.0m wide in each direction, or 3.0 to 4.0m (depending on cycle flows) for bidirectional tracks, there may have to be exceptions (paragraph 1.6.1 5)). The absolute minimum width at constraints is 1.5m (table 5-2). Within a 30mph zone, a 0.5m buffer is desirable adjacent the carriageway increasing to 1.5m adjacent a pedestrian crossing point (Table 6-1). There are also design parameters relating to gradient, headroom, forward visibility, etc.</p> <p>In accordance with Manual for Streets, the minimum unobstructed width for pedestrians should generally be 2.0m (6.3.22). DfT Inclusive Mobility recommends that there should be minimum widths of 3.0m at bus stops and 3.5m to 4.5m by shops though it is recognized that available space will not always be sufficient to achieve these dimensions (Chapter 3). The minimum required overall segregated footway/cycleway width could therefore be considerable and may well be unachievable adjacent the existing highway network due to existing constraints accept within or adjacent the allocation.</p> <p>Parking provision should include charging points for electric vehicles.</p>	
REF054	Resident	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, 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. I believe that 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. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I 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 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 risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.</p>	<p>land is needed to support Retford’s growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF065	Resident	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, 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. I believe that 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. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I strongly feel that the existing boundaries of Retford and Ordsall should be</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford’s growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>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 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 risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.</p>	<p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF066	Resident	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, 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. I believe that 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. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I 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 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 risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.</p>	<p>purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF068	Resident	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, 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. I believe that 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. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I 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 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 risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive</p>	<p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed the requirement for the number of homes needed within the Retford area. There is no need for this development in this area.	<p>country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF069	Resident	<p>I am writing to inform you that I strongly object to the proposed planning of the area of Ordsall South. I am very saddened to read that since the huge objections from the residents of Ordsall there are now plans to increase the housing in this area. I object to this proposal entirely and there are several reasons for my objections. Firstly, the proposal would have a huge effect on the wildlife in those fields and surrounding areas. Also, 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. I believe that 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. Land is a natural resource and of utmost importance, as it supports natural vegetation, wildlife and benefits human life. Many people use this area for walking, and it provides huge benefits to people's mental health having what feels like the countryside on their doorstep. I do not agree that there should be any building of houses beyond the current boundary of Retford; I 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 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 risk to the current properties being flooded due to the water not being able to be absorbed into the fields as it currently is. I can see you have attempted to address this in the new proposal, but this has only heightened my anxieties as it is clearly describing flood areas. You can clearly see that following rainfall there are huge patches of wet ground that remains in the fields for days afterwards, also the ditches still have water in them following days of warm or hot weather. Adding infrastructure, concrete and road to these fields would cause massive problems in the future. Bassetlaw District Council have also oversubscribed 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 undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>There are currently no concerning air quality issues at Ordsall. The inclusion of new green infrastructure, including the country park and woodlands on site will help mitigate against any increased issues with air quality in the area.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF058	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council appreciate that Bassetlaw District Council has to identify suitable land to support the development of new housing to meet future needs in the area however, the Parish Council have raised strong objections to this plan for the following reasons. The proposed rate of this development is not only almost double what is required using the Government’s recommended method of calculation but the time scales do not allow for the considered development of necessary infrastructure to support the needs of such an increased population. The updated plan includes the building of even more houses than identified in the original plan adding 450 houses to the original 850, in reality the Parish Council can not foresee the need for this size of development</p> <p>The following issues were identified as specific issues to consider:</p> <p>Please note that although the plan was deemed to be detrimental to the whole Parish with increased traffic and a general shortage of supporting services, the village of Eaton would be at greater risk because of its location on the route to Ordsall from major A roads in the vicinity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional traffic – The proposed plan would produce an enormous amount of additional traffic deeming local roads not fit for purpose and dangerous. There is limited scope to improve the existing road system in this area for example the two old bridges at Ordsall and Eaton which are very narrow and cannot cope with the amount of traffic they carry currently. Recently N.C.C. 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 this has only had a negligible impact with Eaton being used as a “cut-through” from major ‘A’ roads. The mini-roundabouts at the North of Ordsall and at Whitehouses are even now exceptionally congested and the plan identifies no opportunity to make alternative new/enhanced roadways for the proposed Ordsall South development. • Cyclist and pedestrian usage - Improvements for cyclists would require the removal of much needed kerbside parking in Eaton village. The narrow road through the village of Eaton is precarious and dangerous for pedestrians at present as they have to be aware of speeding vehicles and this would only get worse. • Additional facilities - As the infrastructure of schools, health and leisure facilities does not exist at present the building of these and ensuing chaos created because of the construction will add another layer of 	<p>The volume of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of infrastructure. A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter.</p> <p>The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly to provide a viable development that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support a sustainable development for the community.</p> <p>The Council’s Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>difficulty to the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of Rural countryside - In proposing the Ordsall South development the well-being of residents in the Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council are blatantly being put at risk with the encroachment of new building on rural areas that cannot support such an extensive plan. <p>It would be more sensible, in our opinion, for Bassetlaw 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.</p>	<p>has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment has also identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. However, the Transport Assessment indicates that these impacts can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures, the specifics of which can be found in the Transport Assessment itself.</p> <p>Conditions may be put in place for the developers regarding the potential for disruption to be caused through the construction process of the development. This would be done through the standard planning process.</p> <p>The wider countryside beyond the proposed allocation isn't earmarked for development and is therefore subject to the rural policies within the Local Plan.</p>
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.14 Site HS14: Ordsall South – 7.14.8 – "The use of green infrastructure will....." 7.14 Site HS14: Ordsall South – 7.14.9 – "Elsewhere on site, appropriate use of green infrastructure, such as...." Policy 29 – 3. – "Green infrastructure and biodiversity" Policy 29 – 3. a) – "Provide for a multifunctional green infrastructure network....." <p>7.14.9: We're really supportive of a buffer paragraph; however, we recommend that buffers should be provided alongside all watercourses including rivers, canals, drains and ditches for the benefits they provide in terms of corridors for wildlife movement. Therefore, it'd be beneficial to see reference to that requirement here. Our advice is that undeveloped buffers of 10m should be provided adjacent to all watercourses on site, where existing constraints allow.</p> <p>Also, on the western edge of the site there are two drains which have culverted sections. Our preference is for culverts to be opened where possible, due to the significant improvements it has on biodiversity. We suggest an addition to the site specific Policy 29 which requires the removal of culverted sections of watercourse to improve biodiversity.</p> <p>7.14.11: Excellent to see reference to biodiversity net gain in here. We note that a Biodiversity opportunity mapping project</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We have included your recommendations to the policy where appropriate.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>has been completed for Nottinghamshire, including Bassetlaw so we recommend that you refer to this mapping within the text as it's a great evidence base for highlighting relevant options here.</p> <p>7.14.12: As mentioned above, watercourses should also be buffered for the biodiversity benefits it provides, not just flooding and separation; we'd therefore like to see those reasons added here for extra weight.</p> <p>Policy 29: In light of the above, we recommend the following additions to Policy 29 in order to improve the effectiveness and clarity of the Policy;</p> <p>3. vii – remove existing culverts on the site; in particular, one culvert on the watercourse on the western boundary of the site and another in the North Western Corner of the site, parallel to Retford golf course, in order to improve these watercourses for biodiversity.</p>	
REF062	National Trust	<p>An increase in the amount of new housing is proposed at Ordsall South. This forms part of an overall strategy within the Bassetlaw Local Plan to drive up housing and employment numbers, including large tracts of proposed greenfield development, which appear to be led more by land supply than by identified need. National Trust is concerned that this overall strategy does not represent sustainable development.</p> <p>While land at Ordsall south in some respects may present a more sustainable development proposition than the proposed Garden Village – being well related to an existing settlement, further from the noise and pollution associated with the A1, and less likely to impact on the sensitive ecology of Sherwood Forest and Clumber Park – we are nevertheless concerned about the potential impact on the identified Green gaps between settlements.</p> <p>Part (1)(a) of the policy states that the development should, through a Landscape Strategy and Density Plan, protect and enhance the Retford Eaton Green Gap and its landscape qualities. We suggest that the policy could more explicitly exclude land within the defined Green Gap from the built development area, having regard to the findings of the Green Gap Report 2019, p32-33.</p> <p>Part (1)(a)(ii) of the policy proposes low density development of 15-30 dwellings per hectare. It is unclear whether this relates to the proposed density across the site as a whole (i.e. including green spaces and other uses) or within residential areas. We suggest that this needs to be clarified. If the latter then 15-30 dwellings per hectare is a very low density and would therefore represent an inefficient use of greenfield land. We suggest that dwelling density within residential areas should be at least 30 dwellings per hectare, thus allowing a reduction in greenfield land take. Part 3 of the policy proposes a multi-functional green infrastructure network. National Trust supports this concept as part of any site allocation in this location.</p>	<p>The allocation of land at Ordsall South provides a balance of growth proportionate between the two largest settlements. The site is located on the edge of Ordsall and therefore needs to be carefully designed. The site is also located within a more sensitive landscape and green gap which strengthens the need for it to be sensitive to place. The design of the scheme will provide a mix of densities. Higher densities will be located around the local centre and transport infrastructure whereas lower densities will be located to the edge of the site and closer to the proposed country park.</p>
REF063	CCG NHS Bassetlaw	<p>The 108.7 hectare site will deliver 800 homes up to the year 2037, with a further 450 homes to follow after. 20% of homes delivered will be affordable housing, 20% will be designed for older people and 5% will be designed for wheelchair access.</p> <p>20% affordable housing – 160 homes 20% older people – 160 homes 5% wheelchair access – 40 homes</p> <p>Assuming the 2.3 people per household this is additional 1,840 people in total based on the initial 800 homes. The subsequent 400 homes would have potential increase of 920 people which totals 2760 individuals, however this is outside of this planning period.</p> <p>The plans recognise that Retford has a relatively high proportion of older people (aged 65+) and the highest number of residents aged over 75 in the District (10.6%). Ordsall South provides a significant opportunity to make provision</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your recommendations on health and health facilities and their requirements have been updated as part of the revisions to the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan where necessary.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>for this age group, so that they can ‘age well in place’. The Carr Hill Formulae that is used to calculate payment of GP contracts uses a Carr hill weighting to certain cohorts to factor the increased demand on primary care, the elderly population are weighted in this formula as it is acknowledged they need greater care from primary and community health services. Infrastructure identified: a convenience shop, land for a primary school, a health hub, and community facilities including outdoor sports pitches. The CCG commits to work with BDC to understand the intent of the health hub, the comments from local people about health service provision and services that may potentially be included. It should be noted if this includes primary care services any building space would be rented and therefore subject to reimbursement unless delivered through S106 contributions or delivered up for ownership in public sector as part of the overall development. The CCG has further committed to meet and discuss this further with the planning team before the end of July 2021.</p> <p>Primary Care Supporting Ordsall South:</p> <p>Retford and Villages form one PCN, primary care services in the main town are delivered by three GP practices, Riverside Health Centre delivered by Riverside Health Partnership and located close to the town centre, Kingfisher Family practice and Crown house Surgery are based at the Retford primary care Centre located just outside of the town centre on the hospital site. Riverside Health Centre have branch sites at Harworth, Misterton and Gringley. There are two further practices located at North Leverton and Tuxford, however it is not likely that these practise will be affected and Tuxford, as indicated above, has benefited form an extension recently. Riverside Health Centre is a training practice, which is pivotal to ensuring that GP workforce is strengthened to ensure there is an increase in GPs in Bassetlaw to deliver services to a larger population base. The practice is currently at capacity in terms of space at their main site which impedes on the space available to progress trainee GPs and increase in local population may impact on ability to access health services. Kingfisher and Crown House are located in a LIFT building; any additional space requirements would lead to reconfiguring the internal space available. Increase in patients from smaller housing developments in Retford may be able to be absorbed, (consideration of accumulative effect will need to be accounted for) however larger developments such as this will definitely require investment to increase capacity in primary care. The space referred to above relates only to the primary medical care services and does not consider developing a more holistic approach to health and care integration, delivering a wider scope of services that promote wellness and reduce the burden of ill health on some of the most vulnerable within our communities. The PCN serving the area would be Retford and Villages PCN. The PCN has five GP practices across 8 different sites. The total number of patients registered at Retford and Villages PCN is 52,615 as at June 2021. The Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) has developed and maintains a model to calculate indicative health contributions arising from development proposals which is in widespread use. The model uses a range of assumptions based on the most up to date information available from ONS and other sources. This model indicates that costs to primary and community health in terms of space requirements indicates £610 per dwelling. For acute services, based on a formula which projects increases in attendance at hospital, pro rata for a per capita population, the cost per dwelling is £69. Therefore capital cost requirements would be £679 per dwelling.</p> <p>This funding could be used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alterations and extensions to existing facilities and sites from which health and community services are delivered, including primary and secondary care services, to accommodate increased patient numbers; • Sites for the development of facilities from which health and community services will be delivered; • Construction costs of new facilities from which health and community services will be delivered; • Contributions towards the provision of additional spaces and capital developments to deliver health services; • Other building provision at existing medical centres or other community provisions where this releases additional capacity. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>Using standard NHS cost and floor space requirements for the various facilities, the model is able to quantify the impact in terms of physical space and subsequent cost, enabling an estimate of cost per dwelling based on the future expansion of the population. As indicated above the CCG will work with BDC and NSH England to agree what this may look like.</p> <p>In the interim, known information from Department of Health and NHS Digital can be applied:</p> <p>On average 1 x WTE GP is required per 1,800 patients. Guidance dictates that rooms used for treatment and/or consultation should be no less than 16m2 (as per HTM). It should be noted that the current NHS England space estimator only allows for primary medical services and does not include provision for colocation/integration or primary care network workforce proposals which would increase the physical space or capital investment required, nor does this tool incorporate the additional outpatient services and community care service provision that would need to be delivered so this would need to be factored into the equation.</p> <p>Health Building Note 00-08 provides additional information and guidance on town and country planning. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/414138/hbn08-addend2.pdf</p> <p>It is recognised that 90% of patient interaction is within primary care. The average GP to patient ratio is 1800 patients per GP, however this is historic based on patient attendance being on average 4 appointments per year and does not include the admin support and other clinical professionals input that would be required ie community nursing team, mental health community teams, pharmaceutical services. If the numbers of people moving into the area is 1840* this is potentially an increase in demand for GP appointments of 11, 040 based on average 6 GP visits per year, and clearly at the average of 12 minute appointments would require an additional 2,208 additional GP hours. Full time GP would usually work 9 sessions of 4 hours 10 minutes per session. GP sessions would usually be made up of 7 clinical sessions and 2 none clinical front facing. Each session would deliver up to 20 appointments. It is evident therefore that up to two additional primary care staff may be required and would suitable consultation space from which to deliver services.</p> <p>*Does not include the additional 450 homes after 2037.</p> <p>There is indication of extra care housing – this may indicate additional primary and community services demand as referenced above. 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.</p> <p>As per earlier consultation on overall plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a healthcare provider and commissioner of services we obviously welcome the inclusion of the areas identified in the Healthy Communities section of the plan to optimise healthy living opportunities. 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. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF071	Rotherham MB Council	1250 dwellings and a new Local Centre are proposed on this site, with emphasis on provision for older people. Further information on the quality of bus services at the two shown stops will be needed to ensure sustainable transport connections to Retford town centre and beyond. As Bassetlaw does not benefit from any Green Belt allocation, care should be taken to ensure that Ordsall South and Bassetlaw Garden Village do not risk excessive sprawl and coalescence, which could potentially lead to the two becoming closer together over time. It is noted however that the area surrounding this site has been allocated as a Green Gap which will provide protection to the wider open countryside and this is supported.	Thanks for your comments
1820985	Resident	Too many houses already for the road and transportation links. Schools already too busy and pollution would be increased due to lack of local jobs	<p>The Council undertook a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the potential impact that the new development would have on it. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. Where development has a direct adverse impact, then the development is expected to implement the necessary mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South. The County Council have confirmed that there would be a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has therefore safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this provision will be delivered through the development of the site.</p>
1821092	Resident	<p>I am against these plans as the infastruture in Ordsall is not capable of sustaing such a large housing development. I currently live on Ordsall Road and already at peak times of the day it is very difficult to get of your drive due to high volumes of traffic. During school term traffic is horrendous reducing much of the roads to single file. Families will have to travel to school due to the distsance from this development with no where to park. The proposal does not mention anything about the academy schools in the area and if they have sufficent space for extra pupils. Based on the number of houses proposed this would be around 260 spaces required and a possible 260 extra cars onto Ordsall road just for schools, plus the extra vehicles for those commuting to work. Within the proposal there is no mention of road improvements to the roundabout at the end of Ordsall road or any suggestions about traffic congestion on the Worksop to Retford road which already sees traffic queueing for over a mile at peak times. The infrastructure and road network within Ordsall cannot sustain such a large housing development, and would create chaos The road network within Ordsall, Retford and Eaton is not suitable. Consideration has to be given to the wider area and community and how this development will impact the local</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		area.	<p>a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision would be required for the proposed development at Ordsall South. The County Council have confirmed that a new 1-form entry Primary School would need to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p> <p>An appropriate level of residential and visitor off-road car parking space will be provided in line with the County Council Parking Standards. The ratio for these standards is related to the number of bedrooms per property.</p>
1822709	Resident	<p>The very idea of developing this site without improving the road infrastructure in the area is ridiculous. Your PLAN talks of improvements to roundabouts how inadequate. I believe when the Persimmon Houses were built at Ordsall the mini roundabout was meant to be improved. However this was changed why??? This proposed Ordsall South development seems to ignore the fact that the roads leading to London Road from this site are totally inadequate. High Street at Ordsall is usually fulll of parked cars as the houses there do not have off road parking. The other road that goes past the cricket ground is a narrow road where cars frequently park and it can be difficult to travel along safely due to impaired vision where the road bends. Any development of this site will see vehicles using Eaton Village as a 'rat run' to access London Road. The bridge over the River Idle in the village is only suitable for one vehicle to pass over it. Over the years there have been several accidents here and damage to the bridge. Any improvements to the mini roundabout at Goosemoor would be very welcome as again there have been many accidents here over the years. Why the 30 mile an hour speed limit was not extended to the average speed cameras remains a mystery to me. Lastly I think it is time Bassetlaw Council got its finger out and sorted their Local Plan. I am sick of being consulted about it. As a result of not having one the district is open to being taken advantage of by speculative developers and houses being built in totally inappropriate places. So please get your act together and get a plan put in place. We need a road infrastructure that can cope with all these houses and new health surgeries and schools.</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment has assessed the impact that any new development would have on the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. The Transport Assessment measured traffic flows across the town during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline.</p> <p>The level of new development and the proposed locations for development were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts the new development would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p> <p>Where development has a direct adverse impact, the development will be expected to implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. This</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures which are listed in greater detail within the Transport Assessment.
1822766	Resident	<p>It is unrealistic to believe that future residents of the new development will not drive through Eaton village (even with the suggested road narrowing measures / changes in traffic priority). To travel to Markham Moor from the top of Lansdown Drive is 5.6miles via the A1 but only 4.3miles via Eaton village. The proposed development will have a dreadful impact on Eaton village and would undoubtedly be detrimental to highway safety due to the single width bridge (offering little forward visibility of approaching vehicles) and minimal pedestrian facilities in the village. During nice weather the area around the river in Eaton already gets incredibly busy with parked cars and visitors. The proposed roundabouts to access the development sites are welcomed. It is requested that vehicular access to the development should only come from these (not from existing roads) in order to avoid confusion for highway users and to protect residential amenity. For informaion, there may be a ransom strip at the end of Lansdown Drive?</p>	The Council's Transport Assessment has identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. However, the Transport Assessment indicates that these impacts can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures, the specifics of which can be found in the Transport Assessment itself.
1828681	Resident	<p>I oppose to the new revised plans for Ordsall sound. Retford and Ordsall can not take this amount of people. Our doctors are full and struggling to see patients. Our dentists have 2 and a half year waiting lists. Our schools are at maximum capacity as it is. Traffic is bad at the best of times. We are a small market town and a small village. If there was to be a potential more housing built to this scale. There needs to be dentists, doctors, schools (primary & secondary) built before the house get built to accommodate for the families that will most likely move in. It's a farce and unfair on the locals here already to not think about how this will affect day to day like for them!</p>	<p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there would need to be a new 1-form entry Primary School provide onsite. The Local Plan has therefore safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p> <p>In addition, a new "health-hub" facility will be created so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services.</p>
1828715	Resident	<p>Inhave no objection to more houses people have to have somewhere to live. What I do have objection to is that you have no idea what this area needs. The roads are too small to take to amount of traffic a new estate will bring the schools and doctors in Retford are already full but you say we don't need a new school before the houses are finished. It should be built alongside the houses ready to accommodate the new children the houses will bring. The only people benefitting from this development seem to be the builders and the council. The people of ordsall have already told you what they think to this plan so if you keep having consultations does this mean you will go on until you wear us down and then get your own way</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The proposed new development was then applied to this transport model to see what impacts the new development would have on the existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation strategies to resolve these in certain areas.</p> <p>The delivery of some areas of infrastructure, such as the Primary School, will come through the mid stages of the development. The delivery strategy of the school is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council, who are the education authority, who will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			reach an agreement on the delivery of the school with the developer(s) during the planning process.
1831129	Resident	I am very concerned that the BDC Planning Committee seems determined to pass new proposed housing numbers in Bassettlaw, way in excess of those actually required by law. I especially note the new additional 450 houses planned for Ordsall. I live in the area and traffic is already congested around the limited local amenities and at two of the three closest access points, West Carr Road, where it crosses the railway line and the very narrow and awkward bridge over the river at Goosemoor Lane. Much of the housing in the area was built when cars were not a consideration so these are now parked on the highway, further limiting safe driving conditions and negating the possibility of cycle lanes to keep cyclists safe.	<p>The volume of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of infrastructure necessary to support the sustainable development of the community. A development of this scale needs to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter.</p> <p>The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land; and 2. To provide a viable development that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support a sustainable development for the community. <p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the impact that the new development would have on the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. This was achieved by measuring the traffic flows during peak times and outside of school holidays and then adding the proposed developments to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas to resolve this.</p>
1837498	Resident	Many residents of the new development will surely work and regularly travel in to retford. What will be done to manage this significant traffic increase in the town? Also will safe cycle routes be provided from Ordsall South to Retford town centre?	The Council's Transport Assessment has assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. The traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The level of new development and the proposed locations for development were then added to the transport model to see what impacts the new development would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas in order to respond to this. Where new development has a direct adverse impact, then the development would be expected to implement the necessary mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The development of Ordsall South will provide the opportunity to provide new and enhance existing public transport infrastructure. This will include the provision of enhanced bus services to and from the site to Retford Town Centre, and enhancements to the footpath and cycle network into Retford and the surrounding countryside. A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will also be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>
1841370	Resident	<p>Where will children go to school until/if a primary school is built on the site? Local schools are already at or near capacity. Similarly local health provision eg GP surgeries are already over capacity.</p> <p>‘Traffic management’ schemes in Ordsall and particularly Eaton, the only 2 routes through to south Retford and southern villages, will not mitigate the already untenable traffic problems in those areas. Both places will be ruined by increased traffic flow and both have bridges which have weight limits. A few green corridors and a small area of ‘country park’ will not make up for the loss of hectares of green land and habitat destruction.</p>	<p>New and enhanced facilities will be provided on and off site. The development will trigger the need for a new Primary school on site and a health facility.</p> <p>Before these are available, contributions towards existing provision will be appropriate.</p>
1841587	Resident	The Retford Transport Assessment identifies and accepts that a development of the proposed Ordsall South size will bring an inevitable increase in traffic and as a resident of Eaton, I'm extremely concerned that a few token traffic calming measures will do little to 'discourage' through traffic from using Eaton (when there are very few alternative routes) or indeed slow traffic down. The road through the village is narrow, there are limited footpaths and any further increase in traffic will pose a real danger to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders who regularly use the village. Furthermore, increased pollution and noise levels will substantially reduce the quality of life for village residents. I strongly object to this development.	Although there will be an increase in traffic movements, it would not lead to an unreasonable increase. However, measures are recommended within Eaton to discourage non-village traffic from using this route.
1841717	Resident	With regards to transport comments in relation to impact to the Ordsall South proposal do not take into account the significant amount of traffic that would transit from Goosemoor lane and up high street. Currently is not possible to have dual flowing traffic due to parked vehicles and often has to operate on a one way one vehicle at a time basis. Increased traffic here would enormous impact to residents in this area.	The Transport Assessment identifies the need for mitigation at Goosemoor/ London Road in order to safely accommodate the increase in traffic volumes.
