

This statement summarises the main issues raised during the course of the consultation carried out under Regulations 18/19 and how the comments received have been considered by the Council.

Summary of the consultation process for the Bassetlaw Local Plan

Public consultation under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plans)(England) Regulations 2012 took place in five stages.

Appendix 1 provides details of how the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c) (i) to (iv) have been met in relation to the Regulation 18 consultation, including which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations; how they were invited to make representations; a summary of the main issues raised by the Regulation 18 representations; and how those representations have been taken into account.

Regulation 19 pre-submission publication took place in three stages: for six weeks between August and October 2021; between January and February 2022; and between May and June 2022. Appendix 2 provides details of how the requirements of Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) have been met, namely the number of representations made pursuant to regulation 20 and a high level Council response. A high level summary of the main issues raised in those representations is also given below.

Main Issues raised pursuant to Regulations 19/20 August 2021 Publication Version Plan:

By section of the Plan, the main issues raised pursuant to Regulations 19/20 were:

1.0 Introduction

Duty to Cooperate – welcome the district meeting its own development needs and not those of any other authority as this has minimal implications for other authorities particularly in the HMA (Derbyshire County Council). Sheffield is subject to the 35% Cities & Urban Areas Uplift, which may have implications for the Sheffield City Region HMA (Home Builders Federation).

2.0 Structure of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan

No comment or no issue raised.

3.0 Context

No comment or no issue raised.

4.0 Bassetlaw Vision and Objectives

Climate change - support given to the approach taken to managing climate change and flood risk through sustainable drainage (Severn Trent)

Apleyhead – the vision is overly ambitious and should relate more closely to the provisions of relevant policies in the Plan, specifically logistics only on this site (Sheffield City Council).

Harworth & Bircotes – the vision should better acknowledge that the town is accommodating housing growth over the plan period (Fisher German)

Development strategy – support for directing development to sustainable locations and to ensure that sufficient land is being made available to meet identified needs, but question whether it is necessary to pursue a Garden Village in this plan period (Muller Property Group). Others supported bringing forward a Garden Village to facilitate its contribution to healthy lifestyles and the green agenda (Savills).

Thirty year vision – the vision reflects ambitions to 2037, when the Garden Village is designed to deliver up to around 2053, should extend the vision to the very long term to cover the Garden Village delivery, but as a minimum it should look to 15 years from the expected date of adoption in 2023 (Spawforths).

Use of previously developed land – support for re-use of brownfield land, particularly that which can provide economic growth. This should include the former Bevercotes Colliery site (Gladmans).

5.0 A Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw

Apleyhead – the site is additional to the general employment need and could have negative impacts for regional growth in unsustainable locations (Rotherham Metropolitan District Council); the inclusion of this site is to meet an identified need for logistics in the wider market area, and should not be allocated to improve the quality of jobs (Sheffield City Council).

Housing need – several representors stated the housing requirement of 591 per annum is unjustified, is not consistent with the Government’s standard methodology and not supported by the evidence (Sheffield City Council, NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillors, Bassetlaw Conservative Councillor Group, National Trust, Townplanning.co.uk, Retford Civic Society, Est Markham Parish Council, residents) and is designed to meet other district’s unmet needs (Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council, East Markham Parish Council). Others consider this is likely to make Retford a dormitory town with limited employment and lacking infrastructure (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor). However, other representors indicated the approach was consistent with national policy, and agreed with planning for a housing requirement that exceeds the standard method to support the economic growth in the district and to help deliver sufficient affordable homes to meet evidenced need (Muller Property Group, Inovo Consulting, Home Builders Federation, Fisher German, Barton Wilmore). More flexibility should be built in, in the event that Sheffield confirm it is unable to meet its own needs (Fisher German).

Employment need – the employment allocation is higher than the employment need (Sheffield City Council, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council), the level of jobs growth is unrealistic for the type of employment development expected, and does not take into account Brexit (resident) and will lead to unsustainable travel patterns (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, National Trust, Retford Civic Society, East Markham Parish Council). Others are supportive of the economic-led, jobs growth strategy that retains employment locally, provide opportunities for better paid, higher skilled jobs and increase productivity (Inovo Consulting, Muller Property Group, Home Builders Federation).

Housing distribution – support given to the settlement hierarchy; the approach to deliver sustainable development and growth appropriate to the size of each settlement particularly the housing number attributed to Worksop Outer Area (Inovo Consulting), Retford (Fisher German, Barton Wilmore) and the rural area (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, Lound Parish Council, Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, Derbyshire County Council). Others consider an additional settlement category between large and small rural settlements would provide for those acting as a rural hub (Welbeck Estates). However other representors stated that more housing sites should be distributed to Retford (Muller Property Group, Marrons Planning, nineteen47); Harworth & Bircotes (Fisher German, Spawforths), and the rural area (Barton Wilmore, Crowley Associates Ltd, IBA Planning). It is considered that the approach to Tuxford has not taken into account reasonable alternatives, resulting in the allocation of sites which are not needed (NCC County Councillor, Townplanning.co.uk).

Employment distribution – the spatial strategy for employment should align more closely with housing so employment should be based at Apleyhead and the Garden Village (Townplanning.co.uk). Brownfield sites such as Bevercotes should be identified as a Priority

Regeneration Area for employment use (Gladmans). Concern that employment sites take time to be delivered and will have to compete with South Yorkshire may not be delivered (Retford Civic Society).

Infrastructure delivery – existing infrastructure will be unable to cope with more demand from new houses, there is no plan to address this and the growth will have impact upon the environment and local communities (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, Residents).

Settlement Boundaries – The approach taken to assess and define settlement boundaries is unclear, particularly for rural settlements (Gladmans), and should include sites that are under construction on the edge of Worksop and Retford for example (Grace Machin, nineteen47).

Loss of greenfield land – the level of growth proposed results in the large scale loss of greenfield land which is not sustainable, may impact on the regeneration of other sites in Bassetlaw and may generate unsustainable transport patterns (National Trust, Retford Civic Society, Town Planning.co.uk, residents). Others support the sustainable extensions to existing settlements and the re-use of brownfield sites, such as through the Worksop DPD (Muller Property Group, McLoughlin Planning)

Plan period – the plan is likely to reach adoption later than 2022, so is not in accordance with national planning policy which requires strategic policies to look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from the date of adoption. The plan period should be extended, the housing requirement increased and additional housing allocations identified (Spawforths, Marrons Planning).

