

**Bassetlaw Local Plan
2020-2038**

Publication Version

**August 2021 Consultation - Summary of
Representations Schedule Addendum**

GENERAL COMMENTS

Representation Reference:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Name:					
Representation Reference: 1908459.1 Name: Resident	Refers to: Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant. Plan is sound. Plan complies with Duty to Co-operate.	Comments: N/A	Suggested changes: N/A	Officer comments: Noted.
Representation Reference: 1945371.1 Name: Bassetlaw Conservative Councillor Group	Refers to: Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is not legally compliant, sound or complies with Duty to Cooperate.	Comments: Officers from Bassetlaw District Council have misled members and the public by declaring that infrastructure projects/plans have been agreed with Nottinghamshire. County Council when the fact is they have NOT been agreed. The local plan should be developed in a strong partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council where infrastructure can be planned together between district and county. Need to plan for better roads, schools, health services and all	Suggested changes: The local plan should be developed in a strong partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council where infrastructure can be planned together between district and county. We need to plan for better roads, schools, health services and all support services through partnership.	Officer comments: Officers of the County Council, acting within their delegated powers, had made clear in written responses to BDC that Ordsall South as proposed would generate sufficient demand to sustain a primary school. At no point in these discussions had NCC Officers suggested that there was any likelihood that the County Council would oppose the provision of a school. This was confirmed by NCC in their representations. The IDP 2022 confirms that the

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			support services through partnership.		development of a school at Ordsall South would be delivered through developer contributions. Agree that the local plan should be developed in a strong partnership with NCC to ensure infrastructure is planned comprehensively to benefit Bassetlaw's communities.
Representation Reference: REF003.1 Name: The Coal Authority	Refers to: Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037: Publication Version	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified.	Comments: The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. As a statutory consultee, The Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas. The Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on this document.	Suggested changes: None.	Officer comments: Noted.