1843425	Resident	This development is not wanted or needed in Ordsall, as a resident of Ordsall we have already seen phenomenal growth within the area, congestion on the roads and around the local shops, and a complete impasse around the junior and secondary schools.	Thanks for your comments

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1843701	Resident	Local road networks and school networks are not suitable for additional housing.	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision would be required for the proposed development at Ordsall South. The County Council have confirmed that a new 1-form entry Primary School would need to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p>
1843721	Resident	<p>I am very strongly opposed to the development proposed for Ordsall South. My objection is based on the following:</p> <p>1 Government policy does not require Bassetlaw in general or Retford in particular to build the very large number of houses proposed. The decision to build Ordsall South is a local one based mostly on political preferences. If it is argued that growth in employment requires the number of houses proposed, clear evidence of the sectors in which employment will be increased, the number of jobs that are expected to be created within each sector, the rate of increase and the location of new employment sites is required. That evidence is lacking and the consultant's report about future employment attached to the first draft of the plan was incredibly optimistic. It was most certainly not a document justifying 1200 plus houses in Ordsall.</p> <p>2. My last point is compounded by the lack of community facilities to support the people who will live in Ordsall South. No community facilities or, for that matter, any infrastructure, are guaranteed. How will Retford's health service (it already takes 10-14 days to book a telephone call with a GP) cope with more than 2,000 extra patients? As far as I can tell, no clear planning about school numbers has been completed. There is a lack of information about local shops and other required facilities. The development should not go any further without guaranteed, extensive infrastructure to support residents.</p> <p>3. The situation is more serious than indicated in Point 3. Anybody who knows the roads linking Retford and Ordsall should realise that they simply cannot take the increase of traffic following the building of the development. London Road cannot take the extra cars. A new road leading to London Road is all well and good but does not solve the problem of greatly increased traffic on that road towards town, not least at the traffic lights by the Old King Edward's School. Extra pressure will consequentially be placed on the whole of the Ring Road. The two roads from Ordsall to Babworth Road cannot accommodate the large number of additional cars created by the proposed development. One has two very narrow sections; the other leads to a roundabout that joins a busy road, already blocked from Retford Oaks School to the roundabout at the ring road on every school day of the week – and at other times. It is also important to note that the appeal to build on the Bigsby Road site was refused partly because of concerns about</p>	<p>The level of growth for the District has been decided based on local housing and employment need. The level of jobs should be balanced against the number of homes. The location of growth across the District is a local discussion which is informed by local evidence and community consultation since 2016.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>the implications for traffic on the ring road. The Ordsall South development would be likely to have a very similar, greater effect. I find no evidence that adequate attention has been given to the consequences for the proposed development for traffic growth and flow. Neither do I think any real attention has been given to the effects of extra traffic on Ordsall residents. They will experience greater pollution and noise as well as a much greater number of vehicles travelling through their area.</p> <p>4. I am very keen to see Bassetlaw publish a Local Plan. It is essential. The Ordsall South development is flawed and there is huge resistance to it amongst Retford's residents. Why then continue with it when an adequate number of houses will be built on other sites? Why delay a final local plan with such a flawed proposal?</p>	<p>around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p>
1844226	Resident	<p>I don't agree with any of the plans for the development in Ordsall and the plan to build the planned houses by the Golf Course and Eaton area. The village doesn't have the infrastructure to support the number of planned houses (which has changed and increased since the last planning submission), the traffic and through traffic at present is congested and with more traffic on the roads would increase the possibility of an accident, which is going to happen sooner rather than later! There is no confirmation a school would actually be built and I doubt it would, therefore putting further strain onto already oversubscribed schools. We moved to the area due to the green spaces within close proximity and that we could walk into the countryside. I am a regular dog walker and walk in the fields that are planned for this housing development both by Glen Eagles and Eaton, I think it's disgraceful that you wish to develop on this land losing the natural habitats of wildlife in these areas. I don't believe you'll develop the land to include the wildlife/ natural park and I don't want a place that I walk for tranquility to be destroyed by developers that really are only thinking of their pockets. It's not going to bring any local business or money to our area as people would travel away and again increase the traffic flow to what is already poorly maintained roads, highways and footpaths! Lastly, these proposed areas do flood (and local flooding has increased over the last few years) so in turn would result in further flooding to the area as well as the surrounding areas. I understand developments need to be considered but Ordsall is not suitable for this type of development!</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there would need to be a new 1-form entry Primary School provide onsite. The Local Plan has therefore safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. The delivery strategy of the school is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council, who will reach an agreement on the delivery of the school with the developer(s) during the planning process.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
1849082	Parish Councillor (Garnston)	<p>Following access to the proposed developments in the Retford area I wish to make the following specific comments about the Council's Local Plan's in relation to proposed plans affecting my immediate area: As a resident and a Parish Councillor of Eaton I am extremely concerned yet again about this proposed development NOW even though it is not due to commence until 2027.</p> <p>I 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 I 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. I am also dismayed to see that the local Council has buckled under Government pressure to accept that a further 450 houses should be built on this site in addition to the 850 homes in the 20/21 Plan. I understand that this is an openly political move from homes being built in city areas to the backwater of a rural constituency and local Council.</p> <p>I have reservations about the scale of the increase in employment planned for and I consider that it is enormously over-ambitious.</p> <p>The scale of house-building proposed in the Ordsall South proposal seems excessive and I suggest that this whole proposed site of potentially 1250 homes should be totally abandoned. Furthermore I have considerable reservations about this development in terms of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enormous amount of additional traffic It 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 'cutthrough' 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- 	<p>The level of development at Ordsall South is linked to its viability and the provision of much needed infrastructure. The increase in the number of homes from the November 2020 Draft Plan was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly to provide a viable development that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support a sustainable development for the community.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>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.</p> <p>- 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. I understand that the proposed school as mentioned in the original Plan was abandoned thus putting much pressure on existing school provision becoming overloaded and disrupted whilst further expansion takes place. This appears to have been brought back into the Plan.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>- Protection of Rural countryside In proposing this Ordsall South development it 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. Therefore if the scale of house-building in the Retford and District part of the Draft Plan as a whole was reduced, perhaps there would be no need for the original 800 houses proposed to be added to Ordsall. Therefore this development would become a blot on the surrounding countryside causing immeasurable challenges to local road networks, services and most importantly the indigenous population.</p> <p>I appreciate that some local communities have to suffer in order for major residential developments as suggested in this Draft Plan.</p> <p>However it would be MORE SENSIBLE in my opinion 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.</p> <p>It brings to mind the following sayings that the Ordsall South development would be</p> <p>1) 'Like a carbuncle on the face of an old friend!' Quote from the Prince of Wales</p> <p>2) As Planning should be community-led, green-led and levelling-up led, too many communities are being treated like 'foie gras geese with endless housing shoved down their gullet!' Quote from a Tory MP</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment has also identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall South. However, the Transport Assessment indicates that these impacts can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures, the specifics of which can be found in the Transport Assessment itself.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The delivery strategy of the Primary School is the responsibility of NCC and the developer(s) who will reach an agreement on how it is to be delivered. It is likely that it will come through the mid stages of the development. The Primary School has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services</p>
1849104	BDC Councillor	<p>Area HS13 Ordsall South</p> <p>Para. 2 Mix of Uses</p> <p>(b) (iii) 5% Wheelchair standard market housing is not sufficient and needs to be increased.</p> <p>The reason for recommending an increase is because many disabled and older people in Ordsall still live in unsuitable homes that prevent them living independent and dignified lives.</p> <p>Area HS13 Ordsall South.</p> <p>Para.3 Green</p> <p>Infrastructure and biodiversity (a) (i)</p> <p>In the 23 ha country park on the western boundary a residents' and visitors' car park, with electric charging points for vehicles, with cctv coverage, should be considered. There is an opportunity also to encourage cycling in the estate by providing a cycle hub in the country park that could be used by residents and visitors of all ages. These suggestions are made to help reduce motor vehicle movement and congestion through the estate and lower emissions.</p>	<p>There will be a significant number of assisted and specialist homes on site to accommodate for local housing need. These homes will of a good standard in line with Government Policy.</p> <p>In addition, the safety of new open space is important and is a factor within the design of the site.</p> <p>New cycling opportunities will be provided around the site and its public open spaces.</p>
1851472	Resident	<p>Oppose the development of Ordsall South on the grounds that 1250 possible dwellings in an area of natural beauty. The number substantially affects the green gap with Eaton and covers land in flood zones. The golf club provides recreation for golfers and walkers and the openness and strategic views will be severely impacted. BDC already has a deliverable supply of housing which amounts to a 100% surplus in 5 years. This amount of over development is changing the nature of our rural agricultural town and villages.</p>	<p>Due to its edge of settlement location, the development of Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views,</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>Oppose the development of HS13 the proposal is will permanently change the prime agricultural landscape. The size of the development will impact on the natural beauty and openness of the outskirts of Ordsall as mentioned in the Green Gap Study. No amount of landscaping will replace the strategic views that walkers cyclists riders and golfers have. This area should be preserved for its contributions to nature and wellbeing. Wild animals habitats will be destroyed and prime agicultural land will be lost along with mineral safeguarding of clays and the archaeological contribution the crop marks provide. Housing development of this size will increase transport in the rural village of Eaton and Ordsall significantly along side noise and light pollution generated. BDC has shown that the 5 year housing target set by the government has been met and a 100% surplus deliverable. We do not want or require this substantial over development in our small quaint market town. BDC needs to rethink the extent of the expansion and what it is doing to the landscape of Retford surroundings.</p>	<p>trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable alternative locations to accommodate growth around Retford. The priority to reuse brownfield land formed a large part of this assessment and the local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough suitable or available brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth required to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and to provide a viable development site that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>
1853010	Resident	<p>I would like to raise the following observations of the Ordsall South Concept plan.</p> <p>The Community Uses plan only covers potential development ie Medical centre, School, Playing Fields what guarantee will the developers have to enter into with the council to comply with the proposal. General extent of the development again everything is classed as potential. Where will the money come from to fund the medical centre, school, playing fields etc Brecks Rd is shown as the route onto the development and one other access on Ollerton Rd both of these are unsuitable for the amount of traffic that the development will generate.</p> <p>The development extends onto the preferred site from the previous consultation but the plans show that all the community facilities will be situated on the main development. The plans that the Council have asked the community to comment on are unacceptable they lack the road names, the legend is very misleading the whole proposal hasn't had any thought put into it an absolute disgrace. I expect more from my council.</p>	<p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p> <p>There will be a minimum of 27ha of public open space, sports and woodland on site. This reflects the Local Plan evidence base, the local community aspirations and the need to provide a net-gain in local biodiversity. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment has identified a small rise in traffic volume through Eaton as a consequence of the proposed development at Ordsall</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			South. However, the Transport Assessment indicates that these impacts can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures, the specifics of which can be found in the Transport Assessment itself.
1856045	Resident	The present roads through the proposed site are already at full capacity and any suggested improvements will clearly only be a paper exercise as they will not be viable to implement. The views south towards Eaton across the Idle Valley will not be maintained as houses will obstruct the view and these will be detrimental to the currently existing natural environment. The wording of the proposed plan does nothing to convince me this is a viable proposition and it is very clearly a poor attempt to paint a pretty picture of a ill-conceived idea.	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>Due to its edge of settlement location, the development of Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it's impact on the surrounding landscape is mitigated as much as possible. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality.</p>
1856195	BDC Councillor	I want to register concerns about the Retford transport assessment given the recent ruling about the development of homes on Bigsby road. The team will have access to the details set out by informed individuals te highways offered by barristers in rejecting this planning application Re highways, traffic flow across Retford and the blockages in the system already. How will be sure that the NCC highways will meet any obligation stated in The plan? Concerns already raised about Eaton village used as access to A1 from Ordsall, how will the plan ensure that cats do not use that route when they are aware that the small bridge and access out of Ordsall would be London Road?	The Council has been working closely with Nottinghamshire County Council highways on the Transport Assessments and they have fed into its recommendations. The Retford Transport Assessment details the identified impacts from growth and provides a set of recommendations for how those issues on the network can be mitigated. Traffic calming measures have also been recommended for Ordsall and Eaton.
1856859	Resident	<p>4. Social and community facilities</p> <p>c) states land to accomodate a school yet you are telling people that a school is agreed. No such agreement is in place.</p> <p>a) and b) Nothing is planned for other facilities just space allocated yet you continue to tell people these are agreed.</p> <p>Retford Traffic Assesment 2021 is still based on 800 homes not 1250.</p> <p>Traffic through Ordsall and over Ordsall bridge is not being considered.</p> <p>5 a) ii 3 talks of improvements to Whitehouses roundabout but no consideration for this additional traffic over</p>	The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>Ordsall Bridge.</p> <p>There needs to be proper infrastructure included not just space allocated.</p> <p>It needs proper access roads otherwise there will be over a decade of construction traffic through Ordsall as well as doubling of household vehicles using local roads and services.</p> <p>It needs an access road East to London Road and an access road West towards Morton or Babworth.</p> <p>This is a very ill-conceived proposal.</p>	<p>within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. The exact delivery of the school is set to be decided through an agreement between Nottinghamshire County Council and the developer(s) during the planning process.</p> <p>A new Transport Assessment has recently been undertaken to reflect in the increase in housing numbers. This assessment looks at all planned development within Retford and makes recommendations for mitigation where appropriate.</p>
1856996	Resident	<p>Overall there will be the possibility of another 3000 cars using the current highway infrastructure around the Retford area. I cannot see where on these plans that more roads are being developed prior to any building work beginning? Where is the sustainable energy solutions? Are we all going over to electric hybrid cars soon? So where are the electric car charging points? Empty promises from a contractor and when finished there will be no additional roads or services to be seen! It's a nightmare during peak times through Retford as it is without more cars trying to get to the same supermarkets, schools, nurseries, GPs etc. This place is going to look like concrete city with houses stacked up next to each other with barely any way around anything. I am not against new housing and I realise we need that, but I would like to see new roads built first, and the new services promised to be delivered. You must have an alternative route into the new estate other than the existing roads available. Also a few football pitches, a shop is again small tokenistic facilities that will hardly assist the current resources! A new supermarket, a new gym, a petrol station, a restaurant are all things that need to be built as people will pile into town for, so why not allow the opportunity for these to be built near the new estate? Let's remember that companies do the bare minimum they want profit and it's for the people and those who represent us to ensure that promises are fulfilled, people are held accountable and the right amount of services and roads go hand in hand with this mini village being built! I would ask our counsellors who have Retford and it's people in their best interests to ensure that these are protected alongside the need for more housing. As once the houses are built they will argue that there is no need for what they first promised...classic well known story!</p>	<p>The Council undertook a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the potential impact that the new development would have on it. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. Where development has a direct adverse impact, then the development is expected to implement the necessary mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>All new homes will be required to have the capable infrastructure for installing EV charging points.</p>
1857048	Resident	<p>I strongly oppose the building of 1250 houses on the proposed Ordsall site. Not only will it abolish a vast green space and eco system of our great British wildlife (has an environmental Survey been completed to check for endangered species) but it has not been taken into account the catastrophic effect it will have on our local community, amenities and especially Ordsall primary school and Retford Oaks academy. If a third of the proposed houses has one child, that's approximately 416 school places that need to be found in our already oversubscribed schools. Has a survey been published on how the current infrastructure of gas, electricity and water will support another 1250 houses and what effect it will have on the current residents? And Finally how much is the Labour Government receiving in 'party donations' to push such a crippling estate against local residents' concerns.</p>	<p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development is proposed to deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and greater biodiversity than currently present.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p> <p>New utilities infrastructure will be provided to the development at a cost from the developer.</p>
1857342	Resident	<p>I am not clear at all on what is being proposed. There is very little detail.</p> <p>I can see there will potentially be a new shop, school and medical centres but how many houses are being proposed to be built? What will happen with the roads are new roads being built as the traffic is already a nightmare?</p> <p>Can more detail be provided on:</p> <p>Number of houses</p> <p>Any improvements to roads</p>	<p>A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037 with a further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter for a total of 1250 homes.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment which examined the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. These traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The new developments were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p> <p>Where development has a direct adverse impact, then the development would be expected implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>
1857556	Resident	<p>I responded to the previous plan in some detail, addressing points such as existing infrastructure, flooding, employment and impact on nature. The response of the council with the amended plan seems to have been to ignore the largely negative responses to the consultation and not only press ahead but to add an additional 400 plus houses to the plan. In the same spirit I propose to repeat the objections made previously and add some more.</p> <p>1. The principle</p> <p>The reality here is that Ordsall in particular and Retford more generally does not need a development of this size or nature. I accept entirely that it is national government setting local targets for development and house building and amending planning regulations. It is however the local government which is setting out these plans and therefore to blame “the Tories” alone is somewhat disingenuous. I very much doubt the government have even heard of Retford let alone Ordsall. The argument seems to be that we have to have a local plan and that if we don’t, those nasty developers will cover all the land with houses. So the plan to stop this? To cover the land with our own houses. It’s a bit like saying the only way to stop someone cutting off your arm is to cut it off yourself. The net effect is the same, that the land is covered by houses. One of the few positive comments in the response to the previous plan was that it would provide more accommodation for the elderly. This is of course correct, as it will also at the “affordable” end of the scale (I’ll ignore the implication that what is not affordable is by definition unaffordable). Both of these are admirable. However it is not a binary decision- it is not either no housing for the elderly or a massive development</p>	<p>The need to plan for development is a Government directive, but the location of development across the District is a Council decision. The Local Plan process has to, in line with National Planning Policy, plan for new growth in suitable and sustainable locations. A Sustainability Appraisal is undertaken to look at all options and their impact on the local area.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>featuring some housing for the elderly. There is some middle ground to develop essential housing without fields upon fields of 4 and 5 bed executive homes.</p> <p>2. Infrastructure</p> <p>Roads</p> <p>It was apparent in the previous consultation response that an area of significant concern for residents is road access to the proposed development. As I set out in my previous response, there are only 4 ways into it. One comes over the very narrow Goosemoor bridge and up a heavily parked High Street, one comes up narrow, unlit country lanes from the A1 and Eaton, one is heavily subject to double parking and features significant traffic calming measures and one comes past a busy primary school which is virtually impassable at 850am and 330pm. None of these roads are in any way suited to the inevitable increase in traffic caused by between 850 and 1250 new houses. The local authority proposes to enhance various junctions. Well that may assist with traffic flow at the junctions themselves (unless there's a problem on the A1 in which case the whole area will be even further gridlocked than currently when that happens), but it doesn't have any impact on the roads themselves which are not even suitable for the current levels of traffic let alone the significant increase proposed. This area simply does not have the access to cope with such a development irrespective of junction improvements</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>I understand that the local primary school would not have the room to cope with the increased numbers that would follow the development. Ha, I hear you say, there are plans for a new school. As I see it, the plans are for space for a new school, and a general and rather woolly statement of intention to build one. The reality is that building schools isn't as profitable as building houses and comes some way down the development shopping list. The school needs to be in place in the early stages of any development.</p> <p>Health</p> <p>The current medical resources in Retford are stretched to the limit, as anyone who has tried to book an appointment with a GP will know. The plan as it stands does not adequately consider the immediate and medium term impact on local provision of services, which will make them worse than they currently are. We are talking about a massive development here which will have a significant impact on service users in the area,</p> <p>3. Flooding</p> <p>Currently the fields in question are prone to flooding. As I type this is it 28 degrees and there has been no rain for some time, however in my previous winter-based response the top fields were saturated and had standing water. Concreting over these fields will cause significant water runoff down the hill and into the Idle, almost certainly increasing the risk of flooding to Goosemoor and into the town itself.</p> <p>4. Employment</p> <p>There seems to be an assumption that the people who will live in these houses will draw employment to Retford. This "build it, jobs will come" expectation is pie in the sky. There has not been a significant increase in new local jobs following the significant developments on Bridon or off the Oval, the much vaunted Northern Tower development seems to have replaced a convenience store with a supermarket. The reality is that whoever lives in these houses will work elsewhere and will commute there when they aren't working from home, significantly increasing traffic at the pinchpoints as discussed earlier.</p> <p>5. Impact on nature</p> <p>Pushing the boundaries of any development inevitably pushes back the natural world and the proposed development will clearly have that effect here. In the immediate local area I have seen deer, birds of prey, a variety of smaller mammals and amphibians, all of whom will be affected by the development. I have grave reservations about the proposed "country park" element of the development, more so on the basis that the local council have indicated that they would not adopt it. My fear is that within a short space of time it would just be fields with some paths, which ironically is what we currently have, but without the large development and associated problems.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>I do not believe that the proposed development brings sufficient positives to Ordsall or Retford to justify the significant negatives that will go with it for the local population.</p>	<p>junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. The delivery strategy of the school will be decided by Nottinghamshire County Council who are the education authority and an agreement on the delivery of the school will be made between NCC and the developer(s) during the planning process. The school has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services.</p> <p>New residential and employment are not always located next to each other or on the same site. The housing is often located where there is a need and employment where it has access to that particular market. In some cases, local employment and smaller industry can be accommodated through mixed use schemes.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District, including Ordsall South. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the main risk of flooding currently occurs when surface water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>surface water run-off into the new development and also to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision</p> <p>The proposed Country Park will provide a 22 hectare site for both wildlife and recreation. It will also include significant tree planting and a network of paths and spaces for people to enjoy. It is a significant asset which will provide benefits to residents and the wider area.</p> <p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land is currently used for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and recreation opportunities for residents.</p>
1857600	Resident	<p>Sentence 4c - Safeguard land to accommodate a 2 Form Entry primary school - If provision is to be made for a two-form entry Primary School (which, while small, is still a substantial expansion of local primary school places), has consideration been given to how the funding will be secured for this? (i.e. will this be undertaken through a Free Schools competition? Who will coordinate?) Also - These children will grow up and on a development this size, that will likely have an impact on PAN for local secondary schools. There is no consideration made of this in the document and there will be an impact on already oversubscribed local secondary schools.</p> <p>Sentence 4b - 'Incorporate space for a health hub' - What is a 'health hub'? If it includes provision for qualified doctors and nurses (i.e. a GP's surgery), then the LA will need to consider the substantial challenges involved with recruiting GPs in our local area and to work with the local CCGs/NHS to account for how this would be resourced. If it does not, then a development this size would represent unacceptable pressure on local GPs in Retford.</p>	<p>Funding for education and health on site will come via developer contributions. NHS recruitment is a matter for the NHS, but the Council are comfortable that any new facility on site can be managed appropriately.</p>
1857618	Resident	<p>I strongly oppose the building of 1250 houses on the proposed Ordsall site. Not only will it abolish a vast green space and eco system of our great British wildlife (has an environmental Survey been completed to check for endangered species) but it has not been taken into account the catastrophic effect it will have on our local community, amenities and especially Ordsall primary school and Retford Oaks academy. If a third of the proposed houses has one child, that's approximately 416 school places that need to be found in our already oversubscribed schools. Has a survey been published on how the current infrastructure of gas, electricity and water will support another 1250 houses and what effect it will have on the current residents? And Finally how much is the Labour Government receiving in 'party donations' to push such a crippling estate against local residents concerns?</p>	<p>The proposed site is a strategic urban extension and therefore has to be planned carefully. The impact on the countryside and wildlife can be mitigated on site through the provision of new green space and infrastructure. The existing land is used for intense agriculture and therefore has little wildlife value. The development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity which will be delivered through over 24 hectares of green space and woodlands.</p> <p>New infrastructure such as a school and health centre is required on site to support the additional growth.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1857775	Resident	<p>Only 20% of this development being affordable housing isn't enough. Young people are struggling to find homes. This percentage needs increasing. Furthermore, there needs to be appropriate infrastructure to support this development in Ordsall. E.g. a confirmed school from NCC. Otherwise, it isn't fit for purpose and I wouldn't be supportive of it.</p>	<p>The 20% threshold is based on the Districts affordable housing need.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provided onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. It has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p>
1857803	Resident	<p>I wish to appose to the planning on this site There are 3 of us in the same household that are apprised to this.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comment?</p>
1857876	Resident	<p>The excessively high number of houses planned will mean approx. 2000 more cars using the 2 routes into Retford: 1) Westhill road-Ordsall road-hospital road 2) London road-Arlington way School children walk and cycle along route 1) to get to Retford Oaks, Ordsall Primary, St Josephs, and Elizabethan. The stretch on Ordsall road is supposed to be 30mph but most speed. Pavements and the road is narrow, not room for 2 cars and a bike to pass. The additional traffic from the Ordsall would make the road busier and more pedestrians and it already feels dangerous walking that stretch with my young daughter in the morning. All children from the new development will be going this way to attend secondary school. Your plan does not provide a single cycle lane which these children could use to get to Retford Oaks or the Elizabethan secondary schools. This will cause congestion due to the road width, and put cyclists at risk</p> <p>The excessively high number of houses planned will mean approx 2000 more cars using the 2 routes into Retford: 1) Westhill road-Ordsall road-hospital road 2) London road-Arlington way School children walk and cycle along route 1) At rush hours and school run times traffic currently queues from Hallcroft roundabout, along hospital road, Babworth road, up to the Babworth mini roundabout. As all in the new development would also commute to school/town along this route it would create severe congestion at peak times. The minor junction improvements would not fix this and there is no mention of finally fixing the Hallcroft roundabout which is the bottleneck.</p> <p>The excessively high number of houses means many primary school aged children coming to the area. The local primary schools are already over subscribed. No new school is planned until the second stage after 2037. Houses built before then. Where will the children go to school?</p> <p>I have little confidence in the documents we are being provided with for this consultation. The initial Ordsall plan consultation document on BDC website had Ordsall and Retford the wrong way around on their map. The current plan website states: PLEASE NOTE: Our Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan focussed document contains 30 pages of information and maps. This document is currently not in an accessible format (limited access to the internet). If you require information contained within the plan or any documents associated with the plan, please contact thebassetlawplan@bassetlaw.gov.uk or call 01909 533 533 and ask for Local Plan when prompted. Why hasn't it been made accessible? There is some repetition in the document of Ordsall South development under 7.14, and under policy 29. This means people do not know which section to comment against</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services, whilst footpath and cycle routes in to Retford will also be enhanced. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any alterations to existing cycle ways are likely to be improvements to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting.</p> <p>The Local Plan protects existing employment sites and allocates other areas for new employment over the plan period. The type of employment varies and an objective of the plan is to encourage a range of employment to diversify local skills.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>The employment opportunities for the 1250 new houses will be non existent. Why has sufficient employment not been planned in close to the site?</p> <p>The previous plan for 800 houses was roundly criticised in the responses for the burden it would have on transport and schools infrastructure. The council have not only not listened to previous feedback, they have submitted a plan with more houses and still no significant infrastructure improvements. How can you ignore feedback to this extent, and still call this a consultation? what a sham. The message I get from bassetlaw dc is: Tell us what you think, we will ignore you. Complain and we will make it worse</p>	<p>The Local Plan is a technical document and is required to provide all the necessary information which is why it is a large document.</p> <p>During the consultation, The Council put on a number of online events for the public to attend and ask questions about the proposals. A leaflet was distributed within the area and a direct phone line was made available for people to contact the council about the Local plan.</p>
1857989	Resident	<p>1250 dwellings no suitable infrastructure in area.</p> <p>Junction improvements and cycle ways on already narrow and busy roads are not the solution.</p> <p>Environmental impact has not been assessed fully nor have the transport and highways situation.</p> <p>Flooding impact and damage to the area is not a sustainable project nor is only promises for a school etc. No such plans from NCC so the builder is paying for everything then? New school at 4.6 million?</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposals and the Plan appears to me to be based on foolhardy and unrealistic/untruths.</p>	
1857992	BDC Councillor	<p>I welcome the reference to cycle routes on the site and connecting to Retford town centre. I would hope that these would be separate from the road way -2m wide cycle paths – perhaps shared with pedestrians if space is limited but ideally separate from footway.</p> <p>A really important opportunity here, with this site and with the garden village site, is to connect the two developments with a safe cross country active travel/cycle route between Worksop and Retford. Planning gain monies should be allocated to fund the linking routes between the sites and into the town centres.</p>	<p>A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services, whilst footpath and cycle routes in to Retford will also be enhanced.</p> <p>Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any alterations to existing cycle ways are likely to be improvements to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting.</p>
1858008	Resident	<p>I do not consent to the above proposed housing allocations. I believe that the council have not taken adequate account of the following items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Highways safety issues beyond the sites, but in the locality • The sites’ current value in relation to biodiversity • The sites’ agricultural value • sites’ current contribution to recreation for residents as an open space <p>Highways safety issues beyond the sites, but within Ordsall</p> <p>Ordsall has already seen major housing growth in recent years. Without any corresponding improvements to road access or traffic calming measures to accommodate the resulting increased vehicle movements. The road network in and around Ordsall was not designed to cope safely and efficiently with the current volume of traffic, without any further increase which would result from the development of these 2 sites. All of the residents of Ordsall that I have spoken to have strong concerns about the potential increase in road safety issues, especially for mobility scooter users, cyclists, and for pedestrians (particularly those with pushchairs) in areas where pavements are narrow or nonexistent.</p> <p>I believe that the Council’s highways must take into consideration the following access routes that will be impacted by this development. The areas of particular concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goosemoor Lane Bridge 	<p>The Council’s Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>This is inadequate for today’s traffic, recent improvements have made it safe for pedestrian however the carriageway is barely adequate for the number of vehicles using it with restricted views of oncoming vehicles when approaching from All Hallows Street and Goosemoor Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellbeck Rd Shops This area is often congested, with vehicles parked on pavements on Welbeck Rd, Ollerton Rd, and Wharncliffe Rd. Additional safety issues are created by this area being a bus route and also an HGV route to the West Carr Rd industrial estate. Vehicles reversing onto Ollerton Rd can also be a hazard. Further housing development in Ordsall would lead to increased vehicle activity in this already congested area. • Westhill Rd At the beginning and end of the school day, the main road in and out of Ordsall (West Hill Rd) is reduced to single-line traffic due to parked cars. This is a difficult road to negotiate at these times of day, and the problems would be likely to become more acute if traffic volumes increased. • High St The number of residents parking on High St mean that it is effectively a single-lane road along much of its length. This leads to difficult driving conditions in both directions, and the road appears to be unsuitable for increased volumes of traffic. I have recently seen it completely blocked in both directions due to the number of parked cars on both sides making it difficult for drivers to foresee whether they can pass oncoming traffic that is also passing parked cars. This is supported by the fact that BDC has refused permission for premises on Ordsall High Street to be used as a pharmacy due to concerns about traffic congestion, • West Carr Rd The main concerns on this road are the railway bridges, one of which has a blind summit with narrow pavements. High volumes of traffic use this road, including commercial vehicles using the industrial estate. This route is used by large numbers of pedestrians (Particularly school children) in the mornings and afternoons. <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>The following species have been recently seen on and around the proposed sites Barn owls; tawny owls; skylarks; corncrakes; house martins; buzzards; kestrels; hawks; bees; damsel flies; dragonflies; grasshoppers; many varieties of butterflies and moths; hedgehogs; bats; newts; toads; and frogs. An ecological survey for the above species, and for associated species which might reasonably be expected to cohabit with these, undertaken prior to allocation for development, may identify constraints which are significant enough to prevent development. I believe such a survey should include important areas adjacent to the site, in particular Marsh Lane to the south, which may be impacted by ‘edge effects’ of any development. (NB Marsh Lane is a track bordered on two sides by large, ancient hedgerows in good condition and containing standard trees). A Section 106 Agreement could enable adoption of the buffer strips and walkways as habitats in public ownership to be managed and improved for wildlife with hedgerow maintenance and restoration etc. There would be opportunity for partnership involvement with members of the local community and wildlife and countryside organisations.</p> <p>Open space</p> <p>The sites are bordered and intersected by approximately half a mile of public footpaths which currently have panoramic views of the open countryside to either or both sides. The footpaths are extremely well used and appreciated by large numbers of residents and visitors for taking walks for recreation, health, and wellbeing. These</p>	<p>habitats. The new development is proposed to deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and greater biodiversity than currently present.</p> <p>All existing footpaths will be retained. However, it maybe that some are moved or redirected depending on the layout of the scheme.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford’s growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>form part of a wider network of longer walks between Ordsall and surrounding areas. Parts of the walks which fall within the sites are accessible and easy to negotiate by all, including those with limited health and mobility; these walks also feel safe.</p> <p>On the Nottinghamshire County Council definitive map, showing public rights of way, the footpath called "East Retford FP 2" crosses the sites in a south easterly direction from High St, via Southgate, towards Marsh Lane ("East Retford FP 64"). This right of way is well established and cannot be rerouted without greatly reducing the public amenity it provides in its current form. Also, the public right of way known as "East Retford FP 3" runs due south from High St before turning southwest. This footpath currently avoids traffic for its entire length, but would be bisected by two roads which pedestrians would have to cross if the development is permitted. This would have a detrimental impact on the public amenity it currently provides.</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>The footpath between the fields and the existing estate already floods regularly to the extent that both the path and the pavement where it joins High street cannot be passed by pedestrians unless they are wearing wellingtons (I have photographs of this). During periods of heavy rain high Street can become impassable to pedestrians even if they walk in the middle of the road. This is without the extra burden of the additional housing proposals.</p> <p>Alternative Proposals</p> <p>I understand that if I disagree with the proposed housing allocation it would be helpful if I 'provide realistic alternative proposals'. I do not feel confident about doing this, especially as I am less familiar with other areas than with my immediate neighbourhood.</p> <p>However I believe that plans could possibly be revisited, with a focus, in particular, on brownfield redevelopment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Brecks Rd garage site; <p>I believe that there are sizeable brownfield sites in the West Carr Road industrial area that have been out of use for many years:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The area at the corner of West Carr Rd and Stirling Rd I understand this has been out of use for over thirty years. A derelict factory stood there for a long time, and was subsequently demolished and the site (approximately 7000 sq metres) was cleared and fenced. 2) Site adjacent to UPJ Motorcycles, formerly the Market Hotel (opposite the above site) 3) There is a large area of disused land between West Carr road/Jubilee Road/West Carr Road. Potential access points are from Silver Street, Manvers Road, Stirling Road or Ordsall Park Drive. This area appears to have no current use whereas the proposed sites are currently used for agriculture. <p>It would be preferable for any new housing to be built on brownfield, rather than greenfield, sites.</p>	
1858065	Resident	<p>I have already submitted my objections I just wanted to add my concerns over schooling. I know of a family that recently moved into Ordsall with primary aged children, they were told there were no primary school places available not just in Ordsall but the whole of Retford. How is it proposed to accommodate the extra children that a further 800 houses will bring between now and the second phase in 2035?</p>	<p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. The delivery strategy of the school will be decided through an agreement between NCC and the developer(s) during the planning process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858079	Resident	<p>Regarding - Mini roundabout junction of A638 Goosemoor Lane / London Road at Whitehouses</p> <p>This mini roundabout in my view cannot be improved without increasing its footprint or changed to traffic lights. The speed with which significant numbers are road users approach this roundabout, and the Grove Road roundabout is staggering. I see daily 'near misses' this would only increase if over 1250 properties worth of cars were inflicted on this area. Limited number of people use public transport, walk or cycle and additional infrastructure won't, in my view, promote greater use of public transport. In short it's dangerous. There are a number of new developments in the area of this roundabout, Blossom Grove and Bacopa Drive are very close and there are homes almost directly on the mini roundabout who residents would suffer increase noise levels.</p> <p>Overall I am against the development at South Ordsall.</p>	Goosemoor Lane / London Road at Whitehouses – has been proposed for signalisation rather than any widening of the existing space within the Retford Transport Assessment.