Housing delivery – The anticipated delivery rates are ambitious and there is an over reliance on sites within Neighbourhood Plans, some of which are constrained (Spawforths). It is unclear from the evidence whether all of the transport requirements for the site allocations can be accommodated on the road network (NCC).

Housing supply – the plan is not positively prepared because there is limited flexibility in the overall supply, particularly if Sheffield is unable to meet its own needs (Fisher German). A non-implementation lapse rate should be applied to commitments and allocations to maintain a flexible supply, to accord with national policy (Spawforths, Home Builders Federation). The windfall allowance is not evidenced and may not be maintained for the plan period (Spawforths, Home Builders Federation). The housing supply should include a mix of small, medium and large sites to provide a wide mix of products, including 10% on smaller sites of less than 1 ha. This would require more allocations to meet the housing requirement (Home Builders Federation). The plan is unclear about the five year housing land supply position on adoption using the housing requirement and should use a 10% buffer rather than a 5% buffer (Home Builders Federation).

Cottam Priority Regeneration Area – the site is a broad location so should be included in the spatial strategy as it is a location for future growth (Gladmans). Others consider the location should not be identified for development; it is not evidenced and may be unviable when all mitigation is put in place (residents, Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council). The exclusion of guidance on the appropriate types or mix of land uses is unjustified, lacks guidance and certainty (Gerald Eve LLP, Pegasus Group), whilst other representors state appropriate lead-in times must be built-in to ensure all upfront utilities infrastructure can be accommodated and for an appropriate transport strategy to be agreed and implemented (Severn Trent, NCC).

Rural settlement categorisation – the approach taken to categorisation of the rural settlements is unjustified and unclear and should include further opportunities for growth in the Large and Small Rural Settlements to reflect previous delivery (Barton Wilmore, Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist, Welbeck Estates, East Markham Parish Council, IBA Planning). A

third rural category should be identified to ensure development is directed to the most sustainable settlements (Welbeck Estates).

Growth requirement – the requirement and its operation lack clarity (Walkeringham Parish Council, East Markham Parish Council) and appear as a cap to growth (Welbeck Estates); breakdown between commitments and new housing is unclear (Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist), as is whether Neighbourhood Plan allocations have been double counted in the commitments (Asbury Planning). The growth requirement and the base dates differ from those in the spatial strategy (Asbury Planning, Pegasus Group, Gladmans) and should include a lapse rate and in-built monitoring to protect against non-delivery of housing allocated in made Neighbourhood Plans (Barton Wilmore). The growth identified for the Small Rural Settlements should be higher than 5% (Pegasus Group, IBA Planning).

Developer-led pre-application community consultation – the approach to developer led consultation is unclear and unjustified and may undermine the Neighbourhood Plan process, which should be the only way additional growth can be accommodated (Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, Lound Parish Council, Resident). The policy criteria are unduly restrictive and should align with national policy (Barton Wilmore, Spawforths, Gladmans, IBA Planning)

Principle of a Garden Village – new settlement is unjustified, will see the loss or a large area of agricultural land; there are other small rural settlements and brownfield land that could take the growth (Residents, NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, National Trust, Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist, Barton Wilmore). Its build out is expected to take 30 years; the plan period, vision document and the Sustainability Appraisal should be extended to cover that time frame (Spawforths, McLoughlin Planning, Stone Planning Services Ltd) and the impacts of the full allocation should be considered (NCC)..

Bassetlaw Garden Village design principles – Support for the design and development principles particularly relating to climate change, ecology and healthy place-making and the infrastructure requirements, including the closure of relevant level crossings (Sport England, Savills, Network Rail, Bassetlaw CCG, Network Rail). Support for the Consultative Group to take this forward, and for comprehensive stewardship plan to be put in place (National Trust). Potential impacts on nearby SAC and SSSI will need to be addressed as a cross-boundary matter (Newark & Sherwood District Council, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council); the outputs of the associated evidence base are not known (National Trust).

Garden Village delivery - Lack of evidence to demonstrate delivery of the Garden Village, other site allocations should be identified to accommodate the numbers associated with the first phase (Muller Property Group, McLoughlin Planning, Gladmans). Should be identified as a longer term development option in the next plan; if an allocation is taken forward a 15% flexibility allowance should be added to manage lack of delivery (Muller Property Group). Concern that the infrastructure identified may not be available in this plan leading to unsustainable development (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, East Markham Parish Council, Retford Civic Society, Barton Wilmore, NCC). It is unclear from the transport evidence what the scale of impacts upon the local road network in Retford and upon the A57, in combination with other allocations will be, what the extent of mitigation required should be and how appropriate mitigation will be secured (residents, NCC).

Worksop Central – support for the regeneration of Worksop Central particularly the provisions put in place to deliver multifunctional green/blue infrastructure and reduce flood risk (Canal & River Trust, Severn Trent). However, others stated that for years 5-15 deliverability is unrealistic, and that sites are unlikely to come forward as envisaged; other edge of Worksop site allocations should be allocated to de-risk housing delivery (McLoughlin Planning).

6.0 Delivering Economic Prosperity

Employment need - the employment land position is higher than the employment need, which could undermine the ability of nearby areas to meet their needs. The approach taken is inconsistent with national policy (Sheffield City Council). Others consider the plan aligns with the Growth and Recovery Strategy and will help secure employment diversification through employment and skills plans; and further capitalises on the Districts locational advantage along the A1/A57, as this will help diversify the local and regional economy (D2N2 LEP).

Distribution of employment sites – support for the approach taken to economic growth along the A1 and A57 corridors but consider the site allocations should include Bevercotes Colliery as a deliverable, consented site capable of contributing to the 15 year supply (DHL Real Estate Solutions, Gladmans).

Strategic employment site – support is given for Apleyhead being identified solely for sub-regional/regional logistics needs outwith the general employment supply; that Bassetlaw are well placed to capitalise on the A1/A57 corridors and the potential for large scale logistics as evidenced by the logistics assessment; but it could be strengthened by ensuring the site does not adversely impact regional economic growth aspirations (Sheffield City Council, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council). Even so it is considered that the site is unlikely to adversely impact the northern Derbyshire (HMA) authorities (Derbyshire County Council). However others consider Apleyhead to be unjustified, not evidenced; it is unclear how associated housing numbers would be managed; could have an adverse impact on the highway network, environment and commuting (National Trust).