Representation Reference:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Representation Reference: REF006.1 Name: Hayton Parish Council	Refers to: Consultation Process	Legal compliance and soundness: No comment on legal compliance or Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: Whilst information may have been available on the website, previous consultation packs received, made no mention of the proposal on which we will pass comment, nor was the item raised at the Rural Conference. Been informed that the proposal of 17 pitches have been included since January 2021, however, Hayton Parish Council were not made aware of this pertinent amendment to the draft Plan and therefore have not provided a previous comment.	Suggested changes: The proposed scale of increase to the size of the site is too large. Would like to see the increase to be lowered to a level at which is more appropriate to the size of the site.	Officer comments: The proposal to provide an additional 17 pitches at site GT001 has been in the Policy ST32 since the Regulation 18 January 2020 consultation. The Consultation Statement shows that all Local Plan consultations have been undertaken in accordance with, and have exceeded the requirements of the Local Planning regulations and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The 2022 Addendum reduces the site capacity at Hayton to 10 additional pitches. This is considered an appropriate extension to this site, the site is capable of accommodating the number of pitches associated with the proposed use.
Representation Reference: REF043.5 Name: Gladmans	Refers to: Emerging Planning Bill	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally	Comments: It will be important that the Council keeps abreast with the implementation of the Government's changes to the	Suggested changes: None	Officer comments: Noted.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
		<p>compliant and complies with Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>Plan is unsound.</p>	<p>Planning system (through the emerging Planning Bill) and determine any potential implications for the Local Plan.</p>		
<p>Representation Reference: REF051.2</p> <p>Name: Resident</p>	<p>Refers to: Consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan</p>	<p>Legal compliance and soundness: Plan does not comply legally and is unsound.</p> <p>Plan does not comply with the Duty to Cooperate</p>	<p>Comments: The community affected have been shut out. The majority of the publicising of the BDC plans have been through social media and a lack of real public engagement. At one of the last consultations online due to Covid all participants were muted and questions could only be typed! In the January 2020 consultations none of my neighbours knew about it. Neighbours had to inform neighbours.</p>	<p>Suggested changes: Rethink where you are proposing to build. Use more brownfield sites instead of using good farm land.</p>	<p>Officer comments: The Consultation Statement shows that all Local Plan consultations have been undertaken in accordance with, and have exceeded the requirements of the Local Planning regulations and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This includes those undertaken during the Covid pandemic; consultations were undertaken in accordance with the relevant Planning Practice guidance (Paragraph: 076 Reference ID: 61-076-201200513) and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement was updated in June 2021, to reflect National Guidance on undertaking</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
					Local Plan consultations during the Covid 19 pandemic.
Representation Reference: NRF-REF003.1 Name: West Stockwith Parish Council	Refers to: Consultation	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified.	Comments: West Stockwith Parish Council have no major comments to make on these consultations.	Suggested changes: None	Officer comments: Noted.
Representation Reference: NRF-REF013.1 Name: Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	Refers to: Support for Local Plan	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified.	Comments: Harworth & Bircotes Town Council has no issues with the Local Plan and supports its on-going progress towards completion.	Suggested changes: None	Officer comments: Noted.
Representation Reference: NRF-REF014.1 Name: East Markham Parish Council	Refers to: Consultation	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified.	Comments: Acknowledge the problem that Covid has made for the District Council but is of the view that more face-to-face meetings could have taken place throughout the district. Failing that each parish should have received a paper copy to be made available parishioners without access to the internet	Suggested changes: Hold face to face meetings or send a hard copy of the Local Plan when consulting	Officer comments: The Consultation Statement shows that all Local Plan consultations have been undertaken in accordance with, and have exceeded the requirements of the Local Planning regulations and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			or with difficulty travelling giving then the ability to contribute to the process.		This includes those undertaken during the Covid pandemic; consultations were undertaken in accordance with the relevant Planning Practice guidance (Paragraph: 076 Reference ID: 61-076-201200513) and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement was updated in June 2021, to reflect National Guidance on undertaking Local Plan consultations during the Covid 19 pandemic.
Representation Reference: REF008.5 Name: BDC and County Councillor	Refers to: Lack of contributions towards the extension of the Retford Railway Mainline ST54	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified	Comments: Due to increasing demand on the Kings Cross Edinburgh line, from expanding towns such as Doncaster, Leeds and Hull, the services in Retford have been reduced. These services are unlikely to be increased unless new capacity is financed throughout the line. There are no proposals to do so at the moment. For this reason the expansion of Retford is less desirable than the expansion of	Suggested changes: N/A	Officer comments: Retford is the second town in Bassetlaw, and sits on the East Coast Main Line. Network Rail have not specified any contributions and/or improvements to the capacity of the East Coast Main Line as a consequence of the level of new development proposed in Retford.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			other towns and cities where there is a better provided rail service.		
Representation Reference: REF033.7 Name: Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Refers to: The creation of an Employment Trajectory	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound	Comments: Unable to find a Trajectory for the delivery of employment land within the evidence base. Appendix 2 of the Plan sets out the Housing Trajectory. The Bassetlaw Garden Village is included and indicates that the first housing delivery will not be until 2030/31. It is unlikely that employment space will be available during the Plan Period. Sites which are deliverable without delay should be allocated now. An Employment Trajectory should be published as part of the evidence base.	Suggested changes: Publish an employment trajectory	Officer comments: National planning policy do not require the production of an employment trajectory. The May 2022 Second Addendum withdraws the Garden Village from the Local Plan.
Representation Reference: REF045.5 Name: Agent on behalf of land owner	Refers to: Land north of Common Lane LAA ST1	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with	Comments: Submission of Land north of Common Lane. The site comprises at least 14.19 ha of gross developable area and when calculated at a density of between 30 and 40 dwellings per hectare, could yield	Suggested changes: Include the site in Ranskill in the Plan.	Officer comments: The Local Plan distributes housing growth according to the settlement hierarchy based upon ability to deliver sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of settlements, and