1858084	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure. Over the past 35 years or so Ordsall has have many hundred dwellings - Schools - Ordsall Primary not able to take all of the students from the proposed development. Many hundreds of children are already placed in schools that are at opposite ends of the town to their siblings. The proposed development will surely add to this situation. The result of this situation is that there is excessive traffic causing bottle-necks for an hours - Highways The roads into and out of Ordsall have had various previous planned mitigations which have been repealed at planning appeal or reapplication stage. I would urge planners to take steps to make any necessary highways mitigation BEFORE any new developments take place, not years after or not at all as has been the case of late. - Size of development for the size of the village - the proposed 1,250 dwellings is far out of character with the village and will cause even more issues than the developments that have taken place over the past 35 years or so. For this reason I would urge planners to rethink their proposal and reduce the proposed number dramatically. - Not listening appropriately and adequately to the voice of local people - almost 500 residents voiced their objections and constructive criticisms to the previous proposal of 800 dwellings in Ordsall South - BDC have come back with in excess of 50% extra size in the current plan. In addition, very few consultation events have been held in this current consultation period. I am astounded that more time hasn't been given to the consultation and that other face-to-face methods of consultation have not been used. - Employment - How many real jobs will there be by 2037? What type of jobs will there be? <p>Where will the jobs be? Bassetlaw District Council have not appropriately addressed this issue with 'aspirational' rather than actual projected figures. Even as a BDC councillor I have not been shown the statistical modelling that brings about real jobs and compares these to the actual number of dwellings that these real future jobs will need.</p>	<p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. The exact delivery of the school is set to bel be decided through an agreement between Nottinghamshire County Council and the developer(s) during the planning process.</p> <p>Any identified mitigation as part of the schmem will be phased with the development of the site. Some will be upfront such as the access and public transport, but others will come via the various stages of the development.</p> <p>The scale of the development means that it will also provide new and enhanced infrastructure for the local community. This includes a new school, parks, a local centre and a health facility on site.</p> <p>The Council undertook a number of online events where members of the public could attend and ask questions to the planning officers. These events were spread over the consultation period and had a number of residents attend. Other material was published on the Councils website, via posters and leaflets to the community.</p> <p>The proposed growth for the District includes a number of new jobs located on existing sites or newly allocated sites across the District. The employment development is located close to the relevant markets.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858117	Resident	I am all for the extra housing. There was absolutely nothing in the area when we looked for over 2 years! More housing for family's!!!	Thanks for your comments
1858119	Resident	I welcome this plan for ordsall. We are in desperate need of more housing for the elderly there have been no provisions on the last two developments for Ordsall. I would like to see more housing for the older generation on all future developments too.	Thanks for your comments
1858123	Resident	We vote for this new housing development and welcome housing specifically for the disabled.	Thanks for your comments
1858125	Resident	The proposal for 800 additional houses is not acceptable unless clear and guaranteed improvements to amenities are first agreed. This is not clear to be the case. The decision to further increase the projected number of houses to 1250 exacerbates this further. It is unclear why such a large proportion of the total Bassetlaw requirement is set for this one site given all the issues that the village of Ordsall has faced in recent years given the number of new houses already erected. The school is full; the two key shops on welbeck rd have created dangerous traffic conditions with the recent new builds; the key roads to move in and out of Ordsall (high street over Goosemoor bridge, through Eaton over the one way humpback bridge, welbeck rd with the congested junction, Ordsall rd with tiny roundabout) are inadequate for 800 not even 1250 new dwellings. The transport and communication plan is not linked as operated by different councils with different political masters - none of this conducive to a complete solution to enable this plan to succeed. Internet and mobile connectivity in the ordsall area is already poor with a reliance on very old cabling - such an increase of population will slow down systems and speeds further making new post covid hybrid ways of working less accessible.	The Council is proposing to allocate a sustainable urban extension to Retford which, due to its scale, will require new and enhanced infrastructure. 1250 homes will support the delivery of a new local centre where local shops and services will be based, a new primary school, a health facility and 24 hectares of public open space. Offsite mitigation and enhancements to existing infrastructure is also required.
1858132	Resident	The excessive number of dwellings planned is far too many to be integrated into Ordsall. It would significantly and negatively impact the environment for the current residents of Ordsall. This area is not a "significant opportunity to make provision for the older age group" as the housing would be several miles from the centre of Retford and its shops, services and transport hub. The development would impinge on the Ordsall-Eaton "green gap" because of its position and the number of residents it would introduce to the area. The traffic on the surrounding lanes would increase markedly, particularly through Eaton village. A biodiversity net gain of 10% would be much too small and unambitious for a development of this size and should be set at least at 30% or higher. There are only vague and general aspirational details how the target would be achieved and measured. There is no consideration of the increase in flood risk from the run off from hard landscaping and standings built in a development as large as this. The flood risk would be transferred to current housing along the banks of the Idle in Ordsall, Thrumpton, Retford and downstream. The increase in traffic generated by this development would have a significant impact on the quality of life of the current residents of Ordsall and Eaton.	<p>The provision of elderly homes on site is considered appropriate because of the development of public spaces, health facilities, new public transport and the provision of local shops and services.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>The 10% biodiversity net gain is a minimum percentage as set out by the Government, the development itself may achieve more than this.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
1858165	Resident	The infrastructure of the roads in and out of Ordsall will need to be upgraded, GP cover for everyone will not be sufficient you can't get an appointment now Hospital and emergency services cover again they are overstretched Ordsall cannot cope with any more housing etc we need green spaces not concrete everywhere we look No economy for these houses, no social activities for people young or old to do anymore	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services.</p>
1858166	Resident	Ordsall infrastructure cannot cope with more housing	Thank your your comments.
1858170	Resident	In response to the ordsall build I object to the number of builds.	Thanks for your comments
1858192	Resident	1. Ordsall has not got the infrastructure to support any more housing never mind the 1250 being mooted under this planning application. To start with Ollerton Road already has issues with width, speed, being used as a short cut by drivers wanting to avoid the choked up town centre and a main point of it being used as a diversion whenever there are problems on the A1. 1250 new properties with at least one car each is going to make Ordsall a nightmare for those already living here. The community hub ahead here (Ollerton/Welbeck Rds) is bursting at the seams now trafficwise, imagine another 1250 cars trying to park in 15 spaces, it's an accident waiting to happen already. There is	The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>1 private nursery and 1 infant/junior school in Ordsall, places are tight now, imagine what it would be like with 1250 more houses ! There are no healthcare facilities in Ordsall, no doctors and no clinics. Imagine the residents of 1250 more houses having to drive into Retford for medical care - more traffic congestion. There are limited leisure amenities in Ordsall, where are all these new people going to go to play for example: bowls, tennis, football, where are the young going to get their sport & exercise ?</p> <p>2. The noise & dirt from these developments will impact on local residents for years to come. Many people moved to Ordsall to escape the ambience of towns and cities, to enjoy peaceful surroundings that Ordsall has to offer. This will change dramatically for years to come. There will be increased heavy traffic from the construcion of these 1250 new properties, causing noise and pollution.</p> <p>3. As the British population continues to rise at an astonishing rate, pollution causing all kinds of probems, would it not be better for us to conserve the arable/grazing land we have. This will help to lessen the need for importation of staple foodstuff and meat. Especially when there is vacant land to be had especially at the old colliery site at Bevercotes. Surely there are get rich quick farmers away from Ordsall who are more than happy to sell their land to the highest bidder.</p> <p>4. The Concept Plan is all well and good when drafted out by other people who have nothing to do with Ordsall. The developers must think we're stupid to believe that these things on this draft will ever happen. Woodland areas, ponds, tree lined avenues, sports pitches, community hubs, allotments, etc all pie in the sky.</p> <p>5. Please do not allow this development to happen or it will spoil our village of Ordsall for ever.</p>	<p>holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>A new “health-hub” facility will be provided so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p> <p>Conditions may be put in place for the developers regarding the potential for disruption to be caused through the construction process of the development. This would be done through the standard planning process.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable alternative locations to accommodate growth around Retford. The priority to reuse brownfield land formed a large part of this assessment and the local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough suitable or available brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth required to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and to provide a viable development site that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			There will be a minimum of 27ha of public open space, sports and woodland on site. This reflects the Local Plan evidence base, the local community aspirations and the need to provide a net-gain in local biodiversity. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.
1858233	Resident	<p>Ordsall South. Dear sirs, I object vehemently to this proposal. Having resided in Ordsall and Retford since 1983 I have seen the lovely village and town ruined by overdevelopment and a lack of reinvestment in the village and facilities.</p> <p>1) The road infrastructure cannot take anymore vehicles with regular gridlocks in and around the town/village. 2) Excessive flooding for which this land is needed for. 3) There is no policing and with potentially 10,000 more people coming in, more crime and violence will ensue. 4) Schooling is at full capacity already and with a shortage of teachers the next generation will not be educated well 5) Medical facilities are full locally with no vacancies at doctor or dental surgeries 6) Bassetlaw hospital is not large enough for an expanding populous 7) we are a village/market town not a metropolis like Nottingham, we live her because of its quaintness and do not excessive and unnecessary development. 8) there is a shortage of employment opportunities in Retford/Ordsall so all the traffic will be commuters thus increasing pollution and going against the Government green policy.</p>	<p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided so that new health services can be provided on site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858237	Resident	object to the proposed development od 1200 houses in the Ordsall area as outlined in the proposal. There is no case made either economically socially or environmentally for any such major development in this area as the infrastructure of roads, social, leisure and commercial facilities, employment and schools are either in place nor likely in the foreseeable future in Redford and Ordsall. I believe this proposed development should be rejected.	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>A new “health-hub” facility will be provided so that new health services can be provided on site. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use, this has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p>
1858243	Resident	As a resident of Eaton, I have serious concerns about the resulting increase in traffic through Eaton from a development of 1250 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 was simply not built for the volume of traffic that now exits the A1 at the Elkesley bridge, 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. Currently, a large number of people who live in Ordsall and the surrounding areas commute to work outside of Retford with the preferred route to the A1 southbound being through Eaton to get on the A638 to Markham Moor. Any increase in traffic from the proposed development will further exacerbate this problem, which will not be mitigated by measures such as improving bus routes or upgrading roundabouts on other roads. 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 through the majority of the village, and with	The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		vehicles often parked alongside it, pedestrians have no choice but to walk into the path of the traffic. I do not allow my children to walk unaccompanied through the village for fear of an accident. It is also difficult for emergency services to travel through the village when cars are parked alongside the road, as evidenced by the tragic fatal incident in the river at Eaton this weekend which required an air ambulance to be called out. I understand from attending a consultation event that traffic calming measures are in scope for Eaton should the proposed development be approved but I am concerned whether this would be sufficient to reduce the significant increase in the volume of traffic what would result from the development. I am also concerned about what measures can actually be put in place. Mention was made of widening footpaths, but there are few to be widened! The response to my comment at the previous consultation the Ordsall South development was that preventative measures in Eaton will mean that the majority of traffic heading South will access the A1 at Elkesley rather than Markham Moor, but I have yet to see anything in the revised plans that evidences this assertion. The response to the question that I asked at the consultation event also made clear that officials from BDC have yet to visit Eaton or talk to residents to observe the issues at first hand.	that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.
1858246	Resident	As a resident of Eaton, I am 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, we 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 for Ordsall residents to access the A1 southbound rather than the Elkesley Bridge or Apleyhead junctions. This will be exacerbated if a further 1250 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 any increase in 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. I am already worried about this for my young children and have serious concerns that the problems will get far worse if the proposed development is approved. The local infrastructure simply cannot cope with a development of this size, and the small village of Eaton will be particularly impacted. This does not appear to have been given full consideration in the plan and the voice of residents in Eaton has so far been ignored given that the response to the concerns that we have previously raised about 800 dwellings has been to increase the number by more than 50%!	The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton.
1858617	Resident	Page 16: There is currently excessive traffic in Ordsall with very narrow roads such as All Hallows Street, Goosemoor, Betty's Bridge and High Street. West Hill Road is also very and busy, and Ordsall Park road is increasingly being used as a "rat run". The policy mentions that junction improvements are required but I do not see how this will make these narrow roads less busy or safer which is the current problem. The volume of traffic will only increase. Ordsall is not built for the traffic numbers that 1250 houses will generate. The vast majority of people living in these new houses will need to travel in to Retford to work. I do not think enough consideration has been given to sustainable transport options such as a safe and fully segregated bicycle network in to the centre of Retford. It is naïve and irresponsible to place this development on the edge of Retford which had very poor transport infrastructure.	The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858617	Resident	<p>Page 14: It is mentioned that the loss of 5,3Ha of golf land will be mitigated by improvements to the golfing facilities. This is all well and good but this would only benefit a small majority of people. Is there any way that a wider proportion of the local population could benefit such as with increased funding to Retford Leisure Centre which will surely be impacted by the massive influx of residents. The current leisure centre is poorly equipped, with only a fraction of the facilities that the previous leisure centre used to provide (squash courts, multiple sports courts including a much larger hall, cricket nets etc). The developer should be obliged to provide a more diverse range of sports facilities.</p>	<p>There is an identified local need for some additional sports and recreational facilities in the Ordsall area. As such, there will be a minimum of 27ha of public open space, sports and woodland on site. This reflects the Local Plan evidence base, the local community aspirations and the need to provide a net-gain in local biodiversity. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p>
1859360	Resident	<p>I am a resident of Eaton village, I have grave concerns about the infrastructure not being adequate to support another 1200 homes in this position. Traffic in Eaton is already bad as any use the village as a cut through, the bridge in Eaton has already been damaged twice in the last few years by vehicles hitting it. Speeding is also an issue through the village with some 25% of traffic exceeding the 30 mph limit. The other bridge at Ordsall is also not suitable for an increase in traffic. It has been suggested that some traffic calming would be employed to mitigate the increase. On one of the other replies to our concern it was said that some calming was already in place in Eaton, if that's true where is it? And what form does it take? It is certainly not visible to residents or indeed motorists. The thought of another perhaps 2000 plus vehicles and of course the extra deliveries that would take place would cause significant damage to the lives of residents in all the surrounding villages, if we wanted to live in a city we would have moved to one. Please planners think again!</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>
1859337	Resident	<p>I am opposing plans for the development for South Ordsall. I do not think that Ordsall or Retford have the infrastructure to cope with the amount of houses proposed. I am also confused as to why the number of houses proposed has increased by 50% from the initial consultation. I moved to Ordsall in Nov 2020 - Ordsall Road is struggling to cope with the amount of current traffic (I constantly struggle to get on/off my driveway due to the amount of traffic). I am also concerned that there is only 1 primary school and 1 secondary school in the vicinity and this will not cope with the amount of new residents that are being proposed. I understand there are plans to build a new school but this will not be ready before the houses are ready. As far as I am aware Ordsall does not have a GP or dentist facility to house current resident let alone to cater for more people. I feel that the 2 main roads out of Ordsall struggle to cope with the current levels of traffic - Ordsall Road is in a bad state of repair and has flooding issues (near the roundabout) that have not been addressed despite the fact that money should be available to do so due a newish housing estate near there. Where are the occupants of the new houses going to work? There is little employment in the local town as it is.</p>	<p>The volume of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of infrastructure. A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter.</p> <p>The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly to provide a viable development that can</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>support the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support a sustainable development for the community.</p> <p>The Council's Transport Assessment assessed the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. A new "health-hub" facility will also be provided so that new health services can be provided on site.</p>
1859307	Resident	<p>I object to the development in its current volume & its lack of amenities. Allowing it to go ahead will have a catastrophic impact not only on Ordsall but on the whole of Retford.</p> <p>1. To put even the initial 800 houses in this one location will have harmful consequences. Even if it is possible to develop the infrastructure needed, and that seems at best fantastically aspirational & with no indication that NCC will commit to provision, the result will be disastrous. Hundreds and hundreds of houses with no real improvement of access roads except for a new roundabout,</p> <p>2. There appears to be no commitment by NCC to provide a school until perhaps beyond completion of the first phase i.e 2037. Where will the projected 170 children be educated until then? Most of Retford primary schools are near capacity and recent anecdotal evidence suggest that Secondary schools throughout Bassetlaw are unable to offer even in this current year, places to all children progressing through their education.</p> <p>3. No employment opportunities appear to be included in this new plan. These roads, a school and employment land were mentioned in the initial Plan but anything meaningful has all but disappeared from the June 2021 document along with health care facilities and any other necessary amenities.</p> <p>4. 800 new homes bringing a potential 3,500 to 4,000 new residents. A large majority of these will not be existing residents of the town which is not of itself a bad thing but with none of the employment appearing in the plan that is potentially 1,500 to 2,500 extra cars spilling on to the minor roads from the development to go to their employment outside of the town. The traffic from the 198 homes built during recent years on Fairways Park has already had a very noticeable impact on traffic on Ordsall Road. Those of us who live with it day to day know the reality of the increase. Such is the increase it has</p>	<p>The site is required to provide a new primary school on site and a health hub which will provide health services. These are detailed within the Policy for Ordsall South and have been identified within the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>already become difficult at certain times of day to attempt to turn right on to Ollerton Road to travel towards its junction with Babworth Road. This development would potentially add up to 4 times that last increase in traffic. Local roads in residential areas were not built to accommodate anything like these levels of increase.</p> <p>5. 7.14.15 Is this proposal for a full roundabout or for a mini roundabout which would be unlikely to ‘slow traffic on the approach to Ordsall’?</p> <p>7.14.16 What is the ingenious proposal that will provide sufficient traffic management in Eaton, a settlement of 6 properties at the last available count, to mitigate the extra traffic when it might become a busy short cut for these hundreds of extra cars travelling between the A638 and Ordsall? What strategy can there possibly be that will ‘manage traffic’ on High Street without having a detrimental effect to the people who live there? Goosemoor Lane & Whitehouses/London Road are already impacted by hundreds of new houses at The Brambles development. Local people already know well the dangerous nature of these locations without adding so many more cars to Retford’s road network.</p> <p>6. This Plan is apparently to 'satisfy Bassetlaw’s housing needs'. I would suggest that it is not that need that is being satisfied by the thousands of houses being built and proposed all over Bassetlaw. Is it not to satisfy the needs of the population being priced out of the south of the country by bad national housing policy, who then migrate north? I am 100% in favour of building to provide good, genuinely “affordable” housing especially to cater for the needs of younger generations but would ask how many of those living currently in sub-standard houses in our towns will really benefit from all of these developments.</p> <p>7. Councillors & planners should band together, cross party, with other like councils and reject Government housing targets for our towns. Instead of which they are pushing the various versions of this Plan with which they are actively installing chaos in Bassetlaw. This development whether it be 1250 or even 800 houses, should not be allowed to proceed any further.</p>	<p>of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>
1859172	Resident	<p>I have now been an Ordsall resident for nearly a decade. I understand the need for new housing as the demand for it grows. I myself are looking to purchase a property and haven’t yet due to the costs of local properties being over inflated in comparison to wages. I would love to buy in Ordsall and thus this housing development would be perfect for myself. That being said, I fully oppose this development for the sake of the community. I enjoy walks around Eaton withy dog and see the local wildlife flourish in peace. Children and families enjoy exercising in the area and although at times traffic can be busy it’s mostly manageable. The location of the proposed development is reckless and ill thought through. It will be utterly detrimental for the community and I hope it doesn’t go through. Common sense and respect for Ordsall must prevail.</p>	Thanks for your comments
1859127	Resident	<p>Without these fields that you want to build houses on, where are the fields gonna go when we need food. Without farmers and fields we wouldn’t have food. Taking jobs away from the farmers which means less money for them and their family, you really wanna take that away. Yes we need houses, but in the country-side! Why not build more houses in Elksely village.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable alternative locations to accommodate growth around Retford. The priority to reuse brownfield land formed part of this assessment and the local plan has identified several brownfield sites for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough suitable or available brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford’s growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
1858913	Resident	<p>(Page 18) Inadequate care for the environment, reduction in habitat for wildlife, buildings will also impact water run off into the river idle, more waste.</p> <p>(Page 18) No date provided for when primary school will be built, existing schools are already overwhelmed by new housing developments. This has a significant impact on the quality of education provided to young people.</p> <p>(Page 18) Health hub - what is this? GP surgeries and other health services are already overwhelmed. Where will funding come from for the health hub? I oppose cuts to existing services which are already chronically underfunded.</p> <p>(Page 18) The roads around Retford are already too congested with inadequate cycle routes and public transport. More houses will only add to confection as well as pollution. I oppose this.</p> <p>(Page 19) Further concrete buildings will only increase surface water run off into the nearby dykes and river idle - these already flood bankside gardens and goosemoor bridge. Building more houses will only exacerbate this problem and those that live further downstream.</p> <p>What jobs are the people who live in these houses supposed to do?</p>	<p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is productive for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development would deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and a greater degree of biodiversity.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The delivery strategy of the Primary School is the responsibility of NCC and the developer(s) who will reach an agreement on how it is to be delivered. It is likely that it will come through the mid stages of the development. The Primary School has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p> <p>A new health hub will be delivered on site. This will come through developer contributions towards the creation of the hub.</p> <p>The Council conducted a Transport Assessment on the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The projected additional traffic flows from the proposed new developments were then applied to the transport model. This assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic, which this plan has aimed to mitigate. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.
1858785	Resident	I would like to object to the proposed development at ordsall on the parliamentary boundary of Bassetlaw/ Newark ie Ordsall /Eaton The amount of land covered by the development would contribute to even more flooding not to mention the traffic congestion and incapacity for the schools to cope with the influx of children of school age.	<p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all potential development sites across the District, including for Ordsall South. Surface water run-off in periods of high rainfall is the main flooding risk for Ordsall South. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities are required to help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment which examined the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. These traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The new developments were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p> <p>The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there would need to be a new 1-form entry Primary School provide onsite. The Local Plan has therefore safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site.</p>
1858781	Resident	7.14.1 Retford has seen a massive increase in development over the last few years. The development in Ordsall is too many in one area. Traffic in the town is a nightmare and at certain times of the day during school times it can take ages to get across town. A particular area of concern is the mini roundabout at Ordsall road end. I have been along there at around 8.15 in the morning and traffic cues out towards Babworth. This mini roundabout is a nightmare, and to propose increasing traffic at this point can only show a lack of understanding of the problems. We understood that alterations were to be made and paid for by the developers, who have now turned round and refused to undertake responsibility. Will developers take the same stance and as soon as the site is complete walk	The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		away? I am in favour of a Local Plan as it stops developers coming in and building where they like what they like, but 1200 houses are far to many. Bassetlaw needs to look at other areas and try to shift development to outlying sites and take pressure off the town.	assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.
1858863	BDC Councillor	<p>Concerns remain with regards to flooding. Parts of Retford have been subject to heavy flooding, with standing water remaining on the fields at Goosemoor approaching Ordsall for a considerable amount of time. Paragraph 7.14.13 states that flood risk should not be increased - however with the changing climate, how can this be guaranteed with the addition of new homes? Sufficient drainage should help to manage this, but will this impact other parts of town? Earlier this year, the Idle flooded at Ordsall. What will it be like with fields upstream developed on? Goosemoor Lane is subject to flooding which can causes traffic chaos - adding potentially another 2000 cars to this furthers the chaos. Sites for traffic calming measures have been identified. However, the main A620 is to remain the principle route across Retford. It should be pointed out that this is not a route used by everyone, with several preferring to use Goosemoor Lane to access town and the supermarkets. There are issues on Ordsall Road with speeding, and traffic problems. Highways have suggested lights at the Ordsall Road/Babworth Road junction, but the road is narrow with no room for filter lanes. There is also a nearby bus stop, and this is also where pupils cross to access the only pavement on the road to Retford Oaks. Pupils need to be safeguarded. When the A1 is closed, chaos is caused along Ordsall Road with traffic diverting. This could give an idea of what could happen with additional cars from the new development. The roads around Ordsall Bridge are narrow and residents park on the road. Tailbacks to Whitehouses are not unusual and large vehicles can have problems on the bridges. I feel highways need to address these issues and the impact of additional traffic. Page 8 states land is safeguarded for a two form entry primary school. Safeguarding the land is not a guarantee the school will be built. If this school is not built until after the first 800 houses, where will pupils from those homes be accommodated? They will likely need to be transported by car across the district to a school with space. While recognising homes are needed, is this appropriate for the village? Transport mitigation is necessary (potential loop road), as well as further detailing on flood protection, not just for this development, but for Retford in general.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District. For Ordsall South, surface water flooding is the main risk where water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and in to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has also conducted a Transport Assessment which examined the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. These traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The new developments were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p> <p>The delivery of some areas of infrastructure, such as the Primary School, will come through the mid stages of the development. The delivery strategy of the school is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council, who are the education authority, who will reach an agreement on the delivery of the school with the developer(s) during the planning process.</p>
1858658	Resident	<p>Page 14- This policy with a revised (increased) number of houses ignores responses to the previous consultation. The previous consultation had 800 homes. If this upwardly revised housing allocation is passed then it shows that the plan is not consultative as it is required to be.</p> <p>Page 14- The Green Gap is not guaranteed. The gap actually falls beyond the boundary of the District. The plan cannot claim to maintain a green gap</p> <p>Page 14- Ordsall South claims to be green but fails to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EV charging provision - Solar panels 	The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, it was important to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly it enabled the delivery of necessary infrastructure, such as a new school, to support the sustainable development of the community which

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>- Cycle ways to the town centre and station</p> <p>Page 17- The traffic management for the new development is inadequate. The present traffic management in Ordsall is not sufficient and this will overload the roads. It should fail at inspectorate. None of the transport improvements are practically going to deliver the capacity needed. A new road connection to London Road to the South of Retford is needed as a minimum. Retford has seen tragic deaths due to schools, the plan will see traffic diverted past Ordsall Primary School which increases the risks of death</p> <p>Page 14- The housing allocation for Bassetlaw is incorrect. I understand that other responses will highlight this. Many in the town are accusing the planners of protecting other areas of the district, possibly to save votes, by adopting a "scorched earth" policy for Ordsall. Firing all houses at Ordsall, with a misguided number of homes, is set to invalidate the entire local plan at inspectorate stage.</p> <p>Page 14- The plan fails to provide adequate statistical analysis of the consultation feedback made on Ordsall South by residents. This is essential to understand how popular/unpopular the allocation is.</p>	<p>would not have been possible with lower housing numbers.</p> <p>Whilst located within a Green Gap, the careful design of the development through a masterplan will help to minimise any adverse impacts on the landscape whilst maximising the protection or enhancement of important natural features.</p> <p>All new homes will be required to have the capable infrastructure for installing EV charging points.</p> <p>Solar energy has the potential to be accommodated through the design of new buildings.</p> <p>The Council has also conducted a Transport Assessment which examined the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford. These traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The new developments were then applied to the transport model to see what impacts they would have on those existing traffic flows. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas.</p>
1859136	Resident	<p>This submission is firstly based on the 'Draft Bassetlaw Plan Ordsall South Focussed Consultation 9 June to 21 July 2021; namely under 'Just some of the key features of the site include' heading. Housing: 800 homes with a further 450 houses to follow. This breaches the Core Strategy Plan as per Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan January 2020 at 5.1.2.2 and 5.1.2.2.3 et al. This clearly states that the Retford area only has 528 spaces for additional dwellings.</p> <p>The scale suggested as per the following: 20% of homes delivered will be affordable housing, 20% will be designed for older people and 5% will be designed for wheelchair access. The delivery of such types of housing under Section 106 or such a plan requires a synergy of relationships of which fostering and funding would be core issues. These are in fact unsustainable in the present restrictions of funding, planning and finance for any social housing provider whereby their own limitations would thus not guarantee an availability to deliver on this scale. Therefore, this promise would only result in very limited numbers of affordable housing and would not be able to deliver as proposed.</p> <p>Community and Environmental Features: 'The development will benefit from a Local Centre, including a convenience shop, land for a primary school, a health hub, and community facilities including outdoor sports pitches.' Spaces for possibilities are not factual benefits and the County Council will not provide a school for an area where there is already sufficient provision. However the cost of approximately 4.6 million would be required by the developer to build a primary school as indicated. It appears all that is being offered is land on a provisional basis hence proposals with absolutely no substance or secured funding, for everything mentioned. Empty promises yet again. 'It will also include a 23 hectare Country Park on the western boundary next to Whisker Hill, creating more space for wildlife and community woodland. In addition, Four hectares of high quality, open space will be created across the site for recreation, children's play and facilities for young people.' The area outlined for development already has stunning wildlife, trees and recreational areas which lead to the River Idle and the stunning village of Eaton. Therefore destroy to replace is not ecologically or environmentally friendly and is sacrilege to such an already</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>natural beauty spot. Hence common sense needs to prevail. Finally the subheading of Infrastructure Features Whereby a 'A green buffer around the site will help protect the privacy of residents' Will this also protect the residents already in Ordsall from the dust, disruption and general pollution from HGV's and construction traffic for many years? 'Flood management measures will deal with surface water run off on the site so that existing residents are not impacted. This could include sustainable drainage such as ponds and wetlands.' The proposed site is already where the natural flood planes are so in effect Eaton village will carry the brunt of additional flooding which it appears is an oversight. 'New footpaths and cycleways across the site and to Ordsall, improvements to the public rights of way.' Ordsall roads are narrow to the point that no obstruction can be passed without waiting for other traffic to stop. These same roads can also not be widened due to the extent of properties already occupying these narrow B roads. Therefore, yet again this statement is an unsubstantiated fallacy. 'A new bus service into the site providing links to Ordsall and Retford' and Two new traffic management schemes will be delivered to help improve traffic flow and safety for people and cyclists in Ordsall Old Village and Eaton Village.' As per previous comments the road widths alone do not support such plans and the increase of village traffic by a third will certainly only cause further congestion let alone with alleged 'traffic management' in place. 'Improvements will be made to nearby road junctions including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority T junction of Ollerton Road and West Hill Road • Mini roundabout junction of A620 Ordsall Road / Babworth Road • Mini roundabout junction of A638 Goosemoor Lane / London Road at Whitehouses' <p>These types of road improvements at junctions were promised previously with for example, the Persimmon development at Fairways Park. However, once the 190 houses were built suddenly the road junctions were 'adequate' and this part of the planning permission was permitted to be omitted. Further to which, it appears that the County Council has no information concerning plans for a 1250 development let alone outline consideration of road upgrades which the area would need. To consider merely upgrading junctions is again a narrow perspective whereby the reality is that millions would need to be spent by the developer even before building began. This area lacks any infrastructure that could carry this amount of traffic safely and efficiently.</p> <p>To conclude these plans are not going to be a 'cheap build' for a developer nor is it going to be of any benefit but only detriment to the area itself and the village of Ordsall. This type of development needs strong transport links where adequate provision is available to support this level of development. Ordsall is definitely not that place and as highlighted by my responses to these general cherry picked provisions that are attempting to sell it to us Ordsall residents.</p>	
1822604	Resident	<p>The village of Ordsall and Retford as a whole cannot sustain such a huge number of new houses nor should it need to given the number of new housing developments already approved or underway. Once again Retford is being used as a cash cow for Bassetlaw, no thought given to the impact due to lack of jobs or infrastructure to support this number of houses. With only 1 Road in and out of Ordsall to both Eaton and the A1 the level of traffic is already ridiculous and at peak times reaches dangerous levels for students going to and from local schools. The green areas of Ordsall have been systematically been built on and these developments leave less areas for children and adults to enjoy natural, rural spaces. Lack of spaces in schools, full doctor and dental practices, outdoor community spaces lacking are all going to be made worse by this ill thought out plan. The local nursery and shopping area are already busy beyond belief at certain times of the day and the level of traffic and parked cars is dangerous. This will be exacerbated by more housing developments in the Ordsall area. Whichever developer builds these developments will have an eye on profits and will not be thinking about what is in the best interests of the local community. Despite the fact that there are promises to invest in more infrastructure I have lived in the local area long enough to know that in Bassetlaw thses are likely empty promises and Retford is always likely to lose out in preference to Worksop.</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			The Council has been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and this will be delivered through the development of the site. A new “health-hub” facility will also be provided so that new health services can be provided on site.