Employment delivery – the approach should take a more flexible approach to the mix of employment uses on site; these should include the full range of Class E uses (Fisher German).

High Marnham Green Energy Hub – Support for the re-use of a brownfield site for renewable energy and low carbon development and for the use of a Local Development Order to manage change; lacks clarity about how/when and acceptable land uses will be on the site (National Trust, JG Pears). Infrastructure delivery to support the regeneration of the site is unclear particularly for transport (Town Planning.co.uk, NCC, East Markham District Council). Consider that the site has significant potential for the deployment of green energy, and is capable of responding to different technologies and market signals (Gladmans, JG Pears). Others state the mix of employment uses and/or renewable energy and low carbon technologies on site is unjustified, as is the available site area (JG Pears).

Apleyhead deliverability - It is unclear from the transport evidence what the scale of impacts upon the A1 and the A57 in combination with other allocations will be, and how appropriate mitigation will be secured (Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, National Trust, NCC). Support given for an Improvement Plan to develop a mechanism to secure financial contributions to support delivery (Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, NCC).

Existing employment sites - a more flexible approach to the mix of employment uses on site should be taken; these should include the full range of Class E uses (Rapleys). Others highlighted discrepancies between the policy content and the Policies Map (Heaton Planning, Carlton Forest Partnership).

Rural economy –support for the approach taken to the rural economy, but some representors considered that the approach could be more positive (Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist, Welbeck Estate).

Town centres – the approach should provide more flexibility in its consideration of the change of use of local shops outside the retail hierarchy (IDP Planning); and that taken to development in local centres is unjustified and should align with national policy (IDP Planning). Support for

providing a framework to manage town centres but it is unclear why the primary shopping area boundary for Retford is drawn tightly; it should include Cannon Square (Retford Civic Society).

7.0 Living Communities

Housing Distribution – It is unclear why Tuxford is the only settlement to have a hybrid approach to deliver its housing requirement; it could undermine the neighbourhood plan review and it is unclear whether reasonable alternatives for Tuxford have been considered (Townplanning.co.uk). Others suggested more sites should be identified to provide choice of land (GraceMachin, Muller Property Group, Spawforths, Marrons Planning, McLoughlin planning).

Housing delivery - the Plan is relying on three large sites which is not robust particularly as they are reliant on infrastructure delivery/improvements; and the Garden Village will have a long lead-in time; it should have a mix of small, medium and large sites; slow delivery could have significant impacts on the housing trajectory (planning agent, Marrons Planning). Additional sites should be allocated to maintain a robust supply (Fisher German, GraceMachin, Muller Property Group, Spawforths, Marrons Planning).

HS1: Peaks Hill Farm – support given to the site, but consider the housing delivery timeframe is pessimistic: dwellings could deliver from 2024/25 rather than 2026 (Inovo Consulting, Carlton Forest Partnership). However, others oppose the site because local infrastructure will be unable to cope, the environmental impact and loss of agricultural land will be great, and the numbers are too high for this location (residents, Residents Against Peaks Hill Farm, Bassetlaw Conservative Councillor Group). It is unclear from the transport evidence what the scale of impacts upon the local road network in Worksop and upon the A57, in combination with other allocations will be, what the extent of mitigation required should be and how appropriate mitigation will be secured (residents, NCC) and whether a new link road will help (residents).

HS4: Former Manton Primary School – support for the approach, particularly the protection of the playing field (Sport England).

HS7: Trinity Farm - support given to the allocation, but consider the housing numbers pessimistic: the site area can accommodate slightly more dwellings than identified (Fisher German). Support given to the approach taken to mitigating potential impacts upon the nearby railway line (Network Rail). The requirement for contributions to highways improvements is unjustified (Fisher German), but others consider that it is unclear from the transport evidence what the scale of impacts upon the local road network in Retford in combination with other allocations will be, and how appropriate mitigation will be secured (NCC).

HS8: Milnercroft – it is unclear how much of the site is in use as allotments (resident); clarification is sought relating to the width of the access road which appears of insufficient to accommodate a private drive (NCC).

HS11: Fairygrove – support given to the approach taken to mitigating potential impacts upon the nearby railway line (Network Rail); the approach taken to access needs re-visiting to create a permeable network with 2 access points (NCC).

HS13: Ordsall South – support for development as long as it has correct infrastructure; bringing forward the Garden Village instead would be a better option (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor). Others oppose the planned development because infrastructure will not be able to cope; it is unclear whether the infrastructure will be delivered; infrastructure delivery should be fully funded by the development, transport, school and health facilities (residents, NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, Bassetlaw Conservative Councillor Group, Retford Civic Society). Others oppose the unjustified loss of greenfield land (National Trust), the

approach taken to managing the green gap (Muller Property Group) and flood risk (resident, BDC Councillor). It is unclear from the transport evidence what the impacts of housing in this plan period will be upon the local road network in Retford and nearby villages in combination with other allocations and the Garden Village (NCC, residents, Retford Civic Society); the mitigation proposed is not justified, the demand management measures are unclear, and it is unclear how appropriate mitigation will be secured and phased over two plan periods (NCC); and, whether a new distributor road between the site and London Road has been considered (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor). However, others support the release of a site with good public transport connectivity (Barton Wilmore) and that promotes sports provision (Sport England).

HS14 Ollerton Road, Tuxford: is unnecessary as the housing requirement is exceeding the standard method, and housing would result in harm that outweighs benefits of housing delivery because local infrastructure will be unable to cope, the environmental impact, the green gap and loss of agricultural land will be unjustified (Townplanning.co.uk, residents). The method and process of assessing potential development sites within Tuxford is unclear (BDC Councillor).

Site specific transport requirements - a Transport Statement will not be required for schemes under 50 units (HS5 Talbot Road; HS8: Milnercroft; HS10: St Michael's; HS12: Station Road) (NCC); highways improvements and transport contributions identified for some smaller sites in Retford should be confirmed with the Highways Authority (HS9: Former Elizabethan School; HS10: St Michael's View; HS11: Fairygrove) (NCC).