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
		the Duty to Cooperate. Plan is Unsound.	between 425 and 570 zero carbon residential units. Seek the reconsideration of the Spatial Strategy and Ranskill's position within the Settlement Hierarchy.		availability of services and facilities. The Spatial Strategy Background Paper sets out the qualifying criteria for a 'large and small rural settlement'. As a consequence of the level of services available Ranskill is identified as a Small Rural Settlement.
Representation Reference: NRF-REF005.1 Name: Bassetlaw District Council Councillor	Refers to: Highway infrastructure Improvements ST54	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified	Comments: Refers to submitted diagram. A new highway with a small roundabout at each end (third image) would enable all traffic using Sutton Lane from either direction to cross the railway without using the Botany Bay Level Crossing. Should close the Sutton-cum-Lound Level Crossing as well. It will be an inconvenience for some residents, but safety is a vital factor for both road and train users – you may be aware of a number of recent incidents at Rossington Level Crossing, and the RTA incident last year at Botany Bay involving the death	Suggested changes: Include a highway improvement scheme in the Plan at Sutton-cum-Lound	Officer comments: The Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022 and the Retford Transport Assessment 2022 do not identify the need for a new highway and/or the closure of the Botany Bay Level Crossing as a consequence of Local Plan growth. Network Rail have specified that the transport assessment for the Trinity Farm proposal assess the impacts upon the level crossing and address any impacts identified through a financial contribution. This is reflected in Policy 21.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>of a local cyclist. The parcel of land created by this new highway would be the ideal location for a further housing development. It is close to the new workplaces on Trinity Farm, it is on a well served bus route to and from Retford, the villages and Doncaster, and it will no longer need to have level crossing use to travel either on foot, by bike or by motor vehicle from the site. BDC should compulsorily purchase this land, and build a number of predominantly rented dwellings to satisfy the needs of Retford residents who are slowly being priced out of rental accommodation in town. The size of the parcel of land is flexible, and it appears to contain no significant ecological attributes.</p>		
Representation Reference: NRF-REF014.16 Name: East	Refers to: East Markham Neighbourhood Plan	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified	Comments: Refers to Neighbourhood Plan POLICY NP1: Development Design Principles. Little evidence of an alternative to	Suggested changes: Not specified	Officer comments: Policy ST2 supports the % growth for each community, but also supports additional growth either via a

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Markham Parish Council			<p>travel by car in the village. The bus service is not comprehensive enough to provide an alternative to the car for work purposes. In addition, there is not enough consideration for other forms of transport within the plan. Believe that recent development already has had an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the village. The proportionate cap of 20% has been in existence for some time but there is little evidence that BDC has taken character and amenity into consideration. The 5% proportionate cap is not Government policy but is BDC policy. In the event of a conflict between BDC 5% cap and the Governments no upper limit, seeks clarification as to what takes priority.</p>		<p>Neighbourhood Plan or where a community supports additional growth beyond that identified within Policy ST2. As such it is considered there is no 'cap'.</p>