1858281	Resident	<p>Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan July 2021 I am a resident of Eaton who feels that while the document has merit and the team have consulted with many parties there appears to be a lack of acceptance to fully listen to people’s views. I do accept that like my comments some of them are emotional and may not have a sound planning footing but to deliver such a plan consideration must be given to those who may not have the experience, but they have a much better understanding of their local area and its short falls. This appears to be the case in Eaton the single most potentially affected rural community in the whole plan.</p> <p>Ordsall South You state National Policy requires efficient use is made of any land greenfield or brownfield this is open to interpretation as spaces for wellbeing, activities and improvements to quality of life can all be deemed to qualify as efficient use as you express the growing need to achieve this so therefore it is within your powers to allocate more land to this while reducing the amount for housing. Why do you need to include the additional 450 houses in the current draft plan as they you have stated these are to be delivered in the next plan period therefore this is not to be consulted on as it forms a starting point for a future plan.</p> <p>With regards the density of housing is it not the job of the planning department to allocate sites suitable for residential or commercial development, considering how an area would be affected and would it be able to cope and what must be provided to ensure your plan would work in that location. Would it not be the developer to submit a plan of building to be decided through the correct channels and decided at future planning meetings The use of language within the consultation is very much written in a way to suggest that the general public can indicate where items might go before the plan has been approved thus given a false hope or confirming many details have been agreed.</p> <p>The transport study in my opinion is flawed and while you have always informed people this is down to other to decide. The use of roundabouts will reduce speed coming into the new built up area however the flaw is the ability to accept the huge increase in traffic over the 2 bridges at Eaton and Ordsall, not to mention the strain on both High St in Eaton and Ordsall will be dangerous . There has to be a moral responsibility by the team to accept the current infrastructure is not suitable for such a large development at this site and work with Highways and local residents to find a solution should the site be accepted. If you consider the development of 170 houses of Bigsby Rd was refused due to a junction issue which are both wider roads there has to be further discussions to be had before the site can be adopted .</p> <p>General Comments / Points</p> <p>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 and Improvements for cycle traffic and pedestrians 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 ?</p> <p>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 and suitable parking allocation.</p>	<p>The volume and delivery of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of necessary infrastructure. A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter. The additional 450 homes are included in this plan, despite them not commencing until the next plan period, as combined with the first 800 homes at Ordsall South they allow the delivery of much needed infrastructure and services that would otherwise not be possible.</p> <p>The Local Plan has been through a long public consultation process. This has explored the various options for development around the District.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>I also believe the following points need work on 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 ?</p> <p>You have addressed parking for non residential development however following the experience of 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.</p> <p>At What point in time do you consider 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 to be in place</p> <p>Could you request from your partners White Young and Green to explore the possibilities, If this development was to go forth in its current format a feasibility study as to the merits of building a new road down Marsh lane and across to or London road to ensure your wish of a safe route to Retford town centre could be made by all users. 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</p>	<p>schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>An appropriate level of residential and visitor off-road car parking space will be provided in line with the County Council Parking Standards. The ratio for these standards is related to the number of bedrooms per property.</p> <p>There will be parking provision at the Local Centre for shoppers and at the Country Park for visitors.</p>
REF057	Resident	<p>I am totaly against this massive plan to increase the housing by such a large amount. The Local Plan is going to ruin the area in which I have lived for the last forty years. Over the passed years Ordsall has had more than it's fair share of housing developments, which has already increased the housing capacity a great deal.</p> <p>These are my main objections and concerns:-</p> <p>The amount of proposed houses is far to high. Ordsall does not have the infrastructure to withstand this amount of development. The increase in the amount of traffic. It will cause more congestion and will not be safe for children mainly when travelling to and from school. The roads are already under pressure at certain times now, so will be even worse with this development. The road access to area is inappropriate, causing even more problems with traffic. The proposed area has an abundance of wildlife. It will take away their habitat and endanger more species of animals. Flooding is a concern. The area is prone to flooding at times.</p> <p>From past experiences the promises of extra schools, health centres, open spaces etc., never do materialise, they are just 'Empty Promises' I am very disappointed with this plan. I urge everyone to reconsider how this will have a negative and overwhelming effect on tbe community. The land for the site is perfectly good farm land and should remain so.</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development is proposed to deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and greater biodiversity than currently present. There will be a minimum of 27ha of public open space, sports and woodland on site. This reflects the Local Plan evidence base, the local community aspirations and the need to provide a net-gain in local biodiversity. New community facilities will also be provided so that there is space for local events, gatherings and community groups.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the proposed Ordsall South development, as well as all relevant sites across the District. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the highest flooding risk occurs when high rainfall events result in water running off fields in to existing developments. The Flood Risk Assessment has indicated that new on-site water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into both the new development and existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the development's Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>A new "health-hub" facility will be provided on the site so that new health services are available for both new and existing residents. It is likely this will form part of the Local Centre for the development which will become a focus for shops, community facilities and transport services. The Council has also been working closely with the education authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) on what education provision is required. The County Council have confirmed that there is a need for a new 1-form entry Primary School to be provide onsite. The Local Plan has safeguarded land on the site for education and community use and has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is a policy requirement for Ordsall South.</p>
REF042	Resident	<p>A couple of years ago the little bridge in Ordsall was closed for a few months and the traffic noise on Ollerton Road was horrendous. And that wasn't permanent. The High Street always has parked cars so imagine 1000+ more cars along there. The shops in the village are an accident waiting to happen with cars parked all over the place. I can't imagine the residents of Eaton being very happy with thousands of cars speeding through their quiet village either. Eight hundred homes was bad enough but one thousand two hundred is horrendous. Are the residents oh Ollerton Road going to get any compensation for the traffic, noise and substantial disruptions to our daily lives? I think not. We often walk along the back lane looking over the fields to the A1 and it is truly beautiful. All this will be lost because of a lot of boxes being built.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			<p>measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>Due to its edge of settlement location, development at Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't negatively impact the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality.</p>
REF012	Resident	I am writing to support the Draft Local Plan June 2021 Focused addition I have approved the 2 previous Draft Local Plans and I approve this version including the developments in Ordsal and the planned additional dwellings after 2037. I have one further comment to add. This is now the third draft, now is the time to move this out of draft and into full policy ASAP, so everyone knows where they stand. Until this is finalised we will continually have to fight off applications from cowboy developers wanting to make quick fortunes from totally unsuitable sites. This is stressful to residents and wastes the councils time and money. Now is the time to get this finalised.	Thanks for your comments
REF009	BDC Councillor	<p>There is a traffic rat run through Eaton Village at the moment. The situation will become much worse if the proposed development goes ahead. NCC are wrestling with the problem of speeding traffic at the moment , and how to reduce the speed to a safer level. The road through Eaton has a 90 degree corner , an ancient bridge serving as a chicane ,and another corner nearer to the Old Great North Road. The road through Eaton serves as a short cut to the A1 trunk via the Great North Road for the existing residential estates on the South West of Retford town. (The residential estates of Ordsall). The road through Eaton village is already very busy during computer hours especially. I consider an increase in this traffic , which will definitely take place with any additional development , as that proposed , to increase the dangers within Eaton to an unacceptable level. I genuinely believe that the village street will become an unacceptable danger to residents , and vehicle users. The road is narrow , with no room for a pedestrian pavement on the West side of the idle river within the village. There is not any opportunity to widen this road as existing residences are built close to the road.</p> <p>The area close to the river and on the bridge is used for recreation especially on hot summer days. People use the river for swimming and much as a resort on hot days. The bridge can be difficult to access by vehicles for the large number of people on the bridge at these times, and the access is single vehicle as the bridge is so narrow at any time. Retford Country Market Town: Retford is a traditional market town. The development proposed will change the character to primarily a residential commuter dormitory. There are likely to be few jobs created in, and to the East of Retford in the life of the plan. The residential urban area would be better situated nearer centres of growth, such as Doncaster , Rotherham and Sheffield where the jobs will be. This would allow Retford to retain its character to fit in with the desired growth of tourism within Bassetlaw, North Nottinghamshire, and the Tourism envisaged in the Bassetlaw plan. The Town centre of Retford will become congested and unattractive for shoppers to enter the Town, which was built for a smaller service community. The quality of life in and around the town will reduce, services will become stretched. Health services will become difficult to access. Promised and needed capacity as a result of the</p>	The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas such as Eaton village. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		development required for health a education is unlikely to be delivered satisfactorily. Existing residents are likely to suffer difficulties accessing services at the level they are used to. The plan is forcing a unsustainable and environmentally unfriendly development , in what is still an attractive and rural area	<p>The plan has been developed accruing to national planning policy and an evidence base accompanies its proposals. The community has been consulted on a number of development and growth options since 2016.</p> <p>Where development causes an unreasonable negative impact on landscape and infrastructure, then it must mitigate against those impacts. The Local Plan identifies where new or enhanced infrastructure is needed.</p>
REF017	Resident	<p>As an Ordsall resident, I am not against the proposed development of 1,250 homes to the south of Ordsall However there are several areas that concern me</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cycle routes As a keen cyclists, I have not seen nor do I see in the future any planning nor budget for cyclists. The appointment of a cycling Champion seems to me as a Councillor without portfolio. Taking this into consideration, I will not waste mine or your time by detailing my views. Access to the site during development This development will be undertaken over a number of years. Access to the site is :- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The A1 via Elkesley. The access to the A1 has be vastly improved but not the road into Ordsall From Whitehouses. You state the roundabout is to be improved. What is happening to the bridge over the River Idle which is still very tight, even after the recent work and blind at both ends Through Eton -another tight and blind bridge which is only one way From Babworth Lorry traffic during the development of these new house <ol style="list-style-type: none"> neither the Whithouse nor Eton access is suitable for an increase in lorry traffic The Babworth access is already crowded, especially at the beginning and end of the working day Ideally the road from Elkesley needs upgrading and developers need limiting to using this road only as part of the planning consent The above also applies to the increase in car traffic once the houses are built, at 1.5 cars per household this is an increase of 1,875 cars Services before any development in new services are established. Nobody will be interested in starting a service or business until there is critical mass to make it economic. For a many years the new people will use the shops already established in Ordsall. The parking is already diabolical! <p>There are numerous other area which need careful consideration such as a one way system up the high street and down all hallows street and limitations to on street parking to assist in traffic flow You may have taken all the above into consideration but I have seen little if any communication to inform Ordsall residents. Is it any wonder you get residence to more houses and Councillors resigning</p>	<p>The proposed development Ordsall South would provide new and enhanced footpaths and cycle networks into Retford and the surrounding countryside. A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will also be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any improvements to existing cycle ways will likely just provide improvements to the existing infrastructure such as surfacing or lighting</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>Conditions may be put in place for the developers regarding the potential for disruption to be caused through the construction process of the development. This would be done through the standard planning process.</p> <p>The delivery of infrastructure will be phased alongside the development. The Council has produced an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which details the types of</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			infrastructure needed to support the growth across the District.
REF022	Resident	<p>Please can I submit my objection to the policy 29, Ordsall south focused consultation</p> <p>I feel that Ordsall has poor paths (unsafe, incomplete for prams/wheelchairs), new paths in the site are no good if access in Ordsall isn't possible as it is and needs improving first before any building</p> <p>Unsafe footpaths are potential risk to life and with more housing even more Ordsall residents will be in danger</p> <p>Unsafe roads with poor access e.g. for fire engines and ambulances more housing with more cars will make this worse. The road system is a major concern as is access to Ordsall, for example at Babworth mini roundabout I have reported flooding which has never been dealt with, just ignored by the council.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure needs making safe first before any new builds, endangered life and keeping residents safe is upmost priority NOT housing</p> <p>Employability will be minimal and only the same as if it was at the Bassetlaw garden village, cant see any difference to that site and Ordsall south site? What jobs will there be for these people?</p> <p>School places will be required in the first phase if not before</p> <p>As stated infrastructure needs to be complete and in place for now, and for future THEN house building can occur not the promise of this after which has no guarantee of been upheld</p> <p>The leaflet mentions more nature land which is a contradiction in terms as the nature land is already here, they aren't providing anymore nature land they are building on it and taking away.</p> <p>Existing public rights of way are not labelled correctly, these go across site and are walked 2x a year by myself and will cut the site of adjacent to Lansdown drive in half</p> <p>Wild life such as oyster catchers, cuckoos, owls are on site I see no differences to wildlife objections as those of potential wildlife problems at Bassetlaw garden village.</p> <p>More resident with more pollution and pets such as cats to eat the existing wildlife are a consideration of reducing wildlife in the area.</p> <p>I would like to submit 2 videos of the site showing cuckoo and owls, please can you tell me who I should send this evidence to?</p>	<p>The proposed development Ordsall South would provide new and enhanced footpaths and cycle networks into Retford and the surrounding countryside. A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will also be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any improvements to existing footpaths or cycle ways are likely to be upgrades to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The delivery of infrastructure will be phased alongside the development. The Council has produced an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which details the types of infrastructure needed to support the growth across the District</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity.
REF025	Sports England	<p>The development should be informed by evidence from a Sport England perspective is the Playing Pitch Strategy and the Emerging Built Sports Facilities Strategy. Both strategies should be able to answer the following questions ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the existing sports facilities meet the demand identified? For example how is the demand for Rugby from this development being met given the close proximity of 2. If not, would investment in existing facilities enable them to meet some or all of the demand? 3. If not what is required on site to meet the demand which cannot be met elsewhere? <p>The impact upon the Golf Club should be fully assessed</p>	Both assessments have informed the need for public open space and sport facilities on the site. Where there is a direct impact, the site will provide new facilities otherwise improvements will come via financial contributions from development.
REF031	Resident	<p>We object on several grounds as set out below:</p> <p>Eaton Village We see that Notts.County Council have already confirmed that this is a major problem - their e-mail 04/12/20 refers. Narrow road, no pavement and narrow bridge. This is a short cut onto the A638 for Retford/Tuxford/Lincoln/A1 Your transport people have suggested priority vehicle signage. This will lead to standing traffic in both directions in the village. This in turn will cause noise/pollution for the residents. You will not stop traffic using this as a short cut.</p> <p>Ordsall Bridge Narrow roads with residents parked vehicles (High St). These in turn lead to a narrow bridge. This is also a bus route. Large vehicles including buses have problems on the bridge. Current island at Whitehouses will be swamped with more traffic. Causing tailbacks down Goosemoor Lane and over bridge, This will create pandemonium at this junction.</p> <p>Ordsall Road/Babworth Road Junction There is already problems on Ordsall Road with speeding. The local Police are already aware of this situation. There are a series of junctions and driveways along this road. Recently built housing estates also enter this road. So there is already increased traffic problems. Your transport people are suggesting traffic lights at the junction of Ordsll Road /Babworth Road. The roads at this junction are narrow. There is no room for any light controlled filter lanes so each road will have to be controlled separately which in turn will cause a delay on each road awaiting the lights to change. Also there is a bus stop within 75 yards of this junction on Babworth road approaching from Retford town. There is no room to move this bus stop which will coupled with the lights cause delay and a tail back of traffic, Pupils attending Retford Oaks Academy cross Babworth Road from Ordsall Road to get to the only pavement on that road, We assume the council would wish to safeguard these pupils whilst crossing this busy road. The only way would be to install some kind of light controlled crossing (pelican) Can you imagine the nightmare scenario of all this at this junction. There are 2 further islands Retford Oaks/Amcott Way leading onto Babworth Road so the problem would be magnified. When there is a problem on the A1 you will be aware of the traffic chaos caused by vehicles being sent along Ordsall Road. This will give you a picture of what will happen.</p> <p>We feel that the massive impact that this development will cause is a major cause of concern and should not be further considered.</p>	The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF032	Resident	<p>Please accept this email as OBJECTION to the proposed plan to build 1250 dwellings in Ordsall South (HS13 on the map) My views remain the same as previously emailed to you in that High Street and Goosemoor Bridge barely copes with the traffic as it is. The majority of houses have 2 cars, another 1250 dwellings = the possibility of another 2500 cars using High Street and Goosemoor Bridge and in some cases the road to and through Eaton.</p> <p>Retford to Eaton Green Gap – there may well be some “green” land between Ordsall and Eaton but the road infrastructure cannot and will not cope with the extra volume of traffic, the possibility of up to 2,500 vehicles on narrow roads.</p> <p>Both the bridges at Eaton and Goosemoor are not suitable for such heavy traffic. Goosemoor Bridge is unable to cope as it is – there were 3 accidents in one week during the month of June on Goosemoor Bridge alone!</p> <p>Cllr. Jo White states “increasing the number of properties in the Ordsall South site was something we really didn’t want to do”. The plan was thrown out in 2014 to build on this land and the headline in the Retford Times from Jo White said something on the lines of “Ordsall South cannot cope with this amount of new housing” and now you are actually wanting to build hundreds more houses than was put forward in 2014 and November 2020.</p> <p>I appreciate that the Government puts local councils under pressure and apparently there is a shortage of housing, but you don’t have to look too far to find more suitable areas in Retford that have better road infrastructures than Ordsall South. How many more houses with their vehicles do you expect “old” Ordsall to cope with?</p> <p>I walked around a large area of the roads in Ordsall South last week, cars were parked most of the way on one side of High Street making it only passable for 1 car to drive either up or down at a time, therefore causing traffic to queue to get either up or down. Cars elsewhere parked half on the road and half on the pavement making it impossible for me as a pedestrian to walk on the pavement and having to walk on the main road. This is bad enough on the housing estates but when it’s occurring on Ordsall Road (the road where the rugby club is), it’s very dangerous. I can see if this plan goes ahead that it will be the same as other developments in Ordsall that have been built – the houses will go up but the roundabouts, traffic lights, green areas etc will be forgotten about. It’s too late once the housing has gone up and you realise the area cannot cope.</p> <p>What happened to the idea of a Garden Village?</p> <p>The fields at the bottom of Bankside frequently flood. High Street regularly floods when we have persistent rain as the drains cannot cope, if the farmland close by is built on, where will that rainwater go that would have drained into the fields? As I understand it, the main sewer that 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, the roads off 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. If the plan goes ahead, and I fear it will, you say that Retford has a relatively high proportion of older people. If the plan gets the go ahead, will consideration be given to build bungalows for the older people on the smaller area of HS13 i.e. Hill View & River View, where there are already bungalows backing on to this area? My views in my last email dated 06 January 2021 Ref No. REF038 remain the same regarding Ollerton Road/Welbeck Road and West Hill Road. I do fear it will be fair accompli but feel I must put my opinion across to the people in Bassetlaw Planning Dept.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the projected impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide the most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that several roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal to assess the impacts from the proposed growth and this helps to establish what mitigation is needed to accommodate the level of growth. The Council has also assessed other alternative locations around Retford through this process.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District, including Ordsall South. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the main risk of flooding currently occurs when surface water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and also to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF033	Resident	<p>This response relates to the Ordsall South Housing plan ref ST29 HS13 and is in addition to my previous e-mail sent 6-1-21</p> <p>Having viewed the initial concept plan by the site promoter, William Barton I was admittedly rather surprised at the ratio of development land compared to land allocated for leisure/nature use which is indeed greater than you would normally expect for a housing development of this nature.</p> <p>However, this is a very large development concept and recent changes suggest that the initial number of houses proposed has since been increased from 800 to 1250 which if correct is quite simply bewildering and would effectively double the size of Ordsall which has already been overdeveloped in my view with inadequate infrastructure that simply cannot cope. Given these changes and the difficulty in finding genuinely honest and transparent intentions, I would be highly sceptical that any development would be kept within these parameters and the site would end up larger than implied at this early stage. It is for these reasons and environmental reasons outlined in my previous e-mail that I would oppose any development on this site but especially one as large as this one which is simply unacceptable on all levels, not least the huge increase in traffic on an already busy area with poorly planned roads lashed together from the succession of previous developments. Traffic calming is not the answer and speed bumps are awful for people living in the area which feel like a last resort and everyone has simply given up. I have heard arguments that government has already dictated the number of new properties an area must provide but I was of the opinion we lived in a democracy and that recent governments were promoting greater powers to local regions to decide how there neighbourhoods are to develop so I do not accept this either. Development of open land is taken far too lightly as though it is simply there for the taking. Additional housing should be much more evenly spread, utilising smaller pockets of land and primarily using all previously developed areas or repurposing urban land in view of the inevitable great changes we are facing. Instead of doubling the size of Ordsall we should be doubling the size of Sherwood Forrest and leave a legacy that may actually be positive for future generations rather than just blindly carrying on with the usual, predictable washed out formulas. Given the dire state of pretty much all aspects of current world affairs I am genuinely baffled at how intelligent people think this approach of relentless new development on open land is still acceptable and believe it is necessary for a radical rethink of how all humans consider there future with regard to living, working and leisure activities and unless we seriously look at these issues including managing sustainable population levels then I believe the future is looking very grim indeed.</p>	<p>The volume and delivery of development is closely linked to its viability and the provision of necessary infrastructure. A development of this scale will need to be phased so that the housing and infrastructure are delivered in a sustainable way throughout the lifetime of the development. The Local Plan proposes that the first 800 homes will be delivered before the end of 2037. A further 450 homes will be delivered thereafter. The uplift in the number of homes from November 2020 was undertaken for two reasons. Firstly, it was important to comply with the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and its policy on the effective use of land, and secondly it enabled the delivery of necessary infrastructure, such as a new school, to support the sustainable development of the community which would not have been possible with lower housing numbers.</p> <p>The Council undertook an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable locations to accommodate growth around Retford, with a priority on reusing brownfield land. The local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough available or suitable brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth in the local plan. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>
REF035	Resident	<p>I am writing to comment on the updated proposals to the Ordsall South plan. The thought of 800 new homes was horrific but the new proposal of 1250 homes is even more horrendous. Most households nowadays have at least one car if not two or even three. The roads around the proposed sites will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. I live in Eaton and it is already a 'rat run' for cars travelling from Ordsall. It is positively dangerous to try and exit Woodyard Lane even at 7 am because of poor visibility and cars ignoring the speed limit through the village. There is also the problem of people using the river bank near the bridge and beyond for recreational purposes, namely 'wild swimming' sunbathing, picnicking and dropping litter! There are cars parked on the road verges at any time of day from early morning to late evening. This makes driving over the bridge very dangerous especially as, again, the speed limit is often exceeded. If this is a problem now with the current population I dread to think what it will be like if the proposals for Ordsall South go ahead.</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.
REF036	Resident	<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal for 1250 dwellings (and other facilities) to be developed on Site HS13 Ordsall South on the grounds that this amounts to over-development, there is no supporting infrastructure (e.g. totally inadequate road network), it will be hugely detrimental to the countryside, it is unnecessary use of valuable greenfield sites and there are more suitable alternative sites in Retford and the surrounding area. This amount of new homes would bring unsustainable pressures on the road network which is unchanged since it served the village when it consisted of a handful of farms and a paper mill. Traffic levels are already at a very high level for such a small village, and demand on existing facilities such as shops and the primary school means there is no capacity for additional pressures that would emanate from this development. And no improvements will help deal with traffic and safety issues on roads like the High Street, which is already dangerous because of on street parking and no laybys to allow traffic to safely pass. Some years ago BDC turned down a planning application for a pharmacy on the High Street due to traffic/parking concerns, so how can a huge development in close vicinity to this location be permitted, in the knowledge that it will generate far more traffic and other pressures on the local infrastructure?! I am a Local Government Officer and in over 30 years of experience involving attendance at Planning Committees and viewing Planning Policy documents, I have never seen a more inappropriate proposal for site allocations as this, taking into account all of the potential harm it would have on the area and its residents. There would also be significant loss of public amenity if these fields are built on, and it would have a massively detrimental impact on the landscape character. These fields hold prominent positions within the landscape of the Idle river valley. They can be seen from the London Road going into Retford and there are beautiful views across the valley to and from these fields, both on the river Idle side and from Whisker Hill by the golf course on the other side.. If development was allowed here, it would represent 'urban sprawl' and encroachment into countryside which has significant landscape merit. These fields are the 'gateway' into the Idle Valley from the south of the village. It is an important area for local people to enjoy countryside walks, because it is unspoilt and has lots of rights of way open to the public. There are no other areas like this on this side of Ordsall. If these fields are lost to development, residents in the south of the village will no longer be able to access countryside walks from their doorstep. The landscape merit of the fields to the south of Ordsall has been grossly overlooked and development of these fields would ruin what is, for many residents in the village, the only truly beautiful and scenic area of countryside available within walking distance. This will have a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of residents, a factor which Planning Authorities are now being urged nationally to take into account when considering planning proposals. In my opinion, no amount of 'landscape-led design' or 'sensitive design and density appropriate to local context' will compensate for the hugely detrimental impact on the local landscape and greenspace amenity currently enjoyed by residents across this site by way of existing rights of way. It is laughable that the plan states that 'quality greenspace' will be provided, when it is clear that so much valuable greenspace will be lost as a result of this proposal.</p> <p>Furthermore, the soil tests previously commissioned by BDC show that these fields comprise 96% soil graded as Grade 2/sub grade 3a so this is high quality agricultural land, unlike the derelict factory sites just over the railway line off West Carr Road that have stood empty and disused for years. And there are many other brown field sites in the</p>	<p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the projected impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide the most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that several roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an assessment (sustainability appraisal) on all reasonable alternative locations to accommodate growth around Retford. The priority to reuse brownfield land formed a large part of this assessment and the local plan has identified brownfield land for development where is considered available and suitable within Retford, such as on the Former Elizabethan School off North Road. However, there is not enough suitable or available brownfield land in Retford to accommodate the level of proposed growth required to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and to provide a viable development site that can support the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements. Therefore, some greenfield land is needed to support Retford's growth over the plan period and beyond.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>Ordsall/Retford areas that would be suitable for accommodating future developments without the need to encroach into prized countryside and bring traffic to parts of Ordsall that can't cope with it.</p> <p>There would also be added risk of flooding if these fields are built on, as these fields are already prone to water logging and flooding as they are, let alone if they are covered in tarmac. Where would the run off from the site go to? It would lead to further flooding into the river valley heading east, which is precisely where all the rights of way lead to, so it would render all the walks for local people impassable. To even contemplate building within flood zones in these days of climate change and unpredictable weather patterns is tantamount to recklessness and totally irresponsible.</p> <p>I would suggest that the focus needs to turn to more appropriate locations in Bassetlaw district where such development would have far less of an impact on the local landscape in those areas than that proposed in the south of Ordsall.</p>	<p>Due to its edge of settlement location, the development of Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality. The design of the scheme will be led by a masterplan. This plan will provide a detail on how the layout and density of the scheme responds to the existing landscape features in the area. The details of a masterplan will need to be agreed by the Council.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for all relevant sites across the District, including Ordsall South. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the main risk of flooding currently occurs when surface water runs off the fields into the existing developments in periods of high rainfall events. The Flood Risk Assessment has stated that new (on-site) water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into the new development and also to the existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the developments Green Infrastructure provision.</p>
REF037	Resident	<p>Retford needs quality employment so young people can buy quality housing, there is no point building houses which first time buyers can't afford in places with no employment.</p> <p>Bassetlaw planning seem to be cramming any spare space with houses.</p> <p>Jenkins—Houses</p> <p>Bridon—Houses</p> <p>Waterfields—Houses</p> <p>Spicers board mill—Houses</p> <p>High density housing with little or no garden and parked cars lining every road is no place for families to live. Where is the quality employment in south Retford.</p> <p>Roads are already too congested getting into Retford, and putting traffic calming measures on Whitehouse Road and in Eaton are not going to ease the problem. Traffic jams cause extra pollution and greenhouse gasses which are things we should all be trying to reduce.</p>	<p>The loss of previous employment land was subject to developers demonstrating that the land is not now needed for those employment uses. The majority of these sites were vacant for a long time and are considered brownfield land within an urban area. In addition, some of the locations for employment here historical and their location for economic use were not compatible to their largely central and residential location in Retford.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.