Affordable Housing – support for provision of affordable housing and different approach to greenfield/brownfield land (Home Builders Federation, Churchills Retirement Living); clarification sought relating to affordable housing tenure mix and impacts upon site viability and approach to be taken for off-site and/or financial contributions in lieu of on site provision (Spawforths, Home Builders Federation, Churchills Retirement Living, Welbeck Estates). Support for First Homes requirement but it is unclear whether the requirement for at least 10% of homes be for affordable home ownership is addressed (Spawforths, Home Builders Federation).

Housing mix – the principle of an appropriate housing mix is supported (Gladmans) although some considered it to be prescriptive (Spawforths, Fisher German); the basis for the requirement for 2% of homes on larger sites to be for self-build and custom build housing is unclear, the impacts upon site viability should be clarified (Home Builders Federation, Fisher German, Gladmans, Welbeck Estates).

Specialist Housing – the requirement for all new homes to be built to the optional building regulations standard was unjustified, and the impacts upon viability were unclear (Home Builders Federation). However others commended the approach taken to contribute to meeting an identified need (Churchills Retirement Living).

Gypsy and traveller provision – it is unclear whether the site proposed at Hayton is capable of accommodating the number of pitches identified (Hayton Parish Council); clarification is sought relating to the location and number of pitches sought for stopover use (Hayton Parish Council).

Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings - is too restrictive; a broader approach to development in the countryside should be taken (Welbeck Estates).

8.0 Local Character and Distinctiveness

Design Quality – it is unclear what weight should be given to the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards as they sit outside the Local Plan (Home Builders Federation).

Green gaps - support given to the designation of green gaps and their use to help manage urban sprawl (National Trust) particularly at north Retford (residents). However other representors stated that green gaps are unjustified; their purpose is unclear and is overly restrictive, particularly north west Worksop and south Retford, and the boundaries are not evidenced which may restrict otherwise acceptable growth (McLoughlin Planning, Barton Wilmore).

Green/blue infrastructure – the proposed use of buffer zones along green corridors is unjustified, and the approach taken to delivery of development within the buffer zone is unclear (JG Pears).

Biodiversity and trees – support given to the comprehensive policy framework identified for biodiversity and tree protection, including the approach taken to biodiversity net gain (National Trust, Natural England). However, others stated that the approach to biodiversity net gain is unjustified as it is in advance of national legislation, and that the viability impacts of net gain, tree planting and maintenance are unclear (IDP Planning, Home Builders Federation). Clarity required that the recommendations of the recreational impact assessment will be delivered (Natural England).

9.0 Healthy Communities

Contaminated land – support the principle of the approach but to better align with national legislation/policy the definition of waterways should be widened to include impacts upon watercourses and groundwater (Severn Trent).

10.0 Greening Bassetlaw

Sustainability building standards – support, in principle, for the use of BREEAM Standards and the optional water efficiency standard (Severn Trent) but others required clarity on whether other equivalent sustainability building standards could be applied to non-residential development (IDP Planning). Others stated that the viability impacts of securing these standards; and the Part L changes to building regulations are unclear, and that a carbon offsetting fund should not be required (Home Builders Federation, Welbeck Estates).

Electric vehicle charging – the approach taken to securing electric vehicle charging should be clarified (Home Builders Federation).

Renewable Energy Generation – support the approach taken to the promotion of renewable energy technology and low carbon development particularly at a commercial scale (Lanpro). However, others stated that the requirement for expected power generation based upon yield is unjustified (JG Pears).

Flood Risk and Drainage– support the use of SuDS and the drainage hierarchy in new development, and the use of water management systems in larger new developments (Severn Trent). It is unclear what role the SuDS Manual plays (Severn Trent).

Water quality management – support is given to the policy approach which reflects the principles of the Water Framework Directive and the provisions put in place ensuring appropriate water, sewerage and sewage treatment is in place to meet development needs (Severn Trent, National Trust).

11.0 Transport and Connectivity

A57 – it is unclear from the evidence the extent of the impacts the proposed level of growth and allocations, particularly from Apleyhead and the Garden Village will have on the A57 between Worksop and the A1; the mitigation required and its delivery (National Trust, NCC). Support is given to taking forward an Improvement Plan, in partnership with neighbouring

authorities to ensure the wider implications of growth at a strategic level across the full A57 route between the A1 and M1 are fully understood (Sheffield City Council, Derbyshire County Council, NCC); and so that proportional funding from relevant development towards the A57 improvements can be secured (NCC).

Transport impacts in Doncaster – the approach is unclear about whether the impacts of Local plan growth upon the road network in Doncaster particularly Tickhill and Bawtry has been appropriately considered (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council).

Sustainable and active travel – support is given for the approach taken, including for new and improved walking and cycling infrastructure (Sport England). However, it is unclear how new cycle infrastructure can be delivered on the existing highway to meet the national LKN20 standard (NCC). Consideration should be given to contributions supporting a Travel Plan Co-ordinator (NCC).

12.0 Infrastructure and Delivery

Safeguarded land – additional land may need to be safeguarded to enable the delivery of transport schemes identified by the emerging transport evidence (NCC). However support is given to safeguarding land at the Garden Village for a railway station (Sheffield City Council).

Digital Infrastructure – the requirement should not exceed the Building Regulations (Part R) meaning the viability impacts of the approach are unclear (Home Builders Federation). Flexibility should be built-in to ensure development in rural Bassetlaw can secure digital infrastructure (Welbeck Estates).

Infrastructure delivery – the approach taken to partnership working to secure health infrastructure is supported (Bassetlaw CCG). However, the proposal to make sites of 50 or more dwellings exempt from CIL is unjustified and will mean that there will be less CIL available to deliver strategic infrastructure such as for the A57, which is the mechanism identified by transport evidence as being the mechanism by which developer funding will be secured. Further clarification is sought about how strategic infrastructure improvements will be funded (NCC). It is unclear how the review mechanism proposed will work in practice (Welbeck Estates). Support for the inclusion of transport assessments within the site specific policies (National Highways).

Implementation and Monitoring

No comment or no issue raised.

Glossary

No comment or no issue raised.

Appendix 1: Policies Schedule

No comment or no issue raised.

Appendix 2: References

No comment or no issue raised.

Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory

Additional housing sites are required to support the housing trajectory in the medium term once the supply of commitments and smaller windfalls have delivered (McLoughlin Planning).