POLICIES MAPS

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Representation Reference: REF012.6 Name: GraceMachin on behalf of land owner	Refers to: Development Boundaries Background Paper SS001	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with the Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: Consider that the extent of the Development Boundary around Worksop is unsound (Policy ST1 – Page 35). Obtained planning permission (14/00213/OUT) for mixed use development (upto 380 units and upto 19,000 sq m of B1(a) office space). This site is identified on the Worksop Proposal Map as being a ‘Committed Housing’ site with circa 50% of the site WITHIN the Development Boundary and 50% OUTSIDE. This is unsound; it is unclear why a Development Boundary should cut across a ‘Committed Housing Site’ which is currently under construction. 2014/00213/OUT Committee Report is attached for reference and site identification purposes.	Suggested changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the Proposals Map Key relating to ‘Development Boundary’ and Policy ST1 – Bassetlaw’s Spatial Strategy. Committed housing sites on the edge of Worksop which are under construction should wholly be within the Development Boundary, not partly as is the case. The Local Plan should reference committed housing sites setting out the level of new housing to be delivered on each site. 	Officer Comments: It is considered that the Policies Map inadvertently only identifies part of 14/00213/OUT within the development boundary, when the site is under construction. It is considered that a proposed suggested change to the Policies Map will address the matter: the development boundary will be re-drawn around the consented site boundary.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Representation Reference: REF012.7 Name: GraceMachin on behalf of land owner	Refers to: Workshop Proposal Map PDF	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with the Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: The Development Boundary on the Proposal Map seeks to identify an area where most new development will be delivered but the mismatch of the Proposal Map Key and Local Plan Document is clearly confusing and unsound.	Suggested changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the Proposals Map Key relating to 'Development Boundary' and Policy ST1 – Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy. Committed housing sites on the edge of Workshop which are under construction should wholly be within the Development Boundary, not partly as is the case. The Local Plan should reference committed housing sites setting out the level of new housing to be delivered on each site. 	Officer Comments: It is considered that the Policies Map inadvertently only identifies part of 14/00213/OUT within the development boundary, when the site is under construction. It is considered that a proposed suggested change to the Policies Map will address the matter: the development boundary will be re-drawn around the consented site boundary.
Representation Reference: REF012.9 Name: GraceMachin on	Refers to: Meaning of 'Committed Housing' on the Policies Maps	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with	Comments: Unclear of the status of 'Committed Housing' sites on the Proposals Map; there is no direct reference in the Local Plan. No individual housing numbers are	Suggested changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the Proposals Map Key relating to 'Development Boundary' and Policy 	Officer comments: Housing commitments and the housing numbers attributed are set out in the Local Plan Housing trajectory in Appendix 3. Their identification on the

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
behalf of land owner		the Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	attributed to the 'Committed Sites' in the Local Plan. These are not proposed allocations, but identify sites which will deliver new housing within the Plan Period. Part of the site (although not identified on the Proposals Map) fronting onto Claylands Avenue has been marketed for more than 24 months by <i>Savills</i> for B1 (a) office space – as per the 2014 consent. However, no viable and proceedable offers have been made. There is no B1(a) office space demand of the size and scale obtained under the 2014 outline permission. Supportive of the wider 'Committed Housing' status of the site but consider that the whole site should be identified within the Development Boundary of Worksop. 2014/00213/OUT Committee Report is attached for reference and site identification purposes.	ST1 – Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committed housing sites on the edge of Worksop which are under construction should wholly be within the Development Boundary, not partly as is the case. The Local Plan should reference committed housing sites setting out the level of new housing to be delivered on each site. 	Policies Map is considered necessary to provide all interested parties with an appreciation of the status of land within the district boundary. It is considered that a proposed suggested change to the Policies Map will clarify the status of the site as a mixed use commitment.
Representation Reference: REF046.1	Refers to: Policies Map/High Marnham	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments: Attached as Plan 1 is land ownership of JG Pears on the acquisition of the former High	Suggested changes: Amend the Policies Map to include additional land currently not	Officer comments: The Regulation 19 Addendum proposed amendments to the Local Plan relating to the former

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Name: J G Pears		<p>Plan is legally compliant and complies with Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>Plan is unsound.</p>	<p>Marnham Colliery. The site allocation should appropriately extend to include the land which is cross-hatched in red on the attached plan. The area of land has the same characteristics of the land surrounding the former colliery site and would form a useful addition to the proposals for renewable energy generation. Object to the Proposals Map as drawn.</p>	<p>proposed for allocation (identified as a cross hatched area on the Plan submitted).</p>	<p>High Marnham Power Station site.</p>