REF046	Resident	<p>I have heard that the plans to build 800 houses has been increased to 1250. I wish object to this.</p> <p>There has been a great deal of housing development in and around Retford – some large some small - Bridon, Rosedale, Blossom Grove, the old Normans Garden centre Site, Idle Valley, Tiln Road and the ‘just started’ North Road development. These developments have put additional pressure on our already congested roads. The Ordsall South proposal of 1250 houses will not only increase the congestion in Ordsall but will have a knock on effect throughout the Retford area. Also, we all know what happens with there is an accident on the A1 - traffic pours into Retford from every direction in a bid to avoid being stuck in long queues only to arrive in Retford in a queue.</p> <p>The road infrastructure in Ordsall is not good. On street parking on the High Street, All Hallows Road, Ollerton Road, Welbeck Road, Ordsall Road, West Carr Road. On street parking makes it difficult/dangerous to enter/exit junctions. Weight restricted bridges over the River Idle in Ordsall and Eaton, narrow one-way bridge and hump-back bridge over railway lines on West Carr Road. Many cars seem to be in a rush and exceed the speed limits despite speed bumps and relevant signage eg Westhill Road, Ordsall Road, Ollerton Road, West Carr Road. The path on All Hallows Road is very narrow and dangerous for those walking along . Also the path on the High Street ends at Church Road. People then have to cross the road and when reaching the Five Arches bridge cross the road at the busy T junction in order to reach the new footbridge. Perhaps this needs to be looked at.</p> <p>You have indicated that improvements will be made to the High Street, All Hallows Road, various junctions and mini-roundabouts. It is difficult to see how these can be improved. I and many other people would like to see details of the planned improvements and those of the proposed cycle paths. Also it would be good to be consulted on these before the go ahead is taken.</p> <p>I feel Retford has become a ‘commuter town’. We have lost many big employers like Bridon, Jenkins, and two power stations. I believe our biggest employers are Rampton Hospital, Bassetaw Hospital and Ranby Prison. People have to travel to work and therefore need to have a car. Mortgages/rents are expensive with both partners needing to work and therefore usually requiring two cars. Young people also need transport to get to their place of employment. Public transport is not always suitable especially for shift workers, can take too long and often is unreliable. You put a lot of emphasis on the use public transport. How can you ensure that it meets the needs of the people, is reliable and operates after 5pm! People do work in the evenings.</p> <p>How can you ensure that the houses to be built have enough parking space? It is no good building 4 bedroomed family homes and only have 2 parking spaces. Young people are having to live at home for much longer and generally need a car to get to work. If parking spaces cannot be provided then the roads should be wide enough to allow parking on the road and still allow other vehicles (including emergency vehicles) to pass through. Surely the Planning Department can insist on this. Developers seem to want to squeeze as many houses on land as possible. Paths should not be used for parking cars on causing problems for people pushing prams and with young children, those with sight and physical disabilities, mobility scooters etc.</p> <p>How will the planning department ensure that there is enough parking for the proposed shop, possible medical hub, care home, School, football fields, country park? Parking at Ordsall Primary School on Ordsall Road and West Hill Road is a nightmare as is parking at the shops on Welbeck Road. Lessons should be learnt from these black spots. The developers for the Bridon Estate showed a play park on their original plans. This never materialised. How will you ensure that the plans for a medical hub (and what does this mean), school, shop, care home actually materialise?</p>	<p>The Council has recently conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the potential impact that any new development would have on these. The Transport Assessment collected data for the existing traffic flows during peak times and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. Once the new developments were added to this. the assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic created and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments themselves would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>An appropriate level of residential and visitor off-road car parking space will be provided in line with the County Council Parking Standards. The ratio for these standards is related to the number of bedrooms per property.</p> <p>Parking provision will be made for shoppers and visitors at the Local Centre and Country Park.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF049	Resident	<p>We are local residents to the proposed new housing development and would like to express our serious concern and dismay at the plans for any new development on Ordsall South, particularly to the scale and size of this one.</p> <p>We contest the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Traffic is a huge safety concern in Ordsall anyway and the situation is already a serious accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>1.1 The development would impact and make busier the main roads through Ordsall which are already extremely congested at school drop-off times as well as other times during the day.</p> <p>1.2 It is not uncommon to see bus routes blocked and people parked all over especially around the shops and Ordsall primary school. I fear that one day the emergency services may struggle to access where they need to go. It is already dangerous to pedestrians, bikes and motorists - any new housing development which increases traffic to the area will worsen the problem. How long will it take to act, until someone dies?</p> <p>1.3 The small goosemoor bridge and high street is not suitable for the current traffic flow, never mind adding more. The bridge is already an area of immediate danger and since it would provide one of the main access points to the new development this is a concern. There is also a lack of parking on high street causing people to park on the road making it difficult to pass safely especially on a bike. Alternatively people may come through Eaton which is also not a suitable, safe route or fair on residents.</p> <p>1.4 You state that (undisclosed) improvements will be made to roads but this is impossible if you cannot reduce the number of vehicles wishing to travel on the road. It is not about who has right of way, it is sheer number of cars that is the problem - a new development will make this much worse.</p> <p>2. We have seen over many years the severe and inevitable flooding which occurs on the land you are proposing to build on. The land regularly becomes impassable and consequently floods the surrounding fields too. Currently this isn't too much of a problem as the water is able to drain and reduce naturally from there without flooding properties and no doubt saves further flooding down the river. If you build houses on this land it creates a further problem for where the excess flood water will have to go and I believe with some degree of certainty that the houses built close to the river will always be subject to flood risks. It is massively irresponsible to take this land and build housing developments on it.</p> <p>3. It will severely and negatively affect the residents of the Bankside and Riverside estates both from a noise perspective and a traffic and pollution perspective. Plus it is a huge loss of countryside, green areas and peace not to mention the potential de-valuing that may occur to house prices. The number of houses that has been proposed and the work continuing until 2037 is unfair, not justified and excessive - it will cause daily misery for local residents for a very, very long time. I would like you to publish facts about the housing requirements and shortages in the area as I don't believe these exist and if they do, it is likely to be affordable housing that is required.</p> <p>4. The plan states that the development will create 'more space for wildlife' - I'd like to highlight the loss to eco-biodiversity created by the development and how adding any additional areas does not create 'more' space but instead takes a lot away from our area. The green space is enjoyed daily by many walkers and lots of nature, this is one of the reasons we moved here. Please don't ruin another open space with too many houses.</p> <p>I hope that you give this consultation the consideration it deserves, the proposal covers a huge area and completely changes the dynamic of the village for many, many people.</p> <p>We ask that you do not further risk the safety of our village to make developers rich.</p>	<p>The Council has conducted a Transport Assessment that assessed both the existing traffic flows in and around Retford, and the impact that any new development would have on these. The assessments for the existing traffic flows were carried out during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified that a number of roads and junctions would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The proposed developments would implement these mitigations schemes where they had a direct adverse impact, and financial contributions will be sought to contribute towards wider improvement schemes where the impact is indirect.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the proposed Ordsall South development, as well as all relevant sites across the District. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the highest flooding risk occurs when high rainfall events result in water running off fields in to existing developments. The Flood Risk Assessment has indicated that new on-site water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into both the new development and existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the development's Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Noise and other issues arising from construction and site traffic can be conditioned through the planning process.</p> <p>All major development are required to provide at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and is therefore not particularly supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development at Ordsall South will deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space, and a country park, which will provide space for wildlife enhancement and offer a greater degree of biodiversity</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
REF006	Resident	<p>Overall the plan misses an opportunity to put Bassetlaw at the forefront in responding to the climate emergency. There is an urgent need for radical action. I despair.</p> <p>Recycling - Retford's drive-in waste management facility in Hallcroft is so cramped and inadequate that it can only encourage fly tipping.</p> <p>Zero carbon housing - recent housing developments make no progress in this direction and there is no indication that developers will be forced to build differently. There is no excuse for building inefficient and polluting homes. It is laziness and short-term greed.</p> <p>Cycling - no safe usable network and no effort to provide one</p> <p>Walking - Ordsall needs facilities within 15 minute walking distance of homes. Can you induce a supermarket company to build one in the middle of the housing estates.</p> <p>Allotment gardens - how many new plots are planned per new house built. What is the strategy for encouraging people to grow plants to eat, for wildlife and for the environment.</p> <p>Planting schemes in the public realm - what specific plans are in place for effective and beneficial planting schemes that deliver benefits for wildlife and air quality i.e. who decides what species are planted and ensures that they are.</p> <p>Developers like planting yuccas and cordylines - what is the point or relevance of that?</p> <p>Public transport - no direct link from Retford to Nottingham, disjointed and inadequate bus services with a poor image</p> <p>Water, flooding and run off - requires a more aggressive approach - rainwater capture and re-use, permeable surfaces only, extensive wetlands</p> <p>Sewage processing - is the existing provision adequate? How many instances of discharge of unprocessed sewage form local facilities have there been in the last ten years? How will capacity be increased to meet the demand from new developments?</p> <p>Energy - reduction in demand via radically more efficient housing stock, local micro generation schemes, group heating schemes etc</p> <p>Private transport - 17000 people commute out of Bassetlaw to work. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of residents in proposed new housing will do the same, primarily by car. Whatever tinkering is done to the road network as it is now, congestion will only get worse and commuting's wasteful consumption of resources will increase. If the inevitably of continued reliance on the private car is accepted then housing developments need to make proper provision for parking i.e. roads or cycle lanes should not be seen as car parks.</p> <p>Protecting Eaton village - this is an obvious route out of Ordsall heading south, made more attractive by congestion caused by parked cars on High Street and the inadequacy of the river bridge onto Goosemoor Lane. How will Eaton village be protected from a further influx of through traffic?</p> <p>Lack of inspiration - do we have to create housing developments that are so devastatingly dull, unimaginative and dead?</p> <p>Etc...</p>	<p>The proposed development Ordsall South would provide new and enhanced footpaths and cycle networks into Retford and the surrounding countryside. A new network of footpaths and cycle routes will also be provided on site so that residents can easily access the green spaces and local services. Where new roads and cycle ways are provided, these will be segregated or form part of a shared space for cyclists and pedestrians. Any improvements to existing footpaths or cycle ways are likely to be upgrades to the existing infrastructure such as new surfacing or better lighting</p> <p>There will be space for allotments on site as part of the 24 hectares of greenspace.</p> <p>New development should be located where there is access to new and existing services, facilities and infrastructure. The development of Ordsall South will provide the opportunity to provide new and enhance existing public transport infrastructure. This will include the provision of enhanced bus services to and from the site to Retford Town Centre.</p> <p>The Council has produced a detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the proposed Ordsall South development, as well as all relevant sites across the District. This assessment identifies the type and frequency of flooding and states the necessary type of mitigation required to help reduce the threat of flooding. For Ordsall South, the highest flooding risk occurs when high rainfall events result in water running off fields in to existing developments. The Flood Risk Assessment has indicated that new on-site water storage facilities will help reduce the risk of surface water run-off into both the new development and existing development in Ordsall. Onsite urban drainage systems are also required and these will likely form part of the development's Green Infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Council has also produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
			identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.
1858108	Resident	<p>I strongly object to the continuing inclusion of Site HS13 – Ordsall South in the Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) Draft Local Plan (Policy 29) I refer you to my comments submitted in January 2021 (REF178) when the proposal was for 800 houses. My objections from that earlier submission still stand. In addition, I add the following;</p> <p>Size and Scope of Development: The addition of a further 450 houses (an increase of 50%+) in the subsequent Plan Period takes the total allocation for Ordsall to 1,250 houses. I understand from BDC that there are currently 2,416 residential properties in East Retford South (aka Ordsall). An additional 1,250 houses effectively increases the size of Ordsall by over 50% This represents a huge expansion, both in terms of land surface development, but equally in the local population. The infrastructure and essential services required for the existing and future residents will be put under immense strain and I have no confidence that the mitigation measures outlined in revised Policy 29 are adequate to meet the needs of the expanded community of Ordsall. The revised Policy speaks of ‘at least 800’ by2037, with the additional 450 coming later. This is unacceptably vague, and could result in houses in excess of the 800 limited suggested as being the upper limit in the earlier Plan Period being exceeded. BDC need to firm up the timeline to avoid excessive development in the earlier Plan Period.</p> <p>Type: (Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan – Focused consultation June 2021 p.14/15) 7.14.5/6 More clarity is needed as to the exact numbers of houses to be built within the specified demographics.</p> <p>Density: It is disappointing to see the density across the site increased to 15-30 unites per ha. Careful consideration ought to be given to not repeating the errors of the recent past which see Ordsall residents opening their front doors onto the bonnets of their neighbours cars.</p> <p>Employment: “The site will have good access to a range of employment and other local services within the wider planned development and Retford itself.” (Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan –Focused consultation June 2021 p.14) No it does not. Nor does it provide satisfactorily functioning transport links to employment beyond the immediate vicinity, either onwards into Retford or beyond. There is a mismatch between the housing allocation for Retford / Ordsall and the employment allocation locally. Further, the employment allocation across the District is overly ambitious and unrealistic in its likelihood of delivering the anticipated numbers of jobs. If a more realistic approach were taken towards the employment allocation then it is likely that the housing allocation could, and arguably should, be</p>	<p>The delivery of the site will be subject to a masterplan and a phasing plan due to its scale. The density of the site will vary depending on particular areas. A higher density will be focused around the shops and services, whilst a lower density will be located around the edge of the development and around the country park.</p> <p>Access to employment across the District is generally undertaken by car. This largely due to the type of employment locally being close to the A1 and the rural nature of the District. The Site will need to provide a new bus serve to and from Retford Town Centre. Other services to the wider area may also be enhanced due to the volume of new residents.</p> <p>The Site will provide a significant level of community infrastructure such as a new primary school, a health centre, parks and green spaces and local shops and bus services. Their delivery will be phased alongside the development. New footpaths to connect the site to Ordsall will be provided so that people can also access the existing services within Ordsall Village.</p> <p>Due to the uplift in development, the Council has undertaken a revised Transport Assessment for Retford which details the local road and transport issues and identifies where new or enhanced road and transport infrastructure is required. Development is only required to mitigate against its impacts and will not necessarily fix existing problems.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>reduced accordingly.</p> <p>Social and Community facilities: BDC Sustainability Appraisal June 2021 states: “The allocation of this site may help to maintain and enhance existing community facilities and services as the site is within 800m of a post office, and the Local Centre of Welbeck Road, which could be used by new residents subject to capacity. The site is also partly within 2km of a primary and secondary school, and Retford Town Centre. In addition, development will be required to contribute towards healthcare provision and public realm improvements in Retford Town Centre.” It is immensely disappointing to see that the earlier proposal for public realm improvements to the Local Centre of Welbeck Rd, despite being acknowledged above as likely to be used by new residents (highlighted green), have been removed. Frustratingly, the contributions towards public realm improvements in Retford Town centre remain (highlighted Yellow). BDC ought to seek to ensure that the existing residents and users of the Welbeck Road Local Centre benefit from an appropriate uplift derived from the massive expansion of Ordsall South. The lag between the phased occupation of the proposed development and the establishment of its own Local centre will inevitably see an increase in the use of the Welbeck Road Local Centre. Parking in the immediate area is already inadequate and additional users from the Ordsall South development will likely add to this.</p> <p>The requirement to build a convenience store and other shops in the new Local Centre need to be conditioned as being required at an early stage of the development if the impact on the existing Local Centre is to be mitigated. The allocation of Land for Allotments is welcome but clarification is needed as to the long-term management and ownership of this facility. I note that ‘space’ for a Health Hub, ‘land’ for a two form primary School, and ‘space’ for a recycling ‘bring’ bank is included. These policy requirements are weakly worded and more robust conditions will be required to ensure delivery of the implied facilities. A clear time frame will be needed as at what the trigger point will be to initiate the delivery of the Primary School. The educational needs of the children moving into Ordsall South will need to be addressed as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Transport: Junction Improvements – Despite the misnaming of Whitehouses Rd as ‘Goosemoor Lane’ at the mini roundabout junction with London Rd at Whitehouses (Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan consultation June 2021 p18) the recognition that other routes aside from the A620 will be required to accommodate additional vehicle traffic is a positive improvement from the November 2020 proposals. However, the proposals are inadequate in both scope and detail. Village Traffic Management Schemes – More detail of what exactly is envisioned by ‘traffic management schemes’ for both Ordsall and Eaton villages is required.</p> <p>In regards to Ordsall, a comprehensive scheme to compete the inadequate footpath network will be required. In particular, both High Street and All Hallows Street fail to offer pedestrians a continuous, passable route along either side of the carriageway.</p> <p>I would suggest that through traffic travelling via Eaton Village be actively discouraged. An ‘village access only’ scheme will be needed to prevent traffic travelling into Ordsall South from the A638 (London Rd) from taking the short cut through Eaton village to join Ollerton Rd north of Jockey Lane.</p> <p>The effect of deterring motorists from using Old Ordsall and Eaton Villages will inevitable result in increased traffic along Ollerton/WestHill/Ordsall Rds to and from the A620. It is imperative that measures be put in place to mitigate the negative impact this will have on the health, wellbeing and safety of the residents of these roads.</p> <p>Public Transport - a 'frequent' bus service is included in the Plan. This ought to include a requirement to cover both early mornings and late evenings to ensure an adequate coverage of provision that enables users to use Public Transport outside of the principle service times.</p> <p>Cycle routes – Although a worthy and laudable ambition, the retrospective imposition of cycle routes onto already congested and narrow roads which are heavily relied upon by residents for parking is an inadequate measure. In</p>	<p>A network of new paths and cycle ways will be provided on site and connections to existing paths will also be made to help improve connectivity within the wider area.</p> <p>New and enhanced public transport provision will be required via the new local centre. The bus providers will identify which services can be enhanced or whether new services will need to be provided.</p> <p>The Council’s Transport assessment hasn’t identified issues with traffic flow on Jockey Lane and NCC have not raised any concerns related to this particular area.</p> <p>New flood prevention and drainage infrastructure will be provided on site via increased onsite water storage and via a substantial SUDS scheme</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>addition, the Policy suggests a route from Brecks Rd to Ordsall Primary School but nothing onwards towards Retford Railway Station or Retford Leisure Centre. The incomplete nature of the proposed scheme will result in an ineffective network that fails to interconnect people with the locations they wish to access.</p> <p>Access routes to the A1 – The route to and from the A1 via Jockey Lane and Brickyard Lane is inadequate and needs upgrading. This route needs to be identified as the primary route for access/egress to the site and its status as such ought to be made a Condition of any Planning Permission.</p> <p>Flooding: The recognition that the site currently functions as a natural sponge and is therefore an critical element in retaining rain water away from the drainage system protecting properties down stream in Retford is welcomed. The designation of areas of the watershed as waterlands is also welcome.</p>	
1858211	Resident	<p>I am writing register my objections to the proposed development. Firstly, I have concerns about the consultation process. The foreword of BDC's Statement of Community Involvement (2020) states that 'One of the Council's priorities is to ensure that everyone in Bassetlaw feels more involved in their local community, and in the decisions that affect their neighbourhoods'. The document also states that 'after consultation has closed, officers will assess all of the representations received and make any necessary/appropriate changes to the draft plan'. Despite, the objections raised to the proposed development of 800 houses (Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, Nov 2020) BDC has increased the proposed number of houses, by more than 50%, to 1250. This appears to be inconsistent with the community involvement priorities. Having looked at the draft plan I believe that the following have been underestimated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site's current contribution to recreation for residents as an open space • The site's current landscape value • The site's current value in relation to biodiversity • The site's contribution to green infrastructure • Sewerage and drainage issues • Highways safety issues beyond the site, but within Ordsall and neighbouring areas <p>OPEN SPACE The site provides a countryside setting, with access opportunities for local residents. The part of the site to the east of Ollerton Road is bordered and intersected by approximately 1 km of public footpaths which currently have panoramic views of the open countryside to either or both sides. The footpaths are extremely well used and appreciated by large numbers of residents and visitors for taking walks for recreation, health, and well-being. These form part of a wider network of longer walks between Ordsall and Eaton. Parts of the walks which fall within the sites are accessible and easy to negotiate by all, including those with limited health and mobility; these walks also feel safe. More consideration should be given to: a) how the existing footpaths would be protected; and b) the loss of amenity that would be caused if footpaths were not protected.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE VALUE I believe that the landscape value and sensitivity of the site has been underestimated. The proposed development undermines the landscape and natural environment, which is highly valued and appreciated by existing residents.</p> <p>BIODIVERSITY The site has not been appropriately surveyed in relation to important species and habitats. It has fallen within a proposed European Special Protection Area which is home to breeding populations of nightjars, woodlarks and honey buzzards. This should be carefully considered, especially as the British Trust for Ornithology has recorded buzzards on or very near the area of the site to the east of Ollerton Rd. I and/or other members of the community have seen the following species on and around this part of the site: Barn owls; tawny owls*; skylarks; corncrakes</p>	<p>During the past year, the Council has made every effort to engage with the community during these difficult times. Although we couldn't hold public events in person, the Council has held online events, leafleted the area and had a dedicated phone line to the team for people to ask questions. We have also held recent focused consultations for Ordsall South where the community could input to the changes proposed to the policy.</p> <p>All existing footpaths will be retained. However, it maybe that some are moved or redirected depending on the layout of the scheme.</p> <p>Due to its edge of settlement location, the development at Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality. The design of the scheme will be led by a masterplan. This plan will provide a detail on how the layout and density of the scheme responds to the existing landscape features in the area. The details of a masterplan will need to be agreed by the Council.</p> <p>All major development must provide, at least, a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The existing land at Ordsall South is currently utilised for intense agricultural purposes and therefore less supportive for wildlife habitats. The new development is proposed to deliver a significant level of green infrastructure, such as new trees, green space and a country park, which will</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>(occasional visitors); house martins; buzzards*; kestrels; hawks; bees; damsel flies; dragonflies; grasshoppers; butterflies and moths (many varieties); deer; foxes; hedgehogs; (large) bats; newts*; toads; and frogs (NB * denotes sightings reported by others). I have seen species, other than those listed above, very close to site (e.g. herons and kingfishers at the river, approximately 300 metres from site H5). In addition, I have seen what may be water voles' burrows in the banks of the dyke/spring which is within the part of the site to the south of Ollerton Rd. The above species were all listed in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan for Nottinghamshire, prepared by Action for Wildlife in Nottinghamshire/ Nottinghamshire County Council. I believe bats and water voles are protected by additional legislation. An ecological survey for the above species, and for associated species which might reasonably be expected to cohabit with these, undertaken prior to allocation for development, may identify constraints which are significant enough to prevent development. I believe such a survey should include important areas adjacent to the sites, in particular, Marsh Lane (E. Retford FP 64) to the south, which may be impacted by 'edge effects' of any development. (NB Marsh Lane is a track bordered on two sides by large, ancient hedgerows in good condition and containing standard trees).</p> <p>GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE I consider that the site's importance in relation to Green Infrastructure has been underestimated: a) in terms of its existing features, which require protection; and b) potentially, in terms of design consideration, should allocation go ahead. Footpaths, hedgerows and water courses form an important part of a Green Infrastructure; the site contains these features (NB The species-rich natural spring/dyke within the part of the site to the east of Ollerton Rd is particularly noteworthy). It is important to note that part of the site is very close to the major green network corridor along the River Idle. Greater consideration of the above issues, in conjunction with the issues identified in the preceding sections (Landscape and Biodiversity), could show that the proposed development is likely to detract from or result in significant loss of Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE I have concerns regarding the current sewerage system's ability to cope with the additional foul water which would be generated from development. I understand that prior to development, Severn Trent would be consulted to determine whether development would result in additional necessary upgrading of the existing sewerage system. I also understand that there have previously been problems with build up of sewerage at the Goosemoor pumping station. A water cycle study commissioned by BDC in 2010 states: "There are known internal and external flooding problems downstream of South Retford...Where possible, it is recommended that housing and employment growth should be located at the downstream end of the wastewater network serving the town of village, thereby minimising the need to upgrade the existing network upstream and allowing connections to the larger pipes discharging to the Wastewater Treatment Works." It may prove impracticable to upgrade existing sewerage infrastructure sufficiently to accommodate development.</p> <p>• SUDS I have additional concerns regarding drainage/water run-off from the sites. There are sink holes and natural springs on the sites. The fields become waterlogged after heavy rain.</p> <p>HIGHWAYS SAFETY ISSUES BEYOND THE SITES Ordsall (East Retford South) has already seen significant housing growth in recent years. Little, if any, corresponding infrastructure development or traffic calming measures have taken place to accommodate the resulting increase in traffic. The road (and pavement) infrastructure in and around Ordsall was not designed to cope safely and efficiently with the current volume of traffic, let alone with the increase which would inevitably occur with the building of 1250 more houses. Ordsall residents have very strong concerns about the potential increase in road safety issues, especially for mobility scooter users and cyclists, and for pedestrians in areas where pavements are narrow or</p>	<p>provide space for wildlife enhancement and greater biodiversity than currently present.</p> <p>New and enhanced sewage and drainage infrastructure will be put in place as part of the development. Wider flood and surface water prevention measures will also form part of the design of the development. A drainage strategy is required as part of the development of the site.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>nonexistent. The Council's highways engineers should give greater consideration to these areas, which are beyond the proposed sites, but which may be impacted by their development. The areas of particular concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goosemoor Lane Bridge <p>Even though the bridge has been altered, it is inadequate for today's traffic. The carriageway is too narrow for vehicles to pass safely, with restricted views of oncoming vehicles when approaching from All Hallows Street and Goosemoor Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High St <p>As residents park on High St, it is effectively a single-lane road along much of its length. This leads to difficult driving conditions in both directions, and the road seems to be unsuitable for increased volumes of traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellbeck Rd Shops <p>This area is frequently congested, with vehicles parked on pavements on Welbeck Rd, Ollerton Rd, and Wharncliffe Rd. Additional safety issues are created by this area being a bus route and also an HGV route to the West Carr Rd industrial estate. Vehicles reversing onto Ollerton Rd can also be a hazard. Further housing development in Ordsall would lead to increased vehicle activity in this already congested area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westhill Rd <p>At the beginning and end of the school day, the main road in and out of Ordsall (West Hill Rd) is reduced to single-line traffic due to parked cars. This is a difficult road to negotiate at these times, and the problems would be likely to become more acute if traffic volumes increased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Carr Rd <p>The main concerns on this road are the railway bridges, one of which has a blind summit with narrow pavements. Quite high volumes of traffic use this road, including commercial vehicles using the industrial estate. This route is used by pedestrians (school children) in the mornings and afternoons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eaton <p>The development would lead to a significant increase of the road through Eaton Village. The bridge, in particular, would be inadequate for the traffic volume</p>	