Sustainability Appraisal – the approach taken to the assessment of policies and sites, and sites with planning permission is unclear (Fisher German, National Trust, Gladmans); the detailed outcomes of two allocations and several reasonable alternatives is unjustified (Town Planning.co.uk., Stone Planning Services Limited, Marrons Planning)

Habitats Regulations Assessment – the Habitats Regulations have been met, and the assessment also appropriately includes a shadow HRA to address the Sherwood Forest ppSPA in the district, which also fully aligns with legislation (Natural England). Support the outcome that the provisions of the Local Plan and the draft Recreational Impact Assessment has no adverse impact upon the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC outside the district, but need clarification that mitigation identified will be sought (Natural England). It is unclear how the Assessment can conclude that there will be no adverse effects when the recreational impact assessment is only at draft stage and has not been formally published (National Trust).

Policies Maps

Settlement Boundaries – The settlement boundaries are unjustified; sites with planning permission on the edge of settlements should be included within the boundary particularly Worksop; reference to committed sites is unclear and does not align with a policy approach for rural settlements, and should include sites that are under construction on the edge of such as at Worksop (GraceMachin).

Interactive map - There are inconsistencies between the Policies Map and the interactive map relating to site boundaries for Existing Employment Sites at Lound (Heaton Planning) and Carlton Forest (Carlton Forest Partnership). Development boundaries should include housing commitments,).

Evidence Base

Economic Development Need Assessment 2019 – the approach taken to site selection of the employment site allocations and reasonable alternatives including assessments within the Sustainability Appraisal do not align with the evidence in this report (Stone Planning Services Limited, Townplanning.cok.uk)

Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 – is not up to date or robust as it does not address Covid and the economic recovery, including the market signals/activity in the area such as at Bevercotes Colliery (DHL Real Estate Solutions); jobs growth figures should be higher, with associated higher levels of housing promoted by the Local Plan; this would maintain current housing delivery rates (Spawforths).

Bassetlaw A1 Logistics Assessment, August 2021- is not up to date as it excludes Bevercotes Colliery, thereby underestimating the level of logistics supply in the area (DHL Real Estate Solutions).

Infrastructure Delivery Plan – recognition that this is a live document but concern relates to lack of costs for infrastructure expected to be delivered by strategic sites, particularly the Garden Village (Barton Wilmore, NCC, Stone Planning Services Limited); these omissions can impact upon the funding gap and the justification for retaining CIL (Stone Planning Services Limited, NCC, NCC Councillor and BDC Councillor); it is unclear which funding mechanisms will be used to secure specific types of infrastructure particularly for transport (NCC)

Landscape Assessment November 2019 and Landscape Assessment Addendum October 2020 – do not assess the potential impact of all the proposed allocations and reasonable alternatives upon the landscape (townplanning.co.uk, McLoughlin Planning).

Bassetlaw Heritage Methodology November 2020 - do not assess the potential impact of all the proposed allocations and reasonable alternatives upon heritage (townplanning.co.uk)

General Comments

The plan-making process was not accessible enough; once the Covid 19 pandemic was evident most of the consultations after March 2020 were undertaken online; the forms at Regulation 19 stage are confusing and difficult to use (residents, Friends of Peaks Hill Farm).

Main Issues raised pursuant to Regulations 19/20 January 2022 Publication Addendum Plan:

By section of the Addendum, the main issues raised pursuant to Regulations 19/20 were:

1.0 Introduction

Recreational impact assessment – concern about the extent of engagement undertaken in the drafting of the assessment (Sheffield City Council), however others welcomed the engagement that had been undertaken (Mansfield District Council, Rotherham MBC).

2.0 What are we consulting on?

No comment or no issue raised.

3.0 How do I make comments on the proposed changes within the Addendum?

No comment or no issue raised.

4.0 What will happen to the comments made to the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version

Vision and Objectives

Thirty year vision – the vision now reflects ambitions to 2038 which is supported; but the Garden Village is designed to deliver to around 2053, should extend the vision to cover its delivery (Baron Wilmore, Spawforths, Pegasus Group).

Apleyhead – the vision now appropriately reflects the provisions of relevant policies in the Plan, specifically logistics only on this site (Sheffield City Council).

Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy

Loss of greenfield land – the level of growth proposed results in the large scale loss of greenfield land which is not sustainable, may impact on the regeneration of other sites in Bassetlaw and will lead to unsustainable travel patterns (National Trust, Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist, residents).

Employment need – the approach uses assumptions rather than specific jobs numbers; the level of jobs growth is unrealistic for the type of employment development expected (residents, Retford Civic Society, NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, National Trust) and does not take into account Brexit (resident); these might not be maintained in the future which could have negative impacts for regional growth (Rotherham Metropolitan District Council, Sheffield City Council); others supported the clarification given to explaining the economic policy (National Trust, Barton Wilmore); whilst others consider the number of jobs provided for as pessimistic (Spawforths).

Employment land provision - the general employment need does not correlate with that allocated; should allocate more employment sites to meet need (FCC Environment Ltd, Spawforths, Gentina Development, Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist). Others considered the level of employment growth is not deliverable in the plan period (Retford Civic Society), whilst others consider the sites allocated are deliverable (Quod, Gladmans, IBA Planning).

Extension of plan period – support for adding an extra year to the plan period to align with national policy (Barton Wilmore, Fisher German, Inovo Consulting, Gladmans, Pegasus

Group); others consider the plan period should be extended further to provide flexibility (Pegasus Group).

Housing need – several representors stated increasing the housing requirement is not justified (residents), is not consistent with the Government's standard methodology and not supported by the evidence (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillors, National Trust, Retford Civic Society, residents). However, others supported the increase in housing requirement to align with the additional year of the plan period (Barton Wilmore, Fisher German, Inovo Consulting, GPS Planning & Design Ltd).

Housing distribution – support for the approach to deliver the additional year's housing on the strategic sites (Inovo Consulting, Fisher German, Barton Wilmore). However, other representors stated that the additional year's housing should be provided on additional/reserve sites to provide for a more diverse mix of sites over the plan period, distributed to Worksop (McLoughlin Planning), Retford (Marrons Planning) and Harworth & Bircotes (Fisher German, Spawforths), whilst others considered new housing should be spread to the Large and Small Rural Settlements and other rural villages (Barton Wilmore, Pegasus Group, IBA Planning).

Apleyhead – the mix of uses on this site should be more flexible to meet market needs (NJL Consulting), others consider that the evidence is not robust to justify the allocation of a strategic site for logistics (National Trust), whilst neighbouring authorities support the logistics assessment to justify Apleyhead (Rotherham MBC).