EVIDENCE BASE

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Representation Reference: 1945106.3 Name: BDC and County Councillor	Refers to: Retford Transport Assessments TI-003 and TI-004	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is not legally compliant, sound or complies with Duty to Cooperate.	Comments: Ordsall cannot cope with the potential additional vehicle movements from up to 1250 households. The suggestion that alternative routes or public transport will take up most of the new vehicle movements is not feasible. The Retford Road Traffic Assessment is still based on 800 homes and there is no sensitivity analysis of the impact of the additional 450 homes when the development rises to 1250 homes.	Suggested changes: Have no issue with development. Need more houses but with appropriate infrastructure. It would be better to pick an area and provide 4,000 homes with the correct infrastructure of roads, healthcare and education services as well as transport and retail provision. It is also adjacent to the east-west rail line and as such could become a significant environmentally friendly new town in its own right similar to Cambourne in Cambridgeshire or Buckshaw Village in Lancashire where new small residential villages have been developed from scratch. Bassetlaw Garden Village is planned for an additional 3,000 plus homes post 2037. Why not reduce the developments elsewhere and build 4,000 in the period to 2037. It would attract much more positive funding both from government and also developers due to the scale of such a project. Conversely the current plan to build 500 homes at Bassetlaw Garden Village to 2037 is insufficiently large to make it economically viable given its location. Even Ordsall South would benefit from being larger with the correct infrastructure rather than 1,250	Officer comments: The May 2022 Second Addendum withdraws the Garden Village from the Local Plan. The Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022, accepted by the Local Highways Authority, and the Retford Transport Assessment have assessed the impact of traffic on the existing road network from the proposed allocation. It is considered that this provides an appropriate evidence base and approach to identify the necessary transport requirements, including improvements to junctions and links in the locality from this site, as well as a proportionate split per allocation in terms of the traffic impact and the contribution towards the identified mitigation.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				with no infrastructure or the 'promise' of potential infrastructure at some point.	
Representation Reference: REF007.1 Name: National Highways	Refers to: Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified	Comments: In September 2021 National Highways responded to a consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan Transport Study Update. We advised that more detailed assessments take place as studies, to support the Development Plan Documents, rather than awaiting these assessments to be submitted in support of planning applications. The reason being, is that understanding the scale of traffic impacts and scope of highway infrastructure needs, to accommodate the full growth before sites are allocated for development, will ensure that a more coordinated, efficient and well-integrated set of improvement proposals are developed. Also sought clarification on the inclusion of	Suggested changes: A robust transport evidence base will be required in order for National Highways to be content that the infrastructure identified is sufficient to accommodate the proposed allocations.	Officer comments: The May 2022 Second Addendum withdraws the Garden Village from the Local Plan. The Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022, accepted by the Local Highways Authority, and the Retford Transport Assessment have assessed the impact of traffic on the existing road network from the proposed allocation. It is considered that this provides an appropriate evidence base and approach to identify the necessary transport requirements, including improvements to junctions and links in the locality from this site, as well as a proportionate