1858219	Resident	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed housing allocation HS13.</p> <p>I believe that the following have been underestimated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The sites' current contribution to recreation for residents as an open space · The sites' current landscape value · The sites' sensitivity to biodiversity · The sites' contribution to Green Infrastructure · The sites' agricultural value · Sewerage and drainage issues · Highways safety issues · Process <p>OPEN SPACE:</p> <p>Open space adjacent to Lansdown Drive and Glen Eagles Way fit the definition of 'open space' and should therefore be protected. The sites are bordered and intersected by over 1 kilometre of public footpaths which currently have panoramic views of the open countryside to either or both sides. The footpaths are extremely well used and appreciated by large numbers of residents and visitors for taking walks for recreation, health, and wellbeing. These form part of a wider network of longer walks between Ordsall and surrounding areas. Parts of the walks which fall within the sites are accessible and easy to negotiate by all, including those with limited health and mobility; these walks also feel safe.</p> <p>Rights of way and other footpaths. Further detail is required regarding: a) how the existing footpaths would be protected; or b) the loss of amenity that would be caused if footpaths were not protected. On the Nottinghamshire County Council definitive map, showing public rights of way, the footpath called "East Retford FP 2" crosses the sites in a south easterly direction from High St, via Southgate, towards Marsh Lane ("East Retford FP 64"). This right of</p>	<p>Due to its location, the development at Ordsall South will need to be carefully designed so that it doesn't have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment which details the local and important landscape features (such as views, trees, watercourses and topography) and provides recommendations on how to restore, reinforce, create or conserve the areas landscape quality. All existing footpaths will be retained. However, it maybe that some are moved or redirected depending on the layout of the scheme.</p> <p>The site has been assessed for its biodiversity importance through the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitat Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>When looking for land to allocate for development, the Council priorities the use of brownfield and has allocated a number of brownfield sites across the District. However, there is not enough brownfield land to accommodate the proposed level of growth and therefore some greenfield land is needed.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>way is well established and cannot be rerouted without greatly reducing the public amenity it provides in its current form. Also, the public right of way known as "East Retford FP 3" runs due south from High St before turning southwest. This footpath currently avoids traffic for its entire length, but would be bisected by roads which pedestrians would have to cross if the development is permitted. This would have a detrimental impact on the public amenity it currently provides.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE VALUE: The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment states that “The land is in a less sensitive Landscape Character Area than other potential sites around Retford as identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment”. This statement seems to ignore the inherent qualities of sites HS13. However, ‘less’ is a relative term, and the statement therefore suggests that the sites are in a sensitive landscape.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY: It would appear that the importance of site HS13 has not been fully appreciated with regard to wildlife. HS13 fell within the proposed European Special Protection Area (SPA). This proposed SPA is home to breeding populations of nightjars, woodlarks and honey buzzards. This should be considered, especially as the British Trust for Ornithology recorded buzzards on or very near site HS13 I and/or other members of the community have seen the following species on and around sites HS13 on many occasions: Barn owls; tawny owls*; skylarks; corncrakes (occasional visitors); house martins; buzzards*; kestrels; hawks; bees; damsel flies; dragonflies; grasshoppers; butterflies and moths (many varieties); deer; foxes; hedgehogs; (large) bats; newts*; toads; and frogs (NB * denotes sightings reported by others). I have seen species, other than those listed above, very close to site HS13 (e.g. herons and kingfishers at the river, approximately 300 metres from Lansdown Drive). In addition, I have seen what may be water voles’ burrows in the banks of the dyke/spring which runs along the boundaries of HS13. The above species have all been listed in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan for Nottinghamshire, (List of Species of Conservation Concern in Nottinghamshire), prepared by Action for Wildlife in Nottinghamshire/ Nottinghamshire County Council. I believe bats and water voles are protected by additional legislation. An ecological survey for the above species, and for associated species which might reasonably be expected to cohabit with these, undertaken prior to allocation for development, may identify constraints which are significant enough to prevent development. Such a survey should include important areas adjacent to the sites, in particular, Marsh Lane to the south, which may be impacted by ‘edge effects’ of any development. (NB Marsh Lane is a track bordered on two sides by large, ancient hedgerows in good condition and containing standard trees). A Section 106 Agreement could enable adoption of the buffer strips and walkways as habitats in public ownership to be managed and improved for wildlife with hedgerow maintenance and restoration etc. There would be potential opportunity for partnership involvement with members of the local community and wildlife and countryside organisations.</p> <p>Footpaths, hedgerows and water courses form an important part of a Green Infrastructure. The previous Landscape Character Assessment, and my own observations, confirm that HS13 contains these features (NB The species-rich natural spring/dyke along the boundary adjacent to the side of Lansdown Drive is particularly noteworthy). NB “Green infrastructure provision occurring near to existing nodes or corridors should consider how they connect to district-wide network and/or the possibility of enhancing these instead of making on-site provision.” This is particularly relevant to HS13 as it is very close (approximately 300 metres) to the major green network corridor along the River Idle. Development is likely to detract from or result in significant loss of Green Infrastructure. NB Stating that there will be "a net gain in biodiversity of 10%" does not take in to account the destruction of the breeding and feeding grounds and the mixed flora and fauna as mentioned above.</p> <p>AGRICULTURAL VALUE: Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper (November 2011) states: “PPS7 recommends that the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land (i.e. grades 1, 2 and 3a) should be avoided but where development of agricultural land is unavoidable it should be focused on grades 3b, 4 and 5, which are seen as</p>	<p>Any impacts on sewage and drainage will be mitigated as part of the development, The Council is continuing to work with the water providers to make sure the necessary infrastructure is provided to accommodate the development.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Transport Assessment which assessed both the existing traffic flows on the road network around Retford and the impact that the proposed new development would have on these. The existing traffic flows were assessed during the peak times of the day and outside of school holidays to provide a most accurate baseline. The assessment identified a number of roads and junctions that would be adversely impacted by the additional traffic and has proposed mitigation to certain areas. The Transport Assessment identifies that Eaton will likely see a small rise in traffic volume as a result of the proposed development at Ordsall South, but that this impact can be mitigated through the introduction of traffic calming and prevention measures. The Transport Assessment details the type of measures proposed for Eaton and other areas of concern. Where the proposed development has a direct adverse impact, the development will implement the required mitigation schemes. Where development has an indirect adverse impact, then financial contributions will be sought to help contribute towards wider improvement schemes.</p> <p>The Local Plan has gone through various stages of public consultation since 2016. More recent consultations related to Ordsall has largely been during COVID-19 so there was limited means of attending local public events. The Council undertook various methods to engage locally, including leaflets, posters and Teams Meeting. Several of these were held and there was plenty of opportunity for people to attend. Not all were fully booked and if there were the demand then additional ones could have been provided. Other material was available on the website and there was a phone number for people to ring if they wanted more information or items posted to them during the consultation process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>being of poorer quality. The information is not available to differentiate between grades 3a and 3b in Bassetlaw. Consequently, this assessment will consider all grade 3 sites as being of the same quality unless evidence to make this distinction is provided. Sites will be assessed against the following impacts: No impact on agricultural land - Green Impact on grade 3, 4 or 5 agricultural land - Amber Impact on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land – Red” (Policy 2.32) The above policy effectively downgrades any Grade 3a land to Grade 3b, thus downgrading 3a from ‘Red’ to ‘Amber’. However, a study was subsequently commissioned, by BDC, from LDC Agricultural: Land Classification at Retford Site B, October 2013. This study deemed sites parts of HS13 to be predominantly Grade 2 and 3a (Grade 2:1.7ha (11%), Grade 3a: 12.5ha (85%), and 3b: 0.6ha (4%). Has BDC commissioned an ecological survey as well as a soil survey? However, I am pleased that 96% fall within the highest protection bracket suggested by national policy (PPS7). Despite PPS7 recommending that grades 1, 2, and 3a are afforded equal status, BDC now makes a policy distinction between Grades 2 and 3a, protecting Grade 2 sites elsewhere and allocating (predominantly) Grade 3a sites, sections of HS13, for development. I do not agree with this distinction between 2 and 3a, as it deviates from PPS7. In addition, the sites are eleven percent Grade 2 and warrant protection, even applying BDC’s less stringent criterion. It is important to note that the Grade 2 area all falls within the Lansdown side of HS13. The proportion of this site which is Grade 2 is therefore far greater than eleven percent. The sites’ development, through ‘logical extension’ could lead to further loss of agricultural land in the future, has consultation with Natural England, under Schedule 5 of the Development Management Procedure Order, been carried out?</p> <p>SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE: There are concerns regarding the current sewerage system’s ability to cope with the additional foul water which would be generated from the development. I understand from Severn Trent that there have previously been problems with build up of sewerage at the Goosemoor pumping station. A water cycle study commissioned by BDC in 2010 states: “There are known internal and external flooding problems downstream of South Retford...Where possible, it is recommended that housing and employment growth should be located at the downstream end of the wastewater network serving the town or village, thereby minimising the need to upgrade the existing network upstream and allowing connections to the larger pipes discharging to the Wastewater Treatment Works." It may prove impracticable to upgrade existing sewerage infrastructure sufficiently to accommodate development of HS13. SUDS have additional concerns regarding drainage/water run-off from the sites. There are sink holes and natural springs on the sites. The fields become waterlogged after heavy rain, and tractors get stuck. I have noted that document Site Allocations Selection Process For the Preferred Options Site Allocations Consultation Document February 2014 Bassetlaw District Council states that a SUDS scheme will be required of any development as ‘greenfield run off rates must be maintained’</p> <p>HIGHWAYS SAFETY ISSUES: Ordsall (East Retford South) has already seen significant housing growth in recent years. Little, if any, corresponding infrastructure development or traffic calming measures have taken place to accommodate the resulting increase in traffic. The road (and pavement) infrastructure in and around Ordsall was not designed to cope safely and efficiently with the current volume of traffic, let alone with the increase which would inevitably occur with the building of 1250 more houses. Ordsall residents have very strong concerns about the potential increase in road safety issues, especially for mobility scooter users and cyclists, and for pedestrians in areas where pavements are narrow or non-existent. I would like the Council’s highways engineers to consider these areas, which are beyond the proposed sites, but which may be impacted by their development. The areas of particular concern include; Goosemoor Lane Bridge: Whilst some changes have been made, it is still inadequate for today’s traffic and is a precarious crossing for pedestrians, mobility scooter & wheelchair users & people with mobility issues or with pushchairs. The carriageway is still too narrow for vehicles to pass safely, with restricted views of oncoming vehicles when approaching from All Hallows Street and Goosemoor Lane. High Street: As residents park on High St, it is effectively a single-lane road along much of its length. This leads to difficult driving conditions in both directions, and the road seems to be unsuitable for increased</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>traffic volume. ·</p> <p>Eaton: Eaton village experiences, at times, high levels of traffic as it is the most convenient route from Ordsall to London Road/A1. An increase of 1250 houses would see a massive increase in vehicles using roads such as the one through Eaton. This is not sustainable.</p> <p>PROCESS</p> <p>Having consulted with many Ordsall residents, the feedback was that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • having responded previously, they did not realise that they had to respond again- particularly as they may well be repeating themselves • being in the older age group, they were not comfortable using the internet for such complex issues • having tried several times to attend The Zoom meetings , they had simply given up trying. The reason for being unable to attend was that numbers were capped at approximately 12 residents. Considering that Zoom can host a minimum of 100 people, the cap appears to have excluded many residents • the number of papers, policies and plans which are expected to be cross referenced in relation to Local Plan Policy 29:Site HS13: Ordsall South, Retford is overwhelming eg ST6, ST11, ST14,ST15, ST54, ST56, ST58, ST60, Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020, Retford-Eaton Green Gap: Policy ST40, Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Evidence Base, to name but a few • the use of jargon, and unclear language, disempowers residents from understanding what is meant eg open book viability assessment, housing delivery is not expected to start on the wider site until at least 2027, green buffer, multifunctional green/blue infrastructure network, dual roundabout access to the wider site etc • whilst it is acknowledged that there have been some restrictions as a result of the Coronavirus epidemic, the lack of specific detail ie exact location of the planned roundabout, exact locations of the houses, expected start and finish dates of specific building works in specific areas of HS13 etc is not a result of the epidemic • the animation provided by an external organisation is both useless and patronising eg most people do not need a photograph labelled "a tree lined road". The images are not necessarily what will be crated on HS13, therefor they are misleading. The fact that the council distances itself from the animation also indicates that it is of no real value. <p>BDC STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:</p> <p>Foreword</p> <p>One of the Council's priorities is to ensure that everyone in Bassetlaw feels more involved in their local community, and in the decisions that affect their neighbourhoods, particularly by making sure that residents and businesses have a greater role in the policies and actions taken by the Council itself.</p> <p>Planning policies, neighbourhood plans and the decisions on individual planning applications, play a vital role in shaping the District and ensuring all residents enjoy a good and improving quality of life. Not only is it right that all those affected should have a say, but the comments and information the Council gets back can often help improve the outcome.</p> <p>1.2 The specific benefits of involving a wide range of people and organisations in the planning process include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More focus on priorities identified by the community; • Influencing the provision of local services; • An enhanced sense of the community contributing to the wider community; • Capturing local knowledge in order to achieve the right development in the right place; • Increased understanding of planning procedures and how policy is developed; and • Increased efficiency, helping resolve conflicts earlier in the process. 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>FOLLOWING THE FIRST CONSULTATION, THE COUNCIL IGNORED THE MANY OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED BUILDING OF 800 HOUSES, AND INCREASED THE NUMBER OF HOUSES FROM 800 TO 1250 (AN INCREASE OF OVER 50%).</p> <p>I refer you to the STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT above!</p> <p>NB The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Focussed Consultation June 2021- Comment Form is not user friendly. It does not keep the formatting, and is hard to edit. Once again disempowering the user.</p>	
REF053	Nottinghamshire County Council- Planning Policy Team	<p>COMMENTS RELATE TO THE ORDSALL SOUTH PRELIMINARY CONCEPT PLAN</p> <p>Thank you for your email dated 9th June 2021 requesting strategic planning observations on the preliminary Ordsall South Concept Plan, which is one of three documents published as part of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan. I have consulted with the relevant colleagues who have the below comments to make on this document.</p> <p>Education</p> <p>As indicated within the Bassetlaw Local Plan Focussed Consultation document response, the development of 1250 dwellings on this site, as referred to under Policy 29 Site HS13, would generate sufficient primary pupil demand for this development to sustain a one form entry (210 place) primary school, based on pupil yield formula. Any new primary school should be accompanied with relevant nursery provision; for a one form entry primary school this would be a 26-place nursery. The County Council would require the developer to be responsible for funding this provision in its entirety; the estimated cost based on current DfE information is £4,936,648 (236 places x £20,918 per place). The delivery of a school on this site would be subject to the relevant DfE approval process at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>The County Council does not have any comments to make on the proposed concept plan for the proposed allocated site at Ordsall South in relation to minerals and waste.</p> <p>As highlighted in the NCC policy response to the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (published November 2020), this proposed allocation site (Policy 29: HS13) 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.</p> <p>Strategic Highways</p> <p>As highlighted in the response to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Focussed Consultation document, Roundabouts are proposed to serve the site. The Highway Authority has had sight of the draft Retford Transport Assessment 2021 (RTA) being prepared in support of the allocation of sites in Retford, albeit for 800 dwellings on this site rather than the 1250 now included in the consultation. Comments have been provided with respect the content of the RTA separately. The RTA confirms that the roundabouts will have a 40m ICD. On balance that would be a reasonable choice of junction arrangement. However, there is no junction capacity assessment to demonstrate that the junctions would operate within capacity. Furthermore, the land available for the southern of the two roundabouts has necessitated the sharpening of the bend to the south of the boundary of the site and a tortuous northern junction exit as the roundabout is offset westwards from the Ollerton Road centreline due to land not being available on the east side. It must be demonstrated that this layout could be achieved in accordance with geometric standards. The acceptability of the proposed roundabouts is therefore not certain.</p> <p>The western parcel of land benefits from a junction with both proposed roundabouts. This could provide a convenient bus route through the site. However, the eastern parcel would only have one junction with Ollerton Road. Bus operators are generally reluctant to enter cul-de-sacs as this often necessitates a need to track back. Therefore, to facilitate a bus serving, the internal layout must be designed as a loop that picks up as much of the site as possible and which minimises the need to cover the same streets twice when returning to the wider road network. This should be reflected on the Ordsall Concept Plan Vision.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would expect an outline planning application to be supported by a Transport Assessment (TA). This must identify each junction that would experience capacity issues and propose a suitable scheme of mitigation. The agreed mitigation measures should then be secured by planning condition rather than financial</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your recommendations for the Policy and the site have been included within our revised Local Plan where necessary.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South			
		<p>contribution. Whilst the RTA goes some way to demonstrate which junctions may have capacity issues following the development of 800 dwellings, this does not demonstrate how these capacity issues could be addressed. There therefore remains uncertainty as to whether the wider highway network could be suitably improved to address capacity issues should this site come forward, particularly as there could be another 450 dwellings above those currently included in the RTA.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Eaton is unlikely to be subjected to such an increase in traffic that would then raise highway network capacity concerns. However, the route through the village is not considered appropriate for a material increase in traffic. Main Road is a single carriageway with limited footway provision and limited street lighting. Main Road is also narrow in places with reduced visibility. Furthermore, the existing bridge over the River Idle is only wide enough for one-way vehicular traffic. It therefore may be appropriate to seek a financial contribution in this instance towards measures to deter traffic from using Main Road as a through route and to discourage vehicle speed. It is likely that the introduction of any measures would be best done following engagement with the local community.</p> <p>Transport and Travel Services</p> <p>The development should be designed to facilitate bus access. The Preliminary Concept Plan includes a primary bus served road, a secondary road, the nearest bus stop, and includes the location of a potential bus stop and 400 metre access radii.</p> <p>Transport & Travel Services require new bus stop infrastructure to be installed on the bus served spine roads of the development through Section 38 and Section 278 agreements where appropriate.</p> <p>This includes the below standards at all bus stops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real time bus stop pole & displays including associated electrical connections • Polycarbonate bus shelter • Solar lighting • Raised boarding kerbs • Enforceable bus stop clearway • Additional hard stand (if required) <p>Transport & Travel Services request that the proposed new bus stop locations and accessibility isochrones meeting Nottinghamshire Design Guidelines (part 3.1) are marked on all relevant plans going forward. The provision of detailed bus stop locations will mean that this information is in the public domain for comment from adjacent properties / prospective buyers, and therefore avoiding objections from residents about the location for new bus stop infrastructure.</p> <p>Until the spine loop road is completed, temporary bus turning facilities should be provided to support bus access to each phase of development. Transport & Travel Services request that any bus service and bus stop infrastructure are introduced throughout the build-out phases of the development to allow residents and employees to access public transport as early as possible, to help increase sustainability and reduce the use of the private car.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage			
REF015	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent are supportive of the importance placed on Flood risk and Drainage, we would however also recommend that this section references the Drainage Hierarchy, the utilisation of this hierarchy ensures that surface water is discharged to the most sustainable outfall, mitigating the impacts of surface water on the sewerage network which has a limited capacity. This approach is also more adaptable to the impacts of climate change reducing the risk of flooding in the future.</p> <p>It is however noted that policy ST54 part c bullet point 5 identifies the need to prevent surface water discharging into the sewer, we are supportive of this approach being outlined within Policy 54 we are also supportive of point 6 regarding the use of SuDS and that SuDS should be design to do more than just store water, we are also supportive of point 7 highlighting the need to utilise sustainable outfalls.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>The District contains the Trent Valley and land surrounding the rivers Idle, Ryton, Meden, Maun and Poulter. It lies within the Humber River Basin District (as defined for the Water Framework Directive) and its catchments are covered by the Trent and Don Catchment Flood Management Plans. These recommend that opportunities should be investigated for storage or reduced conveyance upstream of urban areas; such as locations identified where flood attenuation ponds or wetlands could be developed with associated habitat improvement; returning watercourses to a more natural state; and resisting development which may adversely affect the flood management capabilities of green infrastructure. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and developers to support the priorities of these plans, such as within the River Ryton Catchment for Worksop, where the Environment Agency are investigating the potential for a wider flood management scheme to help reduce the risk of flooding within Worksop and Worksop Central. A Flood Management Impact Zone at Worksop has been identified to combat the flooding issue of the Ryton, a tributary of the River Idle. This is good, but Retford too needs a similar Zone and Plan to deal with the recurring flood issues that houses and businesses face in Retford. The Plan currently suggests that SuDS will mitigate the Ordsall South. in the last 12 years the Idle basin around Retford has suffered repeated flooding - some of it as a likely consequence of extensive new build work off London Road – it is time that the BDC Plan promises a similar Plan for Ordsall South and Retford, and it must include the designed re-creation of lakes and wetlands in the Ordsall area and also in the riverside areas around Retford - not just the casual ones that now seem to occur every time it rains heavily for a few days.</p>	<p>The Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has not identified the need for additional storage capacity around Retford. However, the Environment Agency are currently updating the river modelling to the River Idle and Retford Beck which likely to be released in 2022.</p> <p>Ordsall South has to provide mitigation on site through flood storage capacity and SUDS scheme. This will help reduce on site and off surface water runoff and water pooling in the area. This is the advice from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency.</p>
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we’re really pleased to see “blue-green Infrastructure” referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just “green infrastructure”. We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood Risk and Drainage. 10.3.10 – “...including integration with green infrastructure...” Flood Risk and Drainage. 10.3.11 – “....flood management capabilities of green infrastructure” Policy ST54. C. 6) – “Maximise environmental gain through enhancing the green infrastructure....” <p>10.3.7: Whilst we fully support the reference to the climate change allowances (2019), we’d like to take this opportunity to highlight that, in a couple of days’ time, we’ll be releasing new guidance on climate change allowances and so this text will likely need updating to reflect the newer 2021 guidance.</p> <p>Policy ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage: We’d like to see the following amendments made to this Policy in order to increase the effectiveness, clarity and therefore soundness of the Policy;</p>	Thank you for your response. Your recommendations have been incorporated into the updated version of the Local Plan and evidence base where appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage			
		<p><i>POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage</i></p> <p><i>A. All development proposals are required to consider and, where necessary, address mitigate the effect impacts 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:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (where appropriate), to which demonstrates that the development, including the access and egress, will be safe for its lifetime, without increasing or exacerbating flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall;</i> <i>2. Demonstrate that they pass the Sequential Test and if necessary the Exceptions Test in Flood Zones 2 and 3;</i> <i>3. Ensure that where land is required to manage flood risk, it is safeguarded from development.</i> <p><i>River Ryton Flood Management Impact Zone</i></p> <p><i>B. All developments within the River Ryton Flood Management Impact Zone, as identified on the Policies Map, will need to demonstrate that they will not prejudice the delivery of a future flood management scheme for the River Ryton catchment. Applicants will need to evidence that prior engagement has taken place with relevant authorities as part of their design and access statements.</i></p> <p><i>Surface Water Flood Risk</i></p> <p><i>C. Developments (where appropriate) should positively contribute to reducing flood risk. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should be incorporated in line with national standards, and should:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Be informed by the Lead Local Flood Authority, Sewerage Company and relevant drainage board;</i> <i>2. Have appropriate minimum operational standards;</i> <i>3. Be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy;</i> <i>4. Have management and maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation and management for the lifetime of the development;</i> <i>5. Prevent surface water discharge into the sewerage system;</i> <i>6. Maximise environmental gain through enhancing the blue-green infrastructure network, including urban greening measures, securing biodiversity gain providing a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain where possible, and securing amenity benefits along with flood storage volumes;</i> <i>7. Seek to reduce runoff rates in areas at risk from surface water flooding, and that any surface water is directed to sustainable outfalls.</i> <p>In terms of Biodiversity Net Gain, it's our opinion that the Bassetlaw Local Plan should be encouraging/requiring new 'major' developments to deliver a minimum Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% where possible. This can be measured by the Local Planning Authority using the latest version of the Biodiversity Metric Tool. We all know that a requirement to deliver a minimum 10% net gain is likely to be mandated in the forthcoming Environment Bill, so this Plan is the perfect opportunity to get ahead of the curve and catapult Bassetlaw to the forefront of delivery. Even if the measure is not subsequently mandated, we'd still encourage you to include this requirement in Policy as it aligns perfectly with some of the strategic objectives of the Plan in terms of environmental betterment and the desire to create a quality place to work and live.</p>	
REF071	Rotherham MB Council	Focussed Local Plan para. 10.3.7 - "By making an allowance for climate change, it will help reduce the vulnerability of the development and provide resilience to flooding in the future.". It is unclear what this is referring to.	This reference refers to the need to apply a 'climate change' allowance on top of the current modelling to allow for the increasing adverse impact to flooding from climatic events. This is now required by national planning guidance on Flood Risk Assessments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage			
1849104	BDC Councillor	Area HS13 Ordsall South C.5. Prevent surface water discharge into the sewerage system by using the surface water in a grey water scheme in the dwellings. The benefits that if used for toilet flushing, a well designed and fully functional grey water system could potentially save a third of the mains water used in the home. Grey water can also be used for garden watering. The greater the proportion of grey water used, the less mains water will be needed which will ease the pressure on water resources	Thank you for your comments.
REF052	Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the document Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, June 2021. No site-specific information has been submitted as part of POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage, therefore we have made some general comments on the information that we would expect see when the specific applications are submitted for approval.</p> <p>Given the proposed scale of the development to satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) further details would need to be submitted to support this application. Paragraph 163 fn.50 of the NPPF requires that applications in Flood Zone 2, 3 and in Flood Zone 1 over 1 hectare should be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment, reviewing the potential flood risks to the development from all sources. An FRA is vital if the local planning authority is to make an informed planning decision.</p> <p>As LLFA we also require details of the proposed surface water drainage strategy for the development. Paragraph 165 of the NPPF states that major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The LLFA advise that any proposed drainage strategy should be in accordance with CIRIA C753 and current best practice guidance. Any FRA or drainage strategy should include following information:</p> <p>With regards to acceptable surface water management schemes for the sites identified within this draft plan we would offer the following comments and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of a proven outfall from site in accordance with the drainage hierarchy the follows options should be considered, in order of preference; infiltration, discharge to watercourse, discharge to surface water sewer or discharge to combined sewer. • Justification should always be provided for the use or not of infiltration, including the results of soakaway testing, in accordance with BRE 365. • The maximum discharge should be set to the QBar Greenfield run-off rate for the positively drained area of development. • The site drainage system should cater for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100-year event including a 40% allowance for climate change. • For all exceedance to be contained within the site boundary without flooding any properties in a 1 in 100year+CC storm. • SuDS systems should be incorporated into the surface water management scheme for the site, preference should be given to above ground SuDS which provide multi-functional benefits. • Details of who will manage and maintain all drainage features for the lifetime of the development will be required prior to construction. <p>This is only a brief outline of the minimum information we would be expecting to see and not an exhaustive list. There are towns and villages within Bassetlaw that are subject to a considerable</p>	Thank you for your response. Your recommendations have been incorporated into the updated version of the Local Plan and evidence base where appropriate.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST54: Flood Risk and Drainage			
		<p>flood risk with significant flood events having occurred in recent memory. Any schemes proposed in those areas will be expected to address those risks through site-specific flood risk assessments and drainage strategies. We would also expect that any proposed schemes take note and work with any ongoing flood mitigation schemes in those areas.</p> <p>Informative</p> <p>1. SuDS involve a range of techniques and SuDS methods can be implemented on all sites. SuDS are a requirement for all major development as set out within paragraph 165 of the NPPF.</p> <p>2. The LLFA does not consider oversized pipes or box culverts as sustainable drainage. Should infiltration not be feasible at the site, alternative sustainable drainage should be used, with a preference for above ground solutions.</p> <p>3. Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are an approach to managing surface water run-off which seeks to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on-site as opposed to traditional drainage approaches which involve piping water off-site as quickly as possible.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF029	BDC Councillor	<p>The Focussed Paper then sets out what has been envisaged (across the whole of Bassetlaw) with mention of the various detailed items that hold a particular relevance to Ordsall South and Retford. The threadbare 'Retford' element of it is very clear to see on page 25, where the fifteen identified highway improvements are listed; the first ten are valuable and helpful interventions in Worksop and elsewhere in Bassetlaw, the final two are traffic management schemes in Eaton and Old Ordsall, and a mere three then remain as proposals to resolve the issues of a huge housing estate arriving at the southern end of Ordsall. It's not good enough, it's not detailed enough, it's not substantial enough and if the Planners really believe that improving two mini-roundabouts and creating a new junction along with some painted bike lanes will satisfy either the existing residents or the thousands more who are set to live in Retford then they are mistaken. It's no good postulating that these matters will be resolved with future discussion (if it was so, then why have those essential 10 been listed?) - vital and essential Road and cycleway infrastructure will not happen unless the Plan states it now as a requirement, and if it cannot be listed as a requirement then the volume of houses proposed for Retford needs to be re-assessed. Make no mistake – it will be good to see Retford grow, but not in the unbalanced way that this Plan promises. How can it be that those who conceived the Plan for a 1000+ proposed development lying about 3 miles from a national trunk road cannot see the merit and necessity of a much improved quality link road to the development?</p>	<p>An updated version of the Bassetlaw and Retford Transport Assessments have now been finalised following recent consultation. These updates include an updated list of proposed mitigation require to implement the proposed growth in the Local Plan. The Retford Transport Assessment also includes the proportionality of mitigation from each of the affected developments. This helps identify the various costs associated with the scale of different developments. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan has also been updated to reflect the latest evidence.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF034	Highways England	<p>In January 2021 Highways England provided comments on the draft version of the Local Plan, with a housing target of 10,013 dwellings and a minimum of 168 ha of land allocated for employment. Considering the large scale of growth in close proximity to the SRN, we expressed the need for a robust transport evidence base to assess the traffic impacts and suitably inform the development of the infrastructure delivery plan. With regard to the current focussed consultation, our review of the Workso Central DPD notes that this aims to provide 660 dwellings by 2037, plus a mix of commercial, employment, and retail uses. The Workso Central area is however limited to the town centre and aspires to make use of underused, vacant and existing buildings and to meet local needs. Although impacts from development proposals in such a location may not have severe impacts on the SRN, we would expect that as these sites progress through the planning process, they be supported by Transport Assessments to ensure that the likely traffic impacts are appropriately assessed. From review of the Ordsall South strategic site which proposes to deliver 800 dwellings by 2037 (with an additional 450 thereafter), we note that this is located approximately 5km to the east of the A57 / A1 / Blyth Road junction (Apleyhead junction) at Upper Morton. We note that the Bassetlaw Transport Study which is being developed will demonstrate the impacts of the cumulative growth plans across the Local Plan area on the transport network and propose effective mitigation. Our particular area of concern is the operation of the A1 in the vicinity of Retford and Workso, as we note plans for Bassetlaw Garden Village, the proposed strategic employment site by the A1 Apleyhead junction at Upper Morton, and now the addition of Ordsall South. All of these sites are in close proximity to the A1. Therefore, as detailed in our Local Plan consultation response of 18 January 2021 we would expect the Bassetlaw Transport Study to provide a robust transport evidence base to consider the infrastructure improvements required.</p>	<p>The updated Bassetlaw Transport Assessment has included these changes and also assessed the cumulative impact of those development on the strategic and local road networks. It also provides mitigation options where necessary.</p>
REF043	Resident	<p>New and improved walking and cycling links: whilst identifying routes within the District's three main towns, potential links between them continue (except for Workso – Garden Village - Retford) to be omitted. Given the intended life-span of this Plan and to correspond with national, regional and county policies, at least some outline of identified desire lines for longer-distance routes linking the towns listed in Policy ST14 (page 10) should be identified. The Government's new Transport Decarbonisation Plan (page 58) anticipates "a world-class cycling and walking network in England by 2040"; NCC's Local Transport Plan v3 has a vision and implementation plan to link towns and district centres by cycle routes; and the D2N2 LEP's Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan [LCWIP] is based on corresponding proposals. In Bassetlaw, these routes should include (i) Workso – Carlton-in-Lindrick – Langold – Blyth – Harworth/Bawtry; (ii) Retford – Sutton-cum-Lound – Ranskill – Harworth/Bawtry; (iii) Retford – Tuxford; and (iv) Workso – Tuxford. The last can currently be achieved using National Cycle Routes 6 and 647, but these include on-road sections needing diversion and/or improvement. Elements of the above routes might then be delivered as and when opportunities arise and funding becomes available.</p>	<p>New development is only required to provide enhanced or new routes where they are necessary. These are most likely to connect the site to existing routes or to provide routes with a new development. Broader enhancements will likely need to come via external funding. These enhancements are considered aspirational and can be undertaken outside of the Local plan process.</p>
Quired to	Resident	<p>The report on cycling and walking in Retford is excellent, clearly identifying the current problems and the limited opportunities for their absolution. Hopefully the planned cycling and walking route between Tiln Lane and Bolham Lane via a slope west of the Linden Homes development in Tiln Lane will be pursued to completion and that other similar schemes will be implemented as and when possible. In particular the path immediately to the west of the River Idle between Bolham and Morrisons supermarket should be improved.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF050	Stone Planning Services	<p>This policy is supported, but we note it is not fully costed and there is no detailed Cost Plan that demonstrates how each element will be funded or the timeframe for delivery. We anticipate that delivery will be dependent on a cocktail of public and private funding, and we conclude there are serious doubts that many of these schemes will be delivered during the Plan Period. The list set out in the policy should be viewed as aspirational. It is noted that delivery on some of the Plan's Site Allocations is heavily dependent on the provision of the respective infrastructure. We consider the Council must also take advantage of its existing infrastructure and support development that can come forward quickly without major front loaded infrastructure investment. As you will be aware our client controls land at the A57/A1 junction. Employment Development can be brought forward here without delay. It is located on a strategically important communication route which will be attractive to inward investment and internal relocation. In our view the Council needs to be clear and confident on delivery of the ST56 Infrastructure and acknowledge that 'oven ready' strategic sites are available and should be supported.</p>	<p>The proposed costs, funding strategy and delivery is included within the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan which has been updated to reflect the latest evidence.</p>
REF052	NCC – Planning Policy Team	<p><u>Strategic Highways</u></p> <p>Paragraph 11.1.6- The County Council will require planning applications to be supported by a Travel Plan, Transport Statement or Transport Assessment dependent on the scale and kind of development. This may not be necessary for the smaller sites <50 dwellings.</p> <p>In most cases the County Council will require highway infrastructure to be secured by planning condition unless the infrastructure appears on the CIL Regulation 123 list.</p> <p><u>Transport and Travel</u></p> <p>The policy lists three areas for delivery: new highways schemes and improvements; bus corridors and improvements to reduce congestion and new routes and improvements to encourage walking and cycling and to reduce congestion. Transport and Travel Services note the identified bus corridors for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new east-west distributor road at HS1: Peaks Hill Farm; • new Ordsall South neighbourhood (east and west); • A new bus interchange at Bassetlaw Garden Village; • re-aligned B6420 Mansfield Road to service Bassetlaw Garden Village; and <p>View our privacy notice at www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/privacy</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council, County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7QP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A57 and into EM01: Apleyhead Junction to service the new employment area <p>National Bus Strategy - In spring 2021 the government published the National Bus Strategy - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bus-back-better. This includes an expectation that in cities and other congested places, there will be significantly more ambitious bus priority schemes, making services faster, more reliable, more attractive to passengers and cheaper to run. Local Transport Authorities will be expected to implement ambitious bus priority schemes and draw up</p>	<p>The need for Travel Plans, Transport Assessments etc... has been referenced within the Transport related Policies and the site specific policies where appropriate. The National Bus Strategy has been referenced within the supporting text to relevant policies.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
		<p>ambitious Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs). Statutory traffic management guidance will be updated to make promoting bus reliability an integral part of highway authorities' Network Management Duty.</p> <p>The aspirations of the National Bus Strategy including BSIPs and Enhanced Partnership Schemes, should be reflected in the public transport measures set out in the new Local Plan to support future growth. This includes the introduction of Demand Responsive Transport, with a government funded pilot scheme in rural Bassetlaw due to commence in 2022.</p>	
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ST56. A. 3. C) – "...and along green infrastructure corridors...." 	This has been included within the updated Local Plan.