Infrastructure delivery – existing infrastructure will be unable to cope with more demand for new houses, the lack of CIL is unjustified and will mean that there will be less CIL available to deliver strategic infrastructure, there is no credible mechanism to improve the A57 and there's an £89m funding gap (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, Residents).

Settlement Boundaries – the approach taken to assess and define settlement boundaries is unclear, and should include sites that have planning permission on the edge of Langold for example (Pegasus Group).

Housing delivery – the anticipated delivery rates are ambitious; there is an over reliance on sites within Neighbourhood Plans, some of which are constrained, at three strategic sites. It is unclear if the higher rate of delivery achieved in recent years can be maintained (Spawforths, McLoughlin Planning).

Housing supply – a non-implementation lapse rate should be applied to commitments and allocations to maintain a flexible supply, to accord with national policy (Spawforths, Marrons Planning). The windfall allowance is not evidenced and may not be maintained for the plan period (Spawforths, Pegasus Group). The housing supply should include a mix of small, medium and large sites to provide a wide mix of products (Spawforths, Marrons Planning); and, should use a 10% buffer rather than a 5% buffer (Spawforths).

Bassetlaw Garden Village

Principle of a Garden Village – new settlement is unjustified, will see the loss or a larger area of agricultural land; should be identified as a longer term development option in the next plan and not an allocation in this one (Barton Wilmore); there are other small rural settlements and brownfield land that could take the growth proposed there (Barton Wilmore, Spawforths, Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist). Concern that the infrastructure identified may not be available or deliverable in this plan which could result in the site becoming a car dominated settlement initially (Barton Wilmore, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council). Others support the masterplan framework and consider it should be adopted as a SPD (NCC).

Bassetlaw Garden Village design principles – support for the design and development principles particularly relating to active travel, green infrastructure, healthy place-making and recreational impact (BDC Councillor, Natural England, Sport England), although others required clarification relating to impacts upon Clumber Park (National Trust).

Promoting Economic Growth

General employment site – support is given to the sites allocated (Quod, Gladmans, IBA Planning, Fisher German), others consider the approach taken to meet local business needs as unjustified as many of the sites allocated are accommodating logistics, so additional sites are required to meet local needs (Gentina Development). Others state the site selection process is unclear (FCC Environment Limited).

Strategic employment site – Apleyhead is considered to be deliverable in the short term (NJL Consulting, NCC); the policy could be strengthened further by ensuring the site does not adversely impact wider regional economic growth aspirations (Sheffield City Council).

High Marnham Energy Hub

High Marnham Green Energy Hub – the removal of High Marnham as an employment site is supported (Town planning.co.uk); however others consider that the removal of the employment allocation is unjustified as the site is able to deliver a general employment site to meet local business needs; energy generation is not an efficient use of brownfield land; the policy framework is restrictive and will hinder investment on site; an allocation is needed to support the site owners business plans and other businesses that could make use of the grid connectivity (Framptons).

Section 7: Housing

Housing delivery - the Plan is relying on three large sites rather than a mix of small, medium and large sites; only includes one large site to meet the needs of Worksop, two for Retford which is not robust, and the Garden Village will have a long lead-in time; slow delivery could have significant impacts on the housing trajectory; additional sites should be allocated in both towns, in Harworth & Bircotes to maintain a robust supply (Spawforths, Marrons Planning). The larger site allocations are reliant on infrastructure delivery; other reasonable alternatives do not so would provide more certainty that the housing requirement can be met (Marrons Planning).

HS1: Peaks Hill Farm – support given to the approach, but consider the housing delivery timeframe is pessimistic: dwellings could deliver from 2024/25 rather than 2026; the policy requirements for transport would best be secured via the planning application process (Inovo Consulting, IBA Planning). However others oppose the allocation because local infrastructure will be unable to cope, the environmental impact and loss of agricultural land will be great, and the numbers are too high for this location (Residents). The allocation is contrary to the Carlton in Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan (Resident).

HS7: Trinity Farm - support given to the allocation and the revised site capacity, as is the approach taken to employment capacity (Fisher German). Support given to the approach taken to mitigating potential impacts upon the nearby railway line (Network Rail). The policy requirements for transport would best be secured via the planning application process (Fisher German).

HS13: Ordsall South – concern that infrastructure will not be able to cope, particularly for education, transport, flood management and whether this is evidenced; it is unclear whether the infrastructure will be delivered; infrastructure delivery should be fully funded by the

development, (residents, NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor, Retford Civic Society). It is unclear from evidence whether a new link road between the site and London Road has been considered. However, others support the revised site capacity (Barton Wilmore), provision of good public transport connectivity (Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council), the inclusion of a SANG (Natural England, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council).

Gypsy and traveller provision – concern about formalising Blyth and Elkesley, with clarification sought over controls over the use of sites in the future (Hayton Parish Council, residents, Elkesley Parish Council). The approach taken to site selection does not align with national policy; it is unclear whether a sequential approach has been undertaken to identify the proposed site allocations; the sites are not considered to align with the criteria listed in the policy; and local infrastructure is unable to cope with the change of use particularly for transport and drainage (Hayton Parish Council, residents, Elkesley Parish Council, Savills). The number of pitches proposed on each site is disproportionate to the number of dwellings in the nearest settlement (Hayton Parish Council, Savills)

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Recreational impact assessment – concern over the implications of introducing the recommendations identified by the assessment (Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council), the late extension of the zone of influence; and the approach taken to consulting authorities within the zone is a concern; the blanket approach proposed is unjustified (P&DG, Sheffield City Council). However, others support the additional policy requirements (Natural England, National Trust) subject to detailed implementation being agreed

Biodiversity net gain – it is unclear whether the viability impacts of net gain for commercial development have been assessed by evidence (ID Planning)

Renewable Energy Generation

Renewable Energy Generation – concern that the approach requires evidence of need; the policy is unclear on the criteria to be used to assess applications outside an area of best fit, which does not align with national policy (Enso Energy Limited, National Trust). Clarification sought on the justification for identifying the Area of Best Fit, including impacts on biodiversity (Enso Energy Limited, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, Frampton Town Planning Ltd), however, others support the principle of the site's proposed use (Townplanning.co.uk, National Trust).