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>committed developments, and recommended that the full build out of large allocations which will continue past the end of the Local Plan period will need to be assessed to understand the scale of infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate these sites. Queries were raised regarding the highway impact assessments and although raised no objections in principle to the proposed infrastructure improvements, advised that more detailed assessments would be required to better understand the changes needed to accommodate the full growth aspirations of the Local Plan.</p>		<p>split per allocation in terms of the traffic impact and the contribution towards the identified mitigation.</p>
<p>Representation Reference: REF007.2</p> <p>Name: National Highways</p>	<p>Refers to: Transport Evidence Base</p>	<p>Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified</p>	<p>Comments: Welcome that the Plan acknowledges the need for all major developments in the area to be supported by Transport Assessments to demonstrate the impacts on the highway network and determine the need for mitigation. The combination of the Bassetlaw Garden Village and</p>	<p>Suggested changes: To ensure the growth aspirations are not limited by the capacity of the transport infrastructure, there is a need for a robust transport evidence base to provide the basis for assessing the impacts on the SRN and suitably informing and developing the infrastructure delivery plan (IDP). By necessity, a transport evidence base should include the SRN roads and junctions within</p>	<p>Officer comments: The May 2022 Second Addendum withdraws the Garden Village from the Local Plan. The Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022, accepted by the Local Highways Authority, and the Retford Transport Assessment have</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			the proposed strategic employment site being located either side of the A1 Apleyhead junction, together with the wider increase in housing and employment allocations, will have significant implications for traffic demand on the highway network across the District.	the District and immediately nearby with the plan's effects assessed on a site specific and cumulative basis. This will be instrumental in identifying the need for and form of any highway mitigation required. Any proposals for new SRN junctions or significant amendments to the SRN required by the Plan should be identified through the local plan making process and reflected in the supporting evidence.	assessed the impact of traffic on the existing road network from the proposed allocation. It is considered that this provides an appropriate evidence base and approach to identify the necessary transport requirements, including improvements to junctions and links in the locality from this site, as well as a proportionate split per allocation in terms of the traffic impact and the contribution towards the identified mitigation.
Representation Reference: REF008.10 Name: BDC and County Councillor	Refers to: TI-002 - Bassetlaw Transport Assessment Update, August 2021	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified	Comments: The Bassetlaw Plan housing ambitions are likely to increase congestion experienced in the towns of Retford and Worksop, also in the villages, where difficulties in travelling are already experienced at recognised busy times of the day.	Suggested changes: N/A	Officer comments: The Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022, accepted by the Local Highways Authority, and the Retford Transport Assessment have assessed the impact of traffic on the existing

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
					road network from the proposed allocation. It is considered that this provides an appropriate evidence base and approach to identify the necessary transport requirements, including improvements to junctions and links in the locality from this site, as well as a proportionate split per allocation in terms of the traffic impact and the contribution towards the identified mitigation.
Representation Reference: REF009.3 Name: Fisher German on behalf of land owner	Refers to: Paragraphs 9.24 to 9.30 of the 2021 Spatial Strategy Paper	Legal compliance and soundness: Not indicated the plan's legal compliance or that it complies with Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: The Spatial Strategy Paper 2021 claims to provide the rationale behind the Local Plan's Spatial Strategy and the approach taken to the growth of each settlement. It is noted that this does not explain why the number of homes assigned to Harworth within the January 2020 version of the plan (2,000 homes or 22% of the overall	Suggested changes: Allocating more homes to Harworth & Bircotes will enable the Plan to encourage further growth, into the later years of the plan period. If the Council wish to ensure that the ongoing regeneration of Harworth & Bircotes can continue into the latter years of the plan period, it will be important to provide enough homes to enable this to occur.	Officer comments: The Local Plan Trajectory shows sufficient delivery (Harworth & Bircotes has seen significant housing being delivered between 2019-2022 with over 369 completions. As at 31 March 2022 there were 2,006 existing deliverable commitments in Harworth & Bircotes. This

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>housing requirement) has been reduced considerably to just under 1,800 homes (1,758 homes, which is 16% of the housing requirement).</p> <p>Paragraph 67 of the NPPF sets out that planning policies should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites for years one to five and “specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan”. Whilst it could be argued that the commitments may deliver homes for the town for around a 10 year period, concerned that not allocating further homes now may stifle development in years 11 – 15 of the plan period. Whilst both Retford and Worksop were assigned more homes what paragraph 9.30 states isn’t true given the reduction in overall housing requirement assigned to Harworth & Bircotes (22% of overall growth reduced to 16%).</p>		<p>includes an outline planning permission (September 2021) for a re-profiled Harworth Colliery site. The 1,300 dwellings are in addition to the consented phases under construction. At least 1,133 dwellings from this permission are deliverable within the Plan period, thereby adding to the District’s housing supply. There is therefore no requirement to allocate additional housing sites.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Representation Reference: REF018.2 Name: Newark & Sherwood District Council	Refers to: Upcoming Recreational Impact Assessment	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified	Comments: Our jointly funded Recreational Impact Assessment (RIA) will allow this matter to be understood in detail, and Newark & Sherwood District Council will continue to work to positively discharge its responsibilities under the Duty to Cooperate. It will be necessary for the Assessment to have been received and digested before a formal representation on the Publication Local Plan can be made. Please accept this letter as a holding representation, to be followed by a more detailed submission once the Assessment has been received.	Suggested changes: N/A	Officer comments: The Recreational Impact Assessment has been agreed with Newark & Sherwood and now forms part of the Local Plan evidence base. A Statement of Common Ground evidences the approach taken by both authorities on this matter.
Representation Reference: REF020.4 Name: Town Planning.co.uk on behalf of consultee	Refers to: Land Availability Assessment August 2021	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with the Duty To Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: Site HS14 has not been assessed in the Land Availability Assessment or the Site Selection Methodology in the form proposed for allocation. In the updated evidence to support the publication Local Plan this has still not been addressed. The Local Plan has failed to assess all	Suggested changes: Delete site HS14 and allow the review of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan to consider other reasonable alternatives. Within Tuxford there are a number of potential previously developed sites or sites where existing uses no longer represent the most beneficial use, including land to the rear of 10 Newcastle Street; Former Goods Yard on Lincoln Road; the Platts Harris site;	Officer comments: It is considered the Land Availability Assessment and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet the identified