REF062	National Trust	<p>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 increases, congestion and pollution. The surrounding area includes sensitive landscapes and ecology forming part of Sherwood Forest and the setting of Clumber Park Grade I Registered Historic Park and Gardens. The Sustainability Appraisal note acknowledges that 'further development of the highway network could be seen as encouraging and facilitating ongoing car use with the associated emissions', but states that 'the level of housing and employment development proposed through the Local Plan will inevitably require some improvements to the highway network in order to avoid congestion which would have adverse impacts in terms of creating and exacerbating pockets of poor air quality'. We urge the Council to consider whether the level of housing and employment growth proposed by the plan – which is not currently justified by identified need in the Local Plan evidence base – represents an unsustainable level of development. The Sustainability Appraisal goes on to state that 'the infrastructure improvements identified in the policy could also have negative effects on SA objectives 1: biodiversity and 13: cultural heritage'. The impacts on Clumber Park Site of Special Scientific Interest, Sherwood Forest ppSPA and the setting of Clumber Park are not yet fully understood and robust modelling of traffic increases including associated emissions is required.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be noted that an area of land to the south of the A57 corridor, close to the A1 junction, is owned by the National Trust. The land is 'inalienable'. Once the Trust has declared a piece of land inalienable, we cannot sell, give away or mortgage that land. Nor can the land be compulsorily acquired from the Trust against our will without a special procedure involving both Houses of Parliament. The National Trust would therefore welcome early consultation on any development or infrastructure proposals that have potential to impact on National Trust inalienable land.</p>	<p>Any significant road improvements to the A57 will need to be carefully planned. Due to the potential for the current capacity of the A57 around Worksop to become constrained, it is important to consider options on how to provide improvements in the most suitable way.</p> <p>The proposed Local Plan growth only forms a small part of increased traffic along this road. The majority of traffic is regional that travels between the A1 and the M1. The road has a large proportion of freight using it which can slow the flow of traffic and lead to congestion.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the Highways Authority and adjacent landowners on future proposals for the A57.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST56: Transport Infrastructure and Improvement			
REF071	Rotherham MB Council	The Council previously commented on this proposal and welcomes policy ST56 which sets out proposed transport improvements which will be important to improve the sustainability of this site given its remote location. Safe connectivity between this site and the proposed strategic employment land at Apleyhead junction will also be important for encouraging sustainable transport patterns, for biodiversity and to provide a good standard of living for future residents. Policy ST56 sets out that a new bus interchange and further collaboration with bus operators is planned to ensure quality service for Bassetlaw Garden Village. If the proposed new railway station and/or good bus services are not in place during initial occupation of dwellings, there is a risk that unsustainable travel patterns will be established by new residents before these amenities can be provided.	The Council will continue to work with its partners on delivering sustainable transport options for the Bassetlaw Garden Village and other allocations. The new railway station will be delivered through external funding with only small contributions from the first phase of the development. The rail station will have a broader benefit and is not only required to support the development of the Garden Village. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the delivery of this transport infrastructure will need to be phased over the longer term.
1859314	Resident	We can not currently maintain our current roads and transport infrastructure. It is an interesting concept to discover how the cost of this development and improvement, as well as existing repair will be funded. I am particularly interested to hear how the creation of green infrastructure, open spaces etc is going to be managed in relation to tackling the issues of illegal encampment.	Improvements to the roads and transport infrastructure will be delivered in two ways. The first is through Government or County Council investment and the second is through developer enhancements and contributions. Developments are only required to mitigate against the impact of that development, so in some cases, it doesn't mean providing a new road or fully improvement another. The developer of a scheme is required to undertake a transport assessment and travel plan to detail about what impacts that development will create and how that development will then mitigate those impacts.
1858983	Resident	11.1.1 Improving connectivity and the transport network is a key principle which will support the growth of the District. By facilitating the movement of people between their home, work, There is and will be need to get better bus services Worksop/Retford to all the employment hubs currently there is little to no buses from Retford to worksop so Retford people can access the worksop job market, I know lots of ppeople who just cannot get to jobs in Worksop because of lack of public transport	Thank you for your comments.
1858552	BDC Councillor	Page 25- I broadly welcome the Councils ambition in improving the road network. I particularly note the suggested improvements J,K,L,M,N,O as my constituents do raise these as issues on a regular basis. I would urge that if possible any development in road infrastructure take into account the needs of cyclists. Due to the topography of the District and the projected increase in battery supported bicycles I believe we do have an opportunity to take some cars off the road. I know many people would prefer to cycle but do to the speed limit and disrepair on the roads they lack the confidence to do so. Finally I strongly support the new station at the Green Village. This must be pushed for at the highest levels. This will allow this community to access well paid jobs across the District and also Sheffield/Lincoln. Please ensure that if the Village does go ahead this work is prioritised.	New cycle provision will form part of some highway improvements such as those in Ordsall, the Garden Village and Peaks Hill Farm. Additional enhancements to existing may also form part of contributions from development where appropriate or where opportunities exist.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST58: Safeguarded Land			
REF004	Canal & River Trust	<p>Having reviewed the areas subject to the Focused Consultation, the Trust wish to provide the following comments with regards to the proposed River Ryton Flood Management Impact Zone, which includes proposals for water storage. This is referred to in section 10 (e.g. 10.3.13) and within revised Policy ST58: Safeguarded Land.</p> <p>Policy ST58 has been amended to include the following safeguarded site:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6. Land between Shireoaks and Worksop to accommodate water storage as part of a wider Worksop Flood Management Scheme.</p> <p>The land set aside extends close to the Chesterfield Canal. Flood storage areas have the potential to result in erosion or the saturation of soils which could impact any existing canal supporting structures. In addition, existing sluices from the Canal are present in this location to accommodate water management upon the waterway. If these sluices are underwater, then there is a risk that Flood Risks from the canal itself could increase. Careful design management is required to ensure that the Flood Storage area proposed does not adversely impact the canal. This would include the need for sections to show the changes in flood water levels in relation to any supporting structures and detailed plans to confirm how any existing sluices will be affected. We anticipate that these matters would be explored further during the development of any future Flood Management Scheme, and are therefore comfortable that the principle of the safeguarded land shown. It may be best practice, however, if these matters are made clear to future designers and decision makers, to ensure that any final flood storage area design takes these matters into account. We therefore advise that the Local Planning Authority ensure that suitable mechanisms are in place, either through text in any ancillary documents or masterplans associated with the Flood Storage area or additional ancillary wording in the Local Plan, to ensure that impacts on the Canal are fully assessed.</p>	The detail of a flood management scheme within this area will be subject to consultation with relevant landowners and stakeholders at that time. The Council recognise the need to reduce the impacts from a scheme to nearby property, land and infrastructure.
REF016	Barton Willmore on behalf of Howard Retford Ltd	<p>Our client has reviewed the June 2021 focussed Consultation document subject to this consultation. The following comments are provided:</p> <p>At 7.14.14, we refer to our comments above in relation to the policies maps. The location of the school and health hub needs to be further discussed with the County Council. Whilst we agree that it needs to have the very best connectivity, this might be restricted by inclusion of the ‘safeguarded land’ part of the Council’s strategy. We believe that a criteria-based Policy in HS13 would be better.</p> <p>For the reason cited above, we do not see the need for part A, 7 of Policy ST58 and consider that the Council’s aspirations would be better served by including appropriate wording into Policy 29 and HS13 site specific requirements. (See Policy 29 for other comments)</p>	The identified land for the safeguarding of school facilities and buildings has now been removed from the policy and policies map and the policy now refers to the amount of land needed to provide the school so this provides more flexibility on where it is located on site.
REF052	NCC – Planning Policy Team	<p><u>Education</u></p> <p>Policy ST58 states that land is safeguarded “to accommodate a new Primary School and associated infrastructure at Peaks Hill Farm through Policy ST17”. Although current pupil projections (based on existing school capacity) would appear to support the requirement for a primary school at Peaks Hill, it is considered that with the additional capacity that a new school at Gateford North would provide, there would not be a requirement for a second primary school at Peaks Hill. NCC has secured land and funding through s106 to deliver a 315-place school at Gateford North and, assuming this project can proceed, there is expected to be sufficient capacity within the Worksop Planning Area to accommodate the remaining permitted development at Gateford, in addition to that proposed across Worksop in the draft Local Plan. However, NCC requests that the land safeguarded at Peaks Hill is retained for</p>	The identified land for the safeguarding of school facilities and buildings has now been removed from the policy and policies map and the policy now refers to the amount of land needed to provide the school so this provides more flexibility on where it is located on site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST58: Safeguarded Land			
		<p>secondary school use. It is not expected that the existing secondary school estate will be able to expand beyond the level which is already planned to be delivered through existing CIL funds.</p> <p>In order to accommodate the demand on secondary school places arising from Peaks Hill and other proposed Worksop development, it is envisaged that satellite secondary school provision could be provided on the Peaks Hill site and funded through the contributions collected during the Local Plan period. The level of additional capacity necessary to accommodate the 2000 dwellings proposed for Worksop would be two forms of entry (i.e. 300 places). Further investigative work is required to establish an approximate land size for delivering satellite secondary provision of this scale. As this provision would be intended to mitigate the cumulative impact of Worksop developments, it is acknowledged that the financial contribution towards build costs required for the Peaks Hill site may need to be adjusted to reflect the school land value, so that the land requirement does not impose an additional obligation on the developer. However, please note that the delivery of any satellite provision is subject to discussion with the relevant Academy Trust at the appropriate time. Policy ST58 states that land is safeguarded “to accommodate a 2-form entry primary school and health hub, and associated infrastructure at HS13: Ordsall South through Policy 29”. An allocation of 1250 dwellings on this site, as referred to under Policy 29 Site HS13, would generate sufficient primary pupil demand to sustain at least a one form entry (210 place) primary school, based on pupil yield formula. A new primary school of this size should be accompanied by a 26-place nursery and should have core space and service to allow for later expansion to a one and a half form entry (315 place) school. The land size required for a 1.0-1.5FE primary school is approx. 1.5ha. Please note the delivery of a school on this site would be subject to the relevant DfE approval process at the appropriate time. Where land is to be provided by a developer to enable the delivery of school infrastructure, the County Council will require fully serviced land, remediated to a residential standard with a topography appropriate for the building of a school and associated playing fields. Further details on the Council’s serviced site requirements are set out at para 3.17 of its Planning Obligation Strategy.</p>	
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>We are pleased to see the safeguarding of land under policy ST58 for use in a future flood risk management scheme and we are highly supportive of this in principle. However, we’d like to take this opportunity to highlight that whilst we have undertaken preliminary testing of flood water storage in this location, which does show a positive impact on flood risk downstream, this testing was purely hypothetical and was not supported by appropriate engineering assessments. Whilst we’ll continue to work towards the development of a flood risk management scheme for Worksop, at this present time we do not hold appropriate evidence to categorically demonstrate the requirement for, or the scope or scale of, a flood risk management scheme in this location. We understand that your Authority are comfortable with proceeding with the safeguarding of land on this basis and we’re keen to support you with this where our role and remit allows.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency on a proposed Flood Management Scheme for Worksop. Due to some uncertainty related to future results of river modelling, the area of safeguarded land will remain on the Policies Maps.</p>
REF074	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Natural Flood Management (NFM) not only reduces flood risk it can also achieve multiple benefits for people and wildlife, helping restore habitats, improve water quality and helping make catchments more resilient to the impacts of climate change. Within the flood storage area near Shireoaks/Rhodesia (Figure 33: Shireoaks flood storage area) there are a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) including Lady Lee Quarry (1/45), Lady Lee Pasture (2/103), Holme Carr Wood (2/120) and Shireoaks Park Water Garden (1/47). We would like LWS to be included on policy maps because they have protection under the NPPF (2021). We note that they are indicated on the policy map for Harworth and Bircotes but not for Worksop.</p> <p>These measures should particularly include a stronger emphasis on carefully targeted floodplain reconnection, as a means to simultaneously deliver sustainable flood storage, Water Framework Directive (WFD) outputs and habitat restoration and re-creation. An objective should be to protect the LWS as they are designated nature conservation sites and bring them into favourable condition, where</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST58: Safeguarded Land			
		<p>this is possible, through FRM interventions. We strongly advocate Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitat creation in low-lying areas. We would hope to see area targets set for BAP habitat creation through FRM with a clear deadline, informed by the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM) that has been undertaken in Nottinghamshire. Wherever possible, efforts should be made to reconnect with the floodplain, to use natural river processes to slow the flow and reduce the impacts of flooding. This should be encouraged within local authorities when considering new developments within the floodplain. Every opportunity should be taken where measures are being implemented to ensure that this complies with WFD and that all efforts are made to protect and enhance biodiversity. The benefit of implementing NFM is that the problem of flooding can be dealt with at the source, and wildlife as receptors can benefit from the management. Partnership plays a huge role in NFM. It is pivotal for delivering projects, and it allows for a creative approach. As Catchment Hosts for the Lower Idle, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust is ideally placed to work with BDC and other partners to deliver such a multifunctional project.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST60: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>Whilst we're really pleased to see "blue-green Infrastructure" referenced (ST6 – Point 6), after this first reference the text appears to go back to just "green infrastructure". We recommend that you amend the following references to highlight the importance of blue-green infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12.3 – 12.3.3 – "....green infrastructure: including open spaces...." Policy ST60 A. – "...social and green infrastructure and where appropriate..." 	Thank you for your comments. We will incorporate these into the revised policy.
REF060	NHS Property Services	<p>Policy ST60 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan relates to how physical, social and green infrastructure is intended to be provided for and delivered.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 is clear in Paragraph 20 that 'Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for infrastructure and community facilities (such as health).' Paragraph 34 goes on to state that 'Plans should set out the contributions expected from development.' Alongside this, they should include the levels and type of infrastructure required over the plan period.</p> <p>We therefore support the opportunity for Bassetlaw Council and infrastructure partners to engage in the preparation of spatial strategy for infrastructure as is stipulated in Part A of policy ST60; and would encourage that NHS Commissioners, relevant NHS bodies and health providers are included in such engagement.</p> <p>There is a well-established connection between planning and health; in so far that the planning system has an important role in creating healthy communities. Planning can not only facilitate improvements to health services and infrastructure - thereby enabling the health providers to meet changing healthcare needs; but planning also provide a mechanism to address the wider factors of health.</p> <p>A vital part of this is ensuring the NHS continues to receive a commensurate share of developer contributions to mitigate the healthcare impacts arising from growth and help deliver transformation plans. Though supporting statement 12.3.10 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan document makes reference to health facilities, subsequent paragraphs including 12.3.15 and 12.3.16 focus on Affordable</p>	Thank you for your comments. We will continue to work with the NHS through the delivery of the Plan and we will work towards agreeing a Statement of Common Ground with health providers moving forward.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST60: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
		<p>Housing, Highways and Education and give little indication of Bassetlaw Community Infrastructure Levy and developers contributions being considered for Health.</p> <p>Historically the NHS has not had appropriate recognition of its role in supporting the development of new communities. According to the MHCLG Review the value of developer contributions agreed in England during the financial year 2018/19 was £7bn. Health is not provided a separate entry but is grouped under 'other' which received just £187m of non-affordable housing planning obligations in 2018/19– of which the NHS only receives a proportion. Education on the other hand received £439m in 2018/19.</p> <p>Large residential developments often have very significant impacts in terms of the need for additional healthcare provision for future residents, meaning that a planning obligation requiring that the development delivers a new healthcare facility is necessary. As such, the requirement that development plan documents and planning policies recognise the role large sites can play in delivering necessary health facilities is welcomed. We concur with Part B of draft Policy ST60 which seeks to secure developers contribution towards improvements to infrastructure. We also believe that the cumulative impacts of smaller residential developments should also be recognised, and when receiving funds, health facilities should be put on a level footing with education and public transport improvements in order to ensure that healthcare infrastructure and funding requirements arising from planned and unplanned growth across the borough are appropriately represented given its strategic importance.</p> <p>Policy ST60 and the supporting statements would therefore be made more effective and consistent with national policy if it was ensured that Health had access to a more equitable share of developer contributions and recommended criteria for the allocation of health infrastructure monies that come through both S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding routes. This should be at a level to support investment in all forms of healthcare provision to meet the demands of housing growth across Bassetlaw, including primary, secondary, and mental health services.</p> <p>We endorse the continued support for wider public health outcomes, pertaining the aim to better integrate health and social care services including wider community health services and maximise positive contribution to health and wellbeing. We believe that net health gains should be a strategic target for the planning system, and therefore be considered as a requirement in all strategic plans.</p> <p>In order to deliver this, is vital that Bassetlaw Council work with NHS organisations to plan for the healthcare infrastructure required to support the levels of growth anticipated within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. We would encourage the inclusion of health providers being actively involved in the preparation of Local plan as well as planning applications for large residential developments within the Bassetlaw area as these begin to come forward.</p> <p>NHSPS thanks Bassetlaw Council for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Local Plan and hope the comments regarding Policy ST60 are considered constructive and helpful.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST60: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
1855535	Resident	<p>This platform seems to be a way of hobbling public response to your plans. I would need a degree in IT to understand all of this new technology (and you say you don't have enough computer space to provide a pdf printable copy. I don't believe that). You are up to something here. Public gagging! So here are my comments about your plans for my town centre all in one.</p> <p>My town (born and lived here all my life 61 years now) has become a gruesome botch of: Unsuitable pedestrianization which doesn't suit this town - orange block paving and daft lights shining patterns and (only a few) ridiculous market stalls on a hill along Bridge Street (just to cover up all the empty shops I reckon). We once had a lovely market place adjacent to the town hall where it was flat and thriving but you have since turned it into "Adulation Square" again another mismatch of slate and a gruesome "spaceship" cinema and behind that some absolute fenced off derelict land - a great (not) vista for visitors to our town coming down Park Street. Flooding. Your incompetent leader Simon Greaves was told to open the sluice gates in the morning of the flood in Worksop in 2019 but did nothing and has since concocted a story blaming someone else (when he was IN CHARGE . . . err?). The system of sluices and run offs and the library duck pond are the initial problem. Then there is the inadequate width of the Ryton upriver alongside the cricket pitch and the inadequate height of the run-under the shops on Bridge place. So if the water backs up due to sluice gate incompetence, it then double backs up on the shops bridge then overflows. It is simply engineering and sensible reaction to water building up. LET IT GO - DOWNSTREAM. Don't go harping on about letting Shireoaks mop up water - UPSTREAM. Also build a fast reaction plan for sluice gates when ever you see a big storm coming and don't let anyone called Greaves become involved ever again.</p> <p>Our town has no useful purpose now and needs production / manufacturing jobs with a lean towards starting up from the bottom. Boughton Camp in Ollerton is a classic example (go and take a look . . . it isn't pretty but it works and keeps people useful). 100 Wartime Nissen huts give employment to around 500 local people. We need to build national resilience and make our people in our town useful again since we have lost 17,000 production and mining jobs over last 25 years (we need local sustainability) so we must build cheap / subsidized / local workspace quickly on brownfield land. Have you sorted out the 60,000 tonnes of stinking waste plastic abandoned by the botched council / private recycling scheme yet? Its been there now for about 15 years. Shift it and put our 400 Rates free Nissen huts for 2,000 peoples jobs there quickly.</p> <p>Regarding the town's purpose, it used to be called the Gateway to the Dukeries but I reckon Notts were jealous of us and made us take the signs down. We are punching well below our weight now and could beautify the town and begin a big tourism push. We have lots to be proud of that could be enhanced.</p> <p>The Chesterfield Canal (surrounded by clapped out buildings behind the Golden Ball) could be a great asset leading off to Godfreys Pond and the Marina. The proximity to the Dukeries and Sherwood Forest and our other woodlands e.g. Hodsock and Osberton and other tourist attractions such as Creswell Crags and Langold Lake is an asset too and somehow should be made more of.</p> <p>Regarding attracting visitors to the town we need shops that are open and not charity shops nor have tramps sleeping in the doorways and I suggest you adopt free parking to attract people instead of you trying to be revenue based by charging to come for nothing at present.</p> <p>Instead of thinking round in circles and spinning in spirals, try to be more outward looking and inventive.</p> <p>By the way whilst writing, I object to you building an east west "distribution road" popping out at Peaks Hill Farm. This is really a "by-pass" so call it what it is. You have no right to cut down those ancient woodlands which have delighted my eyes all my life and give Worksop a lovely entrance (haha the spellchecker doesn't recognise Worksop . . . technology in your favour ??? American spelling doesn't even recognise recognise or favour . . . Good God!)</p>	<p>The provision of infrastructure delivery will be phased alongside the delivery of development over the Plan period. The Council has developed an Infrastructure delivery Plan and schedule to help structure the need and delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>This will be updated periodically.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
POLICY ST60: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure			
		Look after our town Planners! Its simple. 1.) Gateway to the Dukeries. 2.) Jobs jobs jobs! 3.) Open the Sluice gates when it rains. 4.) Capitalize on our natural beauty and heritage.	