Transport Infrastructure

A57 – it is unclear whether the scope, scale and deliverability of interventions required on the A57 corridor, particularly from Apleyhead is evidenced (National Trust). Support is given to taking forward an Improvement Plan, in partnership with neighbouring authorities to secure a credible mechanism to deliver improvements to the A57 (Rotherham MBC, NCC, Derbyshire CC, National Trust).

Transport impacts in Doncaster – it is unclear whether the impacts of Local Plan growth upon the road network in Doncaster has been appropriately considered

Electric vehicle charging – need a more positive, proactive approach to commercial electric vehicle charging (Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist).

Infrastructure and Delivery

Infrastructure delivery – the proposal to make sites of 50 or more dwellings exempt from CIL is unjustified and leads to an £89m funding gap which will mean that there will be significantly less CIL available to deliver strategic infrastructure; there is no credible mechanism for improving the A57; clarification is sought about how strategic infrastructure improvements will

be funded (NCC Councillor, BDC Councillor, NCC). Support given for the mechanisms identified to secure infrastructure should CIL not be available (NCC).

Monitoring Framework

Support given to the inclusion of indicators relating to recreational impact at Clumber Park (Natural England).

Policies Maps

Settlement Boundaries – The settlement boundaries are unjustified; sites with planning permission on the edge of settlements should be included within the boundary particularly Langold (Pegasus Group).

Local Wildlife Sites – the Policies Map is not up to date; it does not appear to reflect the current designation of land (FCC Environment Ltd).

Evidence Base

Site Selection Methodology – it is unclear why the conclusions for sites have not been taken forward in the Plan (FCC Environment Limited); agricultural land classification should be taken into account (resident)

A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment: the baseline evidence is not up-to-date position, and should be reviewed (Quod); the strategic site is unlikely to solely meet the identified need for logistics, so the assessment should consider additional sites along the A1 to meet evidenced needs (Stone Planning Limited).

Infrastructure Delivery Plan – there are inconsistencies in the evidence; the evidence is unclear how the primary school at site HS13 will be funded (NCC Councillor, BDC Councillor); the 'expected contribution' for some sites is short of the estimated cost and there is still a funding gap which would otherwise justify applying CIL to the sites (NCC).

Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 – is not up to date or robust as it does not address Covid, Brexit and the economic recovery taking a pessimistic view; so more employment land is needed (Spawforths).

Landscape Assessment 2022 – it is limited in scope and is not up to date (Stone Planning Limited)

General Comments

Consultation process - a 1,300 person petition has been reported as a single objection (NCC Councillor, BDC Councillor); the consultation process was inaccessible (residents).

Main Issues raised pursuant to Regulations 19/20 May 2022 Publication Second Addendum Plan:

By section of the Second Addendum, the main issues raised pursuant to Regulations 19/20 were:

1.0 Introduction

Issues covered under spatial strategy below.

2.0 What are we consulting on?

No comment or no issue raised.

3.0 How do I make comments on the proposed changes within the Second Addendum?

No comment or no issue raised.

4.0 What will happen to the comments made to the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version and the January 2022 Addendum

No comment or no issue raised.

Vision and Objectives

Vision and objectives – should be recast more extensively to reflect the withdrawal of the Garden Village (Harris Lamb, Spawforths)

Climate change objective – support the approach taken as it will increase the Plan's resilience to mitigating climate change (Natural England), however others are concerned that the approach being taken to the sustainable use of land is weakened (National Trust)

Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy

Loss of greenfield land – the level of growth proposed results in the large scale loss of greenfield land which is not sustainable (National Trust, residents).

Employment need – the level of jobs growth is unrealistic and introduces allowances for double jobbing (TwelveTwentyOne Planning); and Covid and Brexit is not taken into account (Spawforths). It is unclear from the economic evidence whether an up to date position on economic recovery has been taken or if an up to date market assessment has taken place (Spawforths).

Employment land provision – the plan uses a completions trend scenario but the allocations do not reflect the rate of take-up/delivery for logistics (Gentina Development, Spawforths); the increase in jobs growth does not correlate with the employment land allocated (Gentina Development, Spawforths); the importance of the A1 corridor is not reflected appropriately and is not contributing to meeting strategic logistics needs (Spawforths). More employment sites are needed to meet needs (Spawforths, Gentina Development).

Extension of plan period – support for current plan period but consider should be extended further to provide flexibility (Harris Lamb, Pegasus Group).

Housing need – reducing the housing requirement is not justified: it will not meet increased economic needs (Pegasus Group, Spawforths, Marrons Planning); will not provide for sufficient affordable housing (Marrons Planning); does not reflect the delivery rates of previous years (Pegasus Group). However, others supported the housing requirement and its alignment with the jobs growth scenario (Barton Willmore (Stantec), Fisher German). There are inconsistencies between the growth figures for Large Rural Settlements and that identified in the spatial strategy. (GPS Planning, Barton Willmore).

Housing distribution – the housing previously associated with the Garden Village should be re-distributed to other sites distributed to Worksop (GraceMachin), Retford (Harris Lamb, Marrons Planning) and Harworth & Bircotes (Fisher German, Spawforths); others considered new housing should be spread to the Large and Small Rural Settlements and other rural villages (Barton Willmore, Pegasus Group, resident, Savills, GPS Planning). As a minimum the Plan should provide for reserve sites (Pegasus Group). The ability of sites to deliver housing in Worksop Central is uncertain (Pegasus Group). The housing allocated for Worksop is encroaching on Carlton in Lindrick which is contrary to the neighbourhood plan (residents).

Settlement Boundaries – the approach taken to assess and define settlement boundaries is unclear, and should include sites that have planning permission on the edge of Langold for example (Pegasus Group, GraceMachin).

Housing supply – a non-implementation lapse rate should be applied to commitments and allocations to maintain a flexible supply, to accord with national policy (Spawforths, Marrons Planning, Pegasus Group, Harris Lamb). The windfall allowance is not evidenced and may not be maintained for the plan period (Spawforths, Pegasus Group, Harris Lamb, Marrons Planning) and is unlikely to contribute to meeting identified needs (Marrons Planning). The housing supply should include a mix of small, medium and large sites to provide a wide mix of products (Spawforths, Marrons Planning); and, should use a 10% buffer rather than a 5% buffer (Spawforths).