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>reasonable alternatives in terms of site assessment options. This appears to be as a consequence of the incomprehensible decision to treat Tuxford differently to all other 'Large Rural Settlements' by looking to allocate a site in the Local Plan rather than have all site allocations considered in the Neighbourhood Plan process. The site assessment methodology identifies 9 potentially suitable alternative sites in Tuxford which could deliver up to 587 dwellings were discounted at stage 3 because the "Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan is in the process of being reviewed and all potentially suitable sites in the LAA can be considered for allocation through this process." Potential reasonable alternatives such as site LAA090 (NP10) (east side of Tuxford off Lincoln Road) or LAA087 (NP11) (south of Tuxford east of Ashvale Road) warrant serious consideration. Site LAA087 (NP11) could provide</p>	<p>and Land around Eastfield Farm. Other potential sites around Tuxford would have a better relationship to existing built form such as LAA087 (NP11), which if properly assessed could allow the opportunity for a new primary school to be created next to Tuxford Academy.</p>	<p>housing requirement in the district over the plan period. All reasonable alternatives have been appropriately considered through the Sustainability Appraisal which has informed the Site Selection process. The proposed allocation of Site HS14 will contribute to meeting housing need in Tuxford thereby supporting local services provision. The Land Availability Assessment 2022 identifies the site as suitable to contribute to the housing requirement in Tuxford. The education requirements in the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been provided by Nottinghamshire County Council, the Local Education Authority. NCC</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>scope for a relocated and expanded Primary School linked to the Secondary School and could still meet most if not all of the housing requirement for Tuxford.</p> <p>The recent planning permission for the relocation of the Co-op convenience store on Ashvale Road will move more of the core services and facilities of Tuxford to the east of the A1 closer to other sites such as LAA090 (NP10) or LAA087 (NP11) or LAA158 (NP17) or LAA243 (NP18). New previously developed sites such as LAA510 which were added into the SHLAA (August 2021) have not been considered in the site assessment methodology.</p>		<p>have not sought a new primary school in Tuxford as a result of the allocation of 75 dwellings in the Local Plan, or as a result of the cumulative impact with other committed growth.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Representation Reference: REF031.3 Name: Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Refers to: Site selection of garden village SS-005 - Site Selection Methodology, Update August 2021	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with the Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: There does not appear to have been any form of “sequential test” or approach to identify this particular site. The LPA have previously identified Gamston Airfield and Cottam Power Station as sites for a garden village, both have been removed but at least they were brownfield sites not greenfield allocations.	Suggested changes: Update the Site Selection Methodology Update.	Officer comments: The May 2022 Second Addendum withdraws the Bassetlaw Garden Village from the Local Plan.
Representation Reference: REF033.3 Name: Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Refers to: Lack of robust evidence base	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: In relation to the wider test of consistency with national policy, there are clear gaps in evidence, and this is not adequate within the terms of the Framework para 31: “The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals.”	Suggested changes: No changes suggested.	Officer comments: It is considered that the Local Plan is underpinned by a robust evidence base that is adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals, thereby aligned with the NPPF.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			On the basis of gaps in evidence published as recently as August 2021, the evidence base is not sufficiently robust to support the Local Plan and is therefore not adequate.		
Representation Reference: REF033.5 Name: Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Refers to: WYG Railway Technical Paper and Issues Note (2019) and The WYG New Stations Feasibility Note	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: The White Young Green Railway Technical Paper and Issues Note (August 2019) points out that the Garden Village will be constructed over a considerable timeframe (para 5.5.1) with implications on the demand and viability of the station. However, it cautions against the ability to successfully provide a viable station with high standards of frequent service provision is heavily dependent upon the timely delivery of enough housing numbers (para 6.1.3), suggesting that enhanced bus services between Retford and Worksop in the short term, with delivery of the station in the longer term (para 6.1.4). Policy ST3 sets out criteria that must be	Suggested changes: No changes suggested.	Officer comments: The May 2022 Second Addendum withdraws the Bassetlaw Garden Village from the Local Plan.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>achieved. At Section 2r (iv) it states: “provision for an integrated transport hub in accordance with Policy ST54 including a railway station with a platform and necessary supporting infrastructure located to the north of the railway line, public transport interchange, electric vehicle charging hub and cycling hub and supporting infrastructure”; The WYG New Stations Feasibility Note comments: “The proposed size of the Garden Village is such that sufficient demand could be generated by the completed development to justify the level of investment required to deliver a new station and changes to train timetables and scheduling, and suggested revisions to these demonstrate the possibility to accommodate two trains per hour. Indicates that the railway station will cost in the region of £10m + £1m associated works. It</p>		