REF025	Sports England	Should be informed by evidence from a Sport England perspective is the Playing Pitch Strategy and the Emerging Built Sports Facilities Strategy.	Thank you for your comments.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF008	Retford Civic Society	ST1	<p>We asked that the rate of house building be reduced to close to the level required by the Government's standard method of assessment as the employment growth being projected by the Council and used to justify a higher level of house building is both unrealistic and unnecessary. The revised draft Plan increases even further the amount of house building – adding 450 dwellings to the Ordsall allocation. It is suggested that these may be built after the present Plan period, but there is nothing in the revised draft to secure this as the entire site is allocated without any restriction on when it could be developed.</p> <p>The Society remains strongly opposed to the scale of house building proposed in the Plan. The evidence that this is needed because of employment growth is, in the Society's view, very weak. It is certainly something which will be disputed when the Plan is eventually examined. Continuing with a housing requirement figure that is not justified by the evidence is likely to lead to the Plan being found unsound when it is examined by an inspector.</p> <p>Bassetlaw needs an adopted Plan as soon as possible. The best way to get this Plan judged sound so that it can be adopted would be to reduce the scale of house building proposed, accept that employment growth is unlikely to be anywhere near the upper end of the range set out in the Council's background papers and acknowledge that not all the employment land being proposed will be developed within the Plan period.</p> <p>The Society is also concerned that public statements by the Council continue to say that there is no alternative to the scale of house building proposed as it is required by the Government. This appears to be inconsistent with what is in the Council's background papers. We will be writing separately to the Council seeking clarification of this apparent contradiction as we may wish to comment further on it.</p>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
REF020	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	ST7	In our previous response we set out the various reasons why the highly contaminated Cottam Power Station site would be completely unsuitable for housing. Cottam is not mentioned in the current Draft though there is reference to the regeneration of former power station sites in section 5.4.1. Can we assume that the absence of a specific reference to the Cottam site is an acknowledgement by the Bassetlaw Council of the total unsuitability of this site for housing purposes?	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
REF039	The Coal Authority	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>As you will be aware there are some coal mining legacy features, at surface and shallow depth, within the Bassetlaw area which may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety. These include: mine entries, reported hazards, mine gas sites and fissures. The potential risks posed by these features should be considered when development proposals and site allocations are proposed in areas where they are recorded as being present.</p> <p>It is noted that this consultation relates to revisions to the Sustainability Appraisal with regard to a number of policies in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. I can confirm that the Planning Team at the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the revisions proposed to the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	Noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF044	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologists Ltd	ST2	<p>The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and Focussed Consultation in many parts is acceptable. However, in several areas, particularly rural growth, the documents have a very negative controlling content. Bassetlaw is a rural area, not metropolitan but a rural district Council and, as such, we have already in place villages etc all suitable for sustainable growth. Services will only continue within our villages if we allow growth to take place. Service provision has to be improved, there should be proactive policies surrounding service provision and an understanding of what villages require to maintain a “critical mass” for such things as schools, shops, village halls etc. It is not all about numbers but they most certainly help. Some Parish Councils have embraced development and some have not. Monitoring of these villages will show which process is correct.</p> <p>However, as proposed, the Local Plan does not encourage an expansive approach. With the advent of electric cars for all new homes becoming ever closer then the provision of more rural dwellings will have a lesser impact on sustainability. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF guides LPAs to consider groups of smaller settlements as these often support services in nearby villages.</p> <p>I do not see how this guidance has been taken into consideration in Policy ST2 Rural Bassetlaw. For example, the group of villages around Ranskill comprise Ranskill, Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe, Lound, Sutton-cum-Lound, Barnby Moor and Torworth. Ranskill is classed as a small rural settlement although it has a school, shops, employment, church, village hall, playing fields, good bus service etc. Mattersey is the same, as is Sutton-cum-Lound. These 3 villages have been downgraded and now are expected to deliver only 5% additional homes unless supported by a Neighbourhood Plan. Barnby Moor has limited growth and Torworth is not even identified. All of these villages within this cluster do in fact help each other and there are numerous other “clusters” throughout the district.</p> <p>The percentage figures appear somewhat arbitrary and suggest final control of village development is with the LPA and not as suggested through the Local Plan format as the 5% figure will be a baseline for all Parish Councils to commence their Neighbourhood Plan process. However, the formation of a new garden village at the Apleyhead Junction will, in my view, ensure that development in our villages will be minimal and will almost always result in high value properties. There will not be many developers in our existing villages that will be able to compete with the larger developers and developments within the new garden village. The “economy of scale” will rule and these new garden village homes will be considerably cheaper than the very small sites in the existing villages ensure that lower cost homes for families and senior citizens will only be provided in the new garden village. The result will be a decline in growth and service provision within our rural communities. Much in the same way LPAs resist out of town retail then so should we resist out of town large residential provision all in one particular place.</p> <p>This proposal is contrary to paragraph 78 of the NPPF.</p>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
REF044	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologists Ltd	ST7	<p>This is to be welcomed. However, the LPA must learn from the mistakes of the old High Marnham site which to this day still remains unoccupied and underused save for the electricity. A more proactive approach is needed possibly led by a regeneration team rather than await interest and then react.</p>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF044	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologists Ltd	ST8	No mention of Markham Moor. This is an excellent hub with good services, excellent access, egress to and from the A1, land available etc, etc yet it is once again overlooked in favour of a brand new allocation at Apleyhead. Markham Moor should be reconsidered for future growth.	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
REF044	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologists Ltd	ST37	Policy ST37 Design Quality is a starting point and as a general basis for development it is acceptable but, as with all aspects of design, “the devil is in the detail” and as such Neighbourhood Plans should be guided to include Design Guides. This should also run through with Conservation Area Appraisals. What needs to be clearer is a design approach which is policy led rather than Officer led. Design is a matter of very personal preference but if the LPA have certain requirements, particularly in local authorities then these should be highlighted and written down such that applicants and agents can follow these guides. This again would be a baseline and would not prohibit very contemporary design being promoted within otherwise more restrictive areas.	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
REF047	Resident	ST40	Our previous comments supported the policy of allocating a green buffer around the settlement of Retford (Bassetlaw Green Gaps Report 2019 and Green Gaps Report Addendum October 2020), but highlighted the inadequacy of the Green Gap (Green Gaps Claborough and Welham) separating Claborough from Retford (Reference 377). Part of the land that should be considered for inclusion in a Green Gap was recently the subject of an appeal decision by the Planning Inspectorate (Appeal Reference APP/A3010/W/20/3265803, dated 21st June 2021) concerning land to the north of Bigsby Road, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 6SG). This appeal decision cites the open character of the landscape as part of the reason for dismissing the appeal (see appeal decision paragraph 115). The Planning Inspectorate decision notes that the land to the north of Bigsby Road is predominately rural in character and appearance, and part of the wider landscape which mostly consists of mixed open farmland (paragraph 71 of the Inspectorate report). The same decision records that the land has no formal designation as a “valued landscape” but that it forms part of a locally valued landscape for residents and the local community (paragraph 73 of the report). The Planning Inspectorate decision (paragraph 76) also notes that Bassetlaw District Council views the Idle Lowlands Policy Zone 08, in which the land not so far designated as a Green Gap lies, as carrying the highest designation of ‘conserve’ equating to a ranking of ‘high’ sensitivity and ‘good’ condition, though parts of that zone may have less landscape sensitivity. Surely these conclusions of the Planning Inspectorate are compelling evidence that at least part of the land to the north east of the settlement of Retford and west of the Chesterfield Canal, as discussed in our previous comments (Reference 377) should be included with a Green Gap	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
REF048	P&DG Limited on behalf of Woodard Schools	ST49	Notwithstanding recent discussions with planning officers that implied a future amendment being made to the Proposals Map, until such time that a revised map is published the College continues to raise concerns with the extent of coverage provided by emerging policy ST49. With regards to the Worksop College site, ST49 appears to cover the entire landholding (excluding the golf course). This is incorrect and does not truly reflect the extent of sports pitches actively being used by pupils of the College or during events. For instance, the land to the north of the main access drive into the College site at Worksop is agricultural land with no use as a sports pitch. The same designation exists at the College’s Ranby site, where agricultural land separating the main school site from the village has been washed over by Policy ST49 ‘reference Ranby Preparatory School’. This site has not historically or currently been used in any way associated with	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>the school and is agricultural land. For the policy to be sound in relation to Ranby, this site must be removed from the policy designation, and to do so would not prejudice the separate and adjacent ST49 designation for Ranby Primary School. With regards to the Worksop site, a copy of a plan showing the extent of pitches and their outfields to be considered as part of ST49 is included with previous representations and can be provided upon request.</p> <p>The overall reason for continuing to raise this concern is ultimately a matter of soundness; it is incorrect to designate 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.</p>	
REF061	Heaton Planning on behalf of Tarmac	ST11	<p>Our previous representations involved the promotion of existing employment land at Chainbridge Lane, Lound, as an allocation within draft Policy ST11: Existing Employment Sites.</p> <p>To repeat, Tarmac benefit from freehold ownership of 17.5 hectares of land at Chainbridge Lane, east of Lound, approximately 4km north of Retford. 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 at Chainbridge Lane are long-established and have expanded in recent years.</p> <p>The land 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>Proposed Policy ST11 safeguards 28 existing employment sites within the District including site 'EES27 Chainbridge Lane, Lound'. Referring to the draft Local Plan Policies Map, the location of site EES27 is described as 'Gamston Airport'. Gamston Airfield Business Park is listed as a safeguarded existing employment site (reference 'EES29') within the focussed consultation document. There appears to be some contradiction between the existing employment sites referenced within the focussed consultation document and those illustrated on the policies map.</p> <p>We would like to take this opportunity to request confirmation that site 'EES27 Chainbridge Lane, Lound' is allocated as an employment site through Policy ST11. It appears that the draft policies map requires amendment to reflect this.</p>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF061	Heaton Planning on behalf of Tarmac	ST7	<p>The previous representations also aimed to highlight the importance of considering mineral safeguarding of resources and infrastructure, both generally, and also more specifically in relation to proposed Policy ST7: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area.</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 from unnecessary sterilisation by non-minerals development. The Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan does not show mineral safeguarding areas on the updated Interactive Policies Map (June 2021) 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”.</p> <p>We are aware of the focussed scope of this consultation which does not invite any further comments on proposed Policy ST7. However, we wish to reiterate the importance of mineral safeguarding at a District level and the requirement for District Councils to consider policies set out within the relevant Minerals Local Plan (MLP). Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan was adopted on 25th March 2021 and forms part of the Development Plan for Bassetlaw. We wish the reiterate that the mineral safeguarding areas as identified by Nottinghamshire County Council should be included within the Bassetlaw District Council Policies Maps in accordance with PPG.</p> <p>The previous representations also suggested that Policy ST7 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan should be re-worded to much better reflect the requirement to safeguard minerals infrastructure, such as the railway infrastructure at Cottam Power Station that could enable the import and export of materials and products to/from the site during the construction phase of the regeneration area as well as serving future users.</p> <p>We would like to reiterate the importance of safeguarding mineral infrastructure, in accordance 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>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
REF063	CCG NHS Bassetlaw	ST3	<p>With regards to Bassetlaw Garden Village, 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’.</p> <p>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. Clearly, there will be a need for this, so this expressed requirement will need to link into the Nottinghamshire County Council’s PNA. Dental facilities are commissioned by NHS England but ultimately it remains a dental business decision where to locate their premises , similarly for optometry. We would therefore 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.</p> <p>In order to undertake more detailed calculations the CCG would require the numbers and type of proposed dwellings. Following discussion with Bassetlaw District Council it</p>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
			is understood that there is a broader timescale for this proposal and therefore will be subject to future engagement.	
REF063	CCG NHS Bassetlaw	17	<p>The CCG would need numbers and types of dwellings for this development to undertake more detailed calculations, however, as a basic assessment if the development is expected to deliver circa 3,600 dwellings then the requirements are double that identified for Ordsall South above. The CCG commits to work with the council on this as more information becomes available.</p> <p>It should be recognised that timescales for delivery and at what point infrastructure would be required needs additional exploration. As for the Ordsall South development, the CCG is not in a position to commit to additional revenue investments as a consequence of additional space requirements so would require consideration of S106 contribution or delivery of a health hub in public sector ownership that will not require revenue investment in the building itself.</p>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
1857989	Resident	Jan 2020 – ST1	Spatial strategy is outlined as 528 homes in the Retford area due to other building projects which fulfil the development criteria already set out. These are up to and including 2037 according to the Core strategy residual requirement. Therefore, this Ordsall proposal is not in line with the key strategies and should not proceed further on this basis alone.	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.
1858264	Resident	ST15	<p>I wish to formally raise concerns regarding the proposed Bassetlaw Plan for the Peaks Hill Farm (Policy 15), page 78 onwards.</p> <p>I do not believe that the Council has met their obligation in ensuring that locally affected residents have been properly consulted in relation to the planning process as per appendix 4 of the Local Plan. I am against the inclusion of the prime farmland and current green space land at Peaks Hill Farm within the Bassetlaw Plan.</p> <p>The proposed development site is extremely large and will have a significant impact on local residents. Currently there are over 150 houses being developed already on existing green fields adjacent to this proposed use of land. The Bassetlaw Plan is proposing an additional 1500 homes. This will result in all existing local residents being exposed to significant levels of noise, pollution, transport disruption and inconvenience over at least 15 years.</p> <p>A large proportion of the bordering homes are resided in by older adults. This will have a significant impact on them. The dwellings are being built before any supporting infrastructure is in place (such as schools, GPs etc). There is already significant pressure on the existing infrastructure such as long waits for GP appointments. The railway station at Worksop is very small and already overcrowded, so new commuters are likely to travel by car and not use public transport. This proposed area will in essence be a commuter belt for neighbouring towns and cities. The current roads and infrastructure are already extremely busy and are small, single carriageway country style roads. The three main roads (A57, Carlton Road and Blyth Road) will see significant increased amounts of both construction traffic and commuting traffic. This will increase danger and pollution to all in the local area. The current roads systems are ill-equipped to deal with this increase of population. There are multiple sites</p>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>already in Worksop of new housing development - why more when these high density areas are already being built and planned?</p> <p>The town centre is in dire need of regeneration and I feel that this should be the priority for the town before trying to attract new residents. Although the council have stated a commitment to regeneration and rejuvenation to the town centre, this is not mirrored in the fact that new development of supermarkets / fast food areas are already constructed out of the town centre which will not encourage residents into the centre.</p> <p>Furthermore, since COVID-19 businesses have left the town (either through the business ceasing, or relocating). Town centre area is already cleared for further housing development (plus this is in addition to the already empty or available dwellings there). The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.</p> <p>Bassetlaw is a District that has multiple green space and is rich with wildlife, flora and fauna. I have personally seen multiple species in the fields, such as deer, hare, foxes and buzzards to name a few. This development will have a devastating impact on the existing habits and ecology in this area. It will be extremely sad to see yet another green area outside the town centre fold to development.</p> <p>I remain perplexed as to why brownfield sites are not being utilised and that the Council are proposing to destroy the local greenfield site in favour of increasing the local human population. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) champions brownfield development over building on greenbelt areas. Also, that using existing sites helps to regenerate towns and cities and provides new homes in areas of high demand. As report 25/3/2019 – research found that England has enough derelict or vacant land to build more than 1 million new homes – two thirds of which are ready to start immediately.</p> <p>If my concerns are over-ruled, then I would expect to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 3. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 4. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to the environmental impact and already problematic climate change) 5. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 8. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 9. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
			10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan)	
1858268	Resident	ST15	<p>I wish to formally raise concerns regarding the proposed Bassetlaw Plan for the Peaks Hill Farm (Policy 15), page 78 onwards. I do not believe that the Council has met their obligation in ensuring that locally affected residents have been properly consulted in relation to the planning process as per appendix 4 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>I am against the inclusion of the prime farmland and current green space land at Peaks Hill Farm within the Bassetlaw Plan. The proposed development site is extremely large and will have a significant impact on local residents. Currently there are over 150 houses being developed already on existing green fields adjacent to this proposed use of land. The Bassetlaw Plan is proposing an additional 1500 homes. This will result in all existing local residents being exposed to significant levels of noise, pollution, transport disruption and inconvenience over at least 15 years.</p> <p>A large proportion of the bordering homes are resided in by older adults. This will have a significant impact on them. The dwellings are being built before any supporting infrastructure is in place (such as schools, GPs etc). There is already significant pressure on the existing infrastructure such as long waits for GP appointments. The railway station at Worksop is very small and already overcrowded, so new commuters are likely to travel by car and not use public transport. This proposed area will in essence be a commuter belt for neighbouring towns and cities. The current roads and infrastructure are already extremely busy and are small, single carriageway country style roads. The three main roads (A57, Carlton Road and Blyth Road) will see significant increased amounts of both construction traffic and commuting traffic. This will increase danger and pollution to all in the local area. The current roads systems are ill-equipped to deal with this increase of population.</p> <p>The town centre is in dire need of regeneration and I feel that this should be the priority for the town before trying to attract new residents. Although the council have stated a commitment to regeneration and rejuvenation to the town centre, this is not mirrored in the fact that new development of supermarkets / fast food areas are already being constructed out of the town centre which will not encourage residents into the centre.</p> <p>The amount of housing development locally exceeds local need; 1634 dwellings currently have planning permission with thousands more in the plan, for a population of 42,000. This 'saturation' policy will increase the numbers of commuters in and out of Worksop on already unsustainable road and rail systems.</p> <p>Bassetlaw is a District that has multiple green space and is rich with wildlife, flora and fauna. I have personally seen multiple species in the fields, such as deer, hare, foxes and buzzards to name a few. This development will have a devastating impact on the existing habits and ecology in this area.</p> <p>I remain perplexed as to why brownfield sites are not being utilised and that the Council are proposing to destroy the local greenfield site in favour of increasing the local human population. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) champions brownfield development over building on greenbelt areas. Also, that using existing sites helps to regenerate towns and cities and provides new homes in areas of high demand. As report 25/3/2019 – research found that England has enough derelict or</p>	We are not consulting on this Policy due to this being a focused consultation only on certain policies within the Local Plan. Any previous comments made to consultations will have been taken into account.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	POLICY NUMBER	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
			<p>vacant land to build more than 1 million new homes – two thirds of which are ready to start immediately. If my concerns are over-ruled, then I would expect to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A green buffer zone between current homes and any new development. Minimum 15 metres, to maintain a green corridor for privacy and wildlife 2. New dwellings to have gardens that back onto the 'buffer zone' to increase the distance between existing homes and new houses and to extend the green corridor 3. Any communal areas, such as youth facilities, playgroups, car parks and sports pitches, to be located away from any existing homes in the centre of the new development behind the treeline 4. New dwellings to have minimum car-parking space to discourage multiple car ownership to reduce noise, traffic and pollution. (linked to climate change) 5. Minimal street lighting across the estate to minimise light pollution 6. Low level housing near to any existing homes, such as bungalows, not higher-rise town houses 7. Green pathways and corridors across all the development to connect existing woodlands, new cycle routes, walking routes to enable access to public transport 8. Maximise tree/shrub planting, open spaces, verges etc to create a more attractive environment to overlook 9. Build enough housing that local people can afford and cater for an increasingly elderly population with bungalows and smaller dwellings 10. Decent sized gardens for dwellings so people can benefit from outdoor space; do not allow developers to maximise their profits by agreeing to 'at least 750 dwellings'! (as stated in the plan) 	
REF052	Nottinghamshire County Council	SFRA Level 2	<p>Having reviewed the document, the SFRA appears to suitably note the flood risk in Worksop and Retford and highlight the potential for this to be exacerbated due to the sensitivity of the catchments to the cumulative impact of development and climate change, should development not be approached suitably with the guidelines noted. As noted by the report, site specific Flood Risk Assessments to fully assess the risk to the site and any impacts of the site on the wider catchment will be required as sites come forward into the planning process to ensure that this is managed appropriately at both the site and catchment scale.</p>	<p>A separate SFRA Level 2 is being undertaken for the proposed sites within Worksop. This will be published alongside the Worksop Central DPD.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT SUBMISSIONS					
REF038	Retford	LAA067	Consultant	Previously representations had been made on the attached land shown hatched belonging to my clients which had been included On the most recent proposals this area has been excluded and I wondered if you could give the rationale behind this	Assessed as Reasonable Alternatives in SA.
REF040	Everton	New LAA site	Land owner	Attached is a map of Everton on which is an area of land owned by myself. I would appreciate it if you could file this information and use of your consideration of potential building land in the future.	The local plan is not allocating sites in the rural Bassetlaw other than Tuxford. Instead Policy ST1 and ST2 provide the policy mechanisms for managing new residential development within the rural communities.
REF048	Worksop and Ranby	Worksop College and Ranby House	P&DG	On behalf of our client and following recent discussions held with the Council, this provides our representations along with the associated update to the submitted Vision Document material. In our introductory chapter of the previous submission, we explained that 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. Been asked to demonstrate the public benefits of developing the College site further to support our earlier submission and this can be demonstrated in the accompanied update to the supporting Vision Document (dated July	The Worksop College site has been assessed within the LAA and also as a reasonable alternative within the Sustainability Appraisal. Due to existing constraints, it was not considered appropriate for an allocation. It is considered that the wider Local Plan policies appropriately address the school's operations and any additional enhancements they may wish to make. A site specific policy is not required. The local plan is not allocating sites in the rural Bassetlaw other than Tuxford. Instead Policy ST1 and ST2 provide the policy mechanisms for managing new residential development within the rural communities. A site specific policy is not required for Ranby school either.

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>2021). It is not recognised in the Local Plan just how much the sites are actively used by a large variety of local firms whose operations depend on the school facilities. 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. In very few cases there would be alternative facilities in the District that perform the role or specification afforded by the College site. To quantify this, the College has provided the following information: • In addition to the services and operations of the College site, the two sites host approximately 1,500 people per week, focussed mostly on the Worksop site; • In addition to the above, an annual reach of 10,000 people is achieved through the various annual events held on the College sites, again focussed at Worksop and with the potential for more. Full list as appendices to this letter. This supports the wider public benefits of developing the College site as part of a strategic site. The College would like to seek to open its venues up to further groups, including utilising other areas such as Churchill Hall, the Theatre and the Chapel for the likes of local</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>theatre/drama groups, choirs, dance groups, for networking and business events, baby and toddler groups, and for the community and charity sectors. The potential for additional sporting facilities is also necessary, including supporting both cricket and football academies and the development of an expanded athletics track of regional importance. Many such sports facilities will rely upon a combination of income generated by development and diversification of land uses, together with Sport England funding to be deliverable. This ultimately will depend upon the clear allocation of the site. In their favour, 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, enhancing the sports and wellbeing, leisure and tourism and public benefits to the District. Combined they are substantial. The sites at Worksop and Ranby thus continue to 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. The NPPF looks for development</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>requirements to be specified as a minimum; should further opportunities arise that offer substantial public benefit and regeneration opportunities then they could be considered as an additional commitment in the plan. This forms a regular occurrence without jeopardy to other allocations in the plan and reduces wholesale dependency on a smaller number of allocated sites to deliver Local Plan objectives. Furthermore, the update today to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) suggests that “Where larger scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery.” The current Local Plan that is subject to this consultation only covers a 16 year period to 2037, thereby suggesting needs will not be accounted for in the later period or at best will be put at risk.</p> <p>The focussed consultation does not include particular policies that may affect the College site, but we wish to reiterate the site’s availability and deliverability per earlier promotion of the Worksop and Ranby sites and our recommendations for site specific policies. Site Specific Policy – Worksop Site</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>Still relevant 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 accepted that in the context of both the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy and the emerging Local Plan, the Worksop College site such 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'. In principle by focusing on the policy it provides a greater focus on the following outcomes: • 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. It is considered that all of the</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>above attributes would create significant public benefits necessary to be given weight in the overall planning balance when considering sustainable sites to bring forward in the Local Plan. Should consider our suggested site specific policies for the Worksop and Ranby sites as suggested in the November 2020 Local Plan consultation. The suggested policy for the Worksop site is as follows but with greater clarity provided towards sporting and community facilities: 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 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 sporting excellence, supporting communities and for 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>Site Specific Policy – Ranby Site</p> <p>Also important is ensuring the long-term future of the College's site at Ranby within</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				<p>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> <p>With regards to the Ranby site, no possibilities are available to consider consolidation of the Ranby site as it is not economically viable to do so. The costs of such measures would far outweigh the potential return from a sale. Furthermore, as we have explained, there are a host of local community organisations that depend upon current and future facilities at the Ranby site to exist without consolidation. To ensure comprehensive development during the course of the plan period and beyond, our suggestion for the proposed policy at the Ranby site remains relevant (as amended): The District Council will work with Woodard Schools (Nottinghamshire) Limited and other partners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the 	

REFERENCE NUMBER	SETTLEMENT	LAA NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
				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 sporting excellence, supporting communities and 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.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
REF013	KC Development	<p>I write with regard to the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037 consultation and the accompanying Proposals Map, specifically the settlement of Tuxford.</p> <p>The Development Boundary for Tuxford should be re-examined to ensure it includes the built development area of the settlement. As present there is an anomaly where the former Platts Harris commercial/agricultural dealership (now part of the Russell Group), a large business site with workshops, an office and yard area, is not included within the Development Boundary and is perversely classed as open countryside.</p> <p>The definition of a Development Boundary is determined by the physical extent of the built-up area of a settlement. On the Bassetlaw website, Development Boundaries are defined as “The line that marks the built form of a settlement.”</p> <p>It is clear that the commercial land of the former Platts Harris site, which has been operating for well over 50 years, is part of the built form of Tuxford. The site entrance is off Eldon Street, one of the main roads in the town, and it is surrounded by development to the north, south and west. The A1 runs along the eastern perimeter creating a clear defensible boundary and preventing any expansion in this direction. The site is effectively landlocked by build form and infrastructure; it cannot logically be described as open countryside or sitting outside the established built form of the settlement.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the Development Boundary is amended to include the former Platts Harris site. The plan attached and shown in the extract below, illustrates the amendment highlighting two options. Proposal 1 would be to include the former Platts Harris site within the Development Boundary. Proposal 2 takes the line of the A1 to form the boundary of the settlement, incorporating Tuxford Church and Hall, which are heritage assets within the Conservation Area with a high degree of protection afforded.</p> <p>In both of the proposed options for the realignment of the Development Boundary, the former Platts Harris site should be included given its urban nature and the unnecessary and now illogical restrictiveness of the current open countryside designation.</p> <p>There have been early discussions with the Council regarding potential redevelopment of the site, however, this is not a proposal at present. Irrespective of any future redevelopment, the new owners of the business require the more proactive policy associated with being inside the Development Boundary, than the onerous restrictions of being outside. There is no reason for retaining the Development Boundary as it currently stands, moreover, it has been evidenced as to why the boundary should be amended to the clear defensible boundary of the A1, either partly around the Platts Harris site or fully to include the Church and Hall.</p> <p>See folder for attached maps and images</p>	<p>The development boundary for Tuxford remains unchanged. This particular area remains largely undeveloped at present with just some buildings to store the sale of agricultural vehicles and products. Other parts remain grassed scrubland. Therefore amending the boundary does not conform to the development boundary methodology as identified within the Spatial Strategy Background paper.</p>
REF059	Environment Agency	<p>We can confirm that since our previous response to the draft Local Plan, the Severn Trent Water area has been reclassified as a ‘water stressed area’ for water resources. It’s now particularly important that the Local Plan adopt water efficiency measures which go beyond the mandatory national standard set out in the Building Regulations of 125litres/person/day (l/p/d). There is now an even clearer local need for a policy which requires new dwellings to meet the tighter requirement of 110 l/p/d. We note that the previous draft Local Plan did include this tighter requirement and just wanted to take this opportunity to present this new evidence to you and reiterate our support for this measure.</p> <p>The documents don’t specifically mention sewerage infrastructure. The increased amount of waste water and sewage effluent produced by new and existing development will need to be dealt with to</p>	<p>This has now been updated within Policy ST52.</p>

		ensure that there is no detrimental impact in the quality of the water courses receiving this extra volume of treated effluent. As such, there may be a requirement for the expansion and upgrading of current sewage treatment systems if the volume of sewage requiring treatment within the district increases. Appropriate infrastructure should be put in place by the water company to effectively transfer and treat any increase in waste water; growth should not cause a deterioration in water quality and WFD status. We recommend that you consult with Severn Trent Water on this matter to ensure that the proposed level of growth can be accommodated within the current capacity of Water Recycling Centres (WRC's).	
1857360	Resident	When will the council learn to Stop ruining Retford Town, it is a Town not a City take the the time to really think what it is doing to the place we love massive building in Worksop and Retford area not even one more bed put in place at the Hospital. I should have been admitted , but no beds sent home taking my own morphine my partner having to take a week unpaid to look after me The traffic is bad now by pollution by fumes and noise its getting worse. I totally object to the planning going ahead	Noted.
1859314	Resident	Considering this draft plan is aimed at seeking views via consultation from a wide ranging and diverse community, it's technical jargon and non user friendly language does little to assist members of the public to understand its content let alone pass comment. I am aware there have been consultation events where people can attend face to face, but not everyone can do so. Therefore I feel criticism should be levelled about actually which groups are being represented here. Filling in this form due to its style and complexity for some is off putting. Maybe there should be further consideration given to how this has been approached?	The Council has undertaken a large amount of consultation events and publication of the consultation period via a number of methods. All in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
1858658	Resident	There is no provision for green energy in the plan. Domestic low carbon measures (solar, insulation, EV charging) can have a significant impact on energy poverty yet the latest UK standards in this field, including building standards, seem to have been conveniently ignored.	Policy ST50 and ST51 provide the policy mechanism for renewable energy and low carbon developments.
REF005	Chesterfield Borough Council	I have reviewed the focussed consultation document and have no specific comments other than to support the clear and positive reference to the Chesterfield Canal in Policy ST6 Worksop Central. I look forward to the forthcoming consultation on the full Draft Plan, and to continue to work with you on strategic and cross boundary planning matters via the Local Plan Liaison Group.	Noted.
REF001	Resident	So you didn't read my last email I sent you, why are you asking people, you know you will do exactly what you want, this is to make you look good, well not to me I've seen to much from councils in the past	Noted.
REF002	Resident	I have commented upon this twice now, but would like to make the following suggestions please. When considering plans for Social/low cost housing might the design layout be actively supported to be more imaginative rather than 'as many as possible on one area of land'. currently seen. Given that these developments are increasing with the Government's thinking and mantra of 'build, build, build, we are risk of having uniformity and lack of individuality thereby replicating the Easter blocs still prevalent in Europe. People have to live somewhere, but the lack of ability to buy a property in a stylish area should not preclude residents from living in the most attractive development possible on the site in question. Surely, individual style, shape, design and materials is not beyond the wit of the planners and developers. Cost is not the only factor. Once these new estates are built, they are there into perpetuity. Furthermore, I consider that landscaping should be mandatory and enforced in order that estates blend in to the locality and appear less stark. I also consider that allotments should form part of all developments with more than 30 properties.	Noted.
REF010	Resident	I read and noted the contents of the Regulation 18 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Focussed Consultation, June 2021. I have no comment to make on those contents. I would wish to be informed when the full Draft Plan is re-published in August 2021.	Noted.
REF014	Resident	Upon reflecting on the plan I would like it to go ahead. I would also like it if there was a leisure centre especially for orsdall for future reference.	Noted.
REF003	Resident	I made earlier comments (in February 2020 and January 2021, REF134) on the general countryside policies and in particular the proposed policies for housing and other development off Thievesdale	Noted.

		Lane/ Blyth Road. I also trust brown sites can be developed before green open land. I hope the wording of the policies have been altered to safeguard the green spaces/ landscape corridors within the site and to minimise the impact on the countryside around the site. The Policy Ref. Nos. are 1195325 and 1195889. I trust my comments have been taken into account and should be grateful if you could forward these so I may look at your amended wording.	
REF018	Clarborough & Welham Parish Council	The Clarborough & Welham Parish Councillors have noted the contents of the 'Regulation 18 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Focussed Consultation, June 2021' document and they support the contents of that document.	Noted.
REF019	West Stockwith Parish Council	Following our recent meeting, I have been authorised by West Stockwith Parish Council to state that they have no major comments to make on this consultation.	Noted.
REF024	Sheffield City Council	Thank you for the invitation to comment on this consultation. I can confirm that we have no comments to make but will be interested in seeing further consultations as the draft plan is written.	Noted.
REF056	Derbyshire County Council	Thank you for consulting Derbyshire County Council on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan Focussed Consultation. Having reviewed the content of the Focussed Consultation, it is noted that it particularly focusses on the relationship between the policies in the draft Worksop Central Development Plan Document 2021 (DPD) and the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan; to further consider the development principles, design parameters and infrastructure requirements in relation to the Ordsall South strategic site (Local Plan Policy 29: Site HS13: Ordsall South, Retford); and focuses on a small number of strategic policies, where evidence base work for the DPD and through discussions with key stakeholders indicates a revision would be necessary to provide a consistent strategic planning policy framework. In the context of the above, it is considered that the policies and proposals within Focussed Consultation document raise no significant strategic cross boundary planning and infrastructure issues or concerns for Derbyshire County Council. However, the County Council would welcome the opportunity to comment on the forthcoming Regulation 19 Publication Version of the Local Plan, when it is published for consultation in August 2021, as this may raise a range of more significant cross boundary strategic planning and infrastructure issues for the County Council.	The County Council will be notified on future consultations.
REF006	Resident	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above. I appreciate how difficult it is to engage the community in the current circumstances. The language in the document is very dense and quite obscure. There are a lot of words with very little substance behind them e.g. reference to air quality with no indication of the current air quality or of any sound assessment of the likely impact of new developments. Mentions of active travel, walking and cycling routes - so far Bassetlaw has achieved very little in this regard. Certainly the half hearted attempts at providing cycling routes in Retford have never been satisfactory, have never been comprehensive and have not been maintained. Cycling in Retford is dangerous.	Noted.
REF052	Nottinghamshire County Council	I would also like to note the following points regarding the current draft document that was available via the below link: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The link in 2.6. appears to be to a draft/partially edited version of 'Nottinghamshire County Council's Guidance Note on the Validation Requirements for Planning Applications', however the link to the same document in section 8 appears to be to a complete version of the document. The future 'Worksop Central Development Plan Document' is also of interest to the LLFA, and the opportunity to review a draft of this when available would be welcomed. If there are any particular points the document addresses/sections of the document or proposed development sites which you would like further comment on, or to discuss, please feel free to let me know and I'll be happy to look into these further.	Noted.