Rural growth requirement - it is unclear whether the growth requirement is a 'cap' or a 'minimum' requirement (Savills); however others supported the current requirement (Clarborough & Welham Parish Council, Lound Parish Council, Lound Neighbourhood Plan Group). The categorisation of the large and small rural settlements is unjustified and unclear (resident, Savills, Barton Willmore, Babworth Parish Council).

Rural housing growth – the approach is restrictive and does not support growth in the rural area, should provide for more flexibility for growth in sustainable rural locations and the delivery of facilities (Barton Willmore, resident, Savills, Pegasus Group, Babworth Parish Council). It is reliant on additional growth being delivered via Neighbourhood Plans (Barton Willmore, Pegasus Group); should include a mechanism to approve housing via alternative means, should a Neighbourhood Plan be dated or delayed, or the community resist growth (Barton Willmore). However others supported the provisions that enable communities to have a greater say in the growth of their area (Lound Parish Council, Lound Neighbourhood Plan Group)

Bassetlaw Garden Village

Principle of a Garden Village – following withdrawal of land by one landowner, support given for the deletion of the Garden Village from the Plan (Barton Willmore (Stantec), Fisher German)

Promoting Economic Growth

General employment sites – support is given to the sites allocated (Gladmans), others consider the approach taken to meet local business needs as unjustified as many of the sites allocated are under construction and/or accommodating logistics, so additional sites are required to meet local needs particularly towards the end of the plan period (Gentina Development, Derek Kitson Technologist Ltd, Spawforths).

Strategic employment site – Apleyhead is considered to be deliverable in the short term (Barton Willmore (Stantec)), however the mix of uses on this site should be more flexible to meet market needs (Barton Willmore (Stantec)). The requirement for proposals to align with other local authorities plans is unjustified (Barton Willmore (Stantec)), however others welcome the policy provision (National Trust). It is unclear whether the transport evidence appropriately considers the impacts upon the A57 and the environment from the increase in traffic from the site (National Trust); however others recognise that work is ongoing in relation to the A57 Improvement Plan through duty to cooperate and that this will be evidenced through statement of common ground (NCC, Rotherham MBC).

Section 7: Housing

Housing delivery - there is an over reliance on sites within Neighbourhood Plans, some of which are constrained (Barton Willmore (Stantec), Spawforths); the Plan is relying on three large sites rather than a mix of small, medium and large sites; only includes one large site to meet the needs of Worksop, two for Retford which is not robust; slow delivery could have significant impacts on the housing trajectory; consider the Ordsall South is capable of delivering fully in this plan period (Barton Willmore (Stantec), Gerald Eve, Spawforths),

additional sites should be allocated in both towns and in Harworth & Bircotes to maintain a robust supply (Spawforths, Marrons Planning, Harris Lamb, Heatons). The larger site allocations are reliant on infrastructure delivery; other reasonable alternatives do not so would provide more certainty that the housing requirement can be met (Marrons Planning, Harris Lamb).

HS13: Ordsall South – concern that infrastructure will not be able to cope and it is unclear how the infrastructure will be delivered; infrastructure delivery should be fully funded by the development, (residents, NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor). It is unclear from evidence whether a new link road between the site and London Road has been considered (NCC County Councillor, BDC Councillor).

Affordable housing – support for requiring 20% affordable housing on brownfield sites (Rotherham MBC). It is unclear whether the impacts of affordable housing have been assessed for specialist housing, such provision should be exempt to enable greater number of specialist homes to be delivered to meet needs (Planning Issues).

Gypsy and traveller provision – support for the removal of the Elkesley site (Savills)

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Recreational impact – support for the change in approach as a result of the withdrawal of the Garden Village (Natural England, Rotherham MBC); however others say it is unclear why the potential recreational impacts would lessen solely on the basis of the Garden Village loss, and consider that the impacts of growth on the Clumber Park SSSI have not been fully addressed (National Trust)

Infrastructure and Delivery

Safeguarded land – reference should be made to the potential emerging Worksop Flood Management Scheme to align with ongoing feasibility work (Environment Agency)

Monitoring Framework

No comments or issues raised.

Housing Trajectory

Housing trajectory – it is not up to date and does not reflect all commitments and neighbourhood plan allocations (GPS Planning)

Policies Maps

Settlement Boundaries – the settlement boundaries are unjustified; sites with planning permission on the edge of settlements should be included within the boundary particularly Langold (Pegasus Group).

Local Wildlife Sites – the Policies Map is not up to date; it does not appear to reflect the current designation of land (Axis).

Evidence Base

Sustainability Appraisal – is out of date and inconsistent with other evidence base documents for several sites, and the outcomes for site assessments is inaccurate (Gentina Development, Marrons Planning, Harris Lamb, Heatons).

Site Selection Methodology – it is unclear why the conclusions for sites have not been taken forward in the Plan (Axis); there are inconsistencies between site selection recommendations and other evidence base documents, so the approach taken to identifying site allocations is unclear (Marrons Planning, Spawforths).

A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment Addendum: the updated position in terms of supply and demand is supported and confirms the approach taken to Apleyhead ((Barton Willmore (Stantec))

HEDNA Addendum – it is unclear why the 2020 HEDNA did not use the same assumptions as the Addendum when the impacts of Covid and Brexit were known; it is unlikely the approach taken to unemployment rates and double counting are robust as the economy continues to recover so reducing the housing requirement is unjustified (Pegasus Group, Spawforths). Others consider it to be a robust assessment of employment space and need (Barton Willmore (Stantec))

Infrastructure Delivery Plan – there are inconsistencies in the evidence (NCC Councillor, BDC Councillor); it is unclear why the costs are higher since the Garden Village is no longer in the plan (Barton Willmore (Stantec)); the evidence is unclear how the primary school at site HS13 will be funded (NCC Councillor, BDC Councillor); it is unclear how the site specific infrastructure requirements have been arrived at, their costings identified and how the proportionality has been reached (Barton Willmore (Stantec)).

Whole Plan Viability Assessment – it is unclear why the strategic sites are being proposed as CIL exempt when there is a funding gap of over £52m ((NCC Councillor, BDC Councillor); support given for employment sites being CIL exempt (Barton Willmore (Stantec))

Bassetlaw Transport Study – considerable progress has been made relating to highways and transport matters since Publication with regard to agreement over this study and to undertake work to plan for necessary improvements to the A57 (NCC)

General Comments

No main issues identified.