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			should be accurately costed and used to inform a revised Infrastructure Delivery Plan.		
Representation Reference: REF033.6 Name: Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Refers to: WYG Junctions Assessment 2020	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.	Comments: The WYG Junction Assessment Report of 2020 makes a number of pertinent points which do not feature in the Council's assessment of Apleyhead Junction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that without Apleyhead, the 2037 design flows for the Garden Village are within and very close to capacity at AM and PM peak respectively (para 9.3.4) • Apleyhead will lead to a further increase in pressure on the capacity of the A57, further testing and modelling being recommended (para 9.3.5) • For the A57 to perform satisfactorily additional link capacity would be required which would mean widening the A57 to dual carriageway between the A1 (J6) and the B6034 Netherton Road (J5) over a length of circa 6km (para 	Suggested changes: The Plan has not fully considered delivery of Apleyhead Junction and the Bassetlaw Garden Village including beyond the plan period.	Officer comments: Existing issues on the A57 are exacerbated by freight traffic using the road as a link between the A1 and M1. National legislation/guidance states it is not appropriate for new development to address existing issues. Due to the A57's importance to the local and regional economy, the Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022, accepted by the Local Highways Authority, identifies that parts of the A57 are currently near or at capacity, including at peak times but that a credible mechanism should be put in place through an Improvement

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>10.2.19)• A corridor improvement plan is recommended taking account of planned growth and other likely sites alongside a credible mechanism for delivery of improvements (para 9.3.6) • Widening the carriageway of this 6km section of the A57 is likely to cost in the region of £15m to £20m and could have detrimental environmental impacts due to the A57 being bordered by forest over most of this length (para 10.1.30) • With exclusion of the 'Land off the A57 Apleyhead' employment allocation site and allocation of the Garden Village the sensitivity test results suggest that widening of the A57 to dual carriageway would not be required (para 10.1.33) • The results demonstrated that without vehicle trip reductions to reflect trip internalisation at the Garden Villages (i.e. some trips remain internal to the site and therefore do not impact on the</p>		<p>Plan to consider the scope, options and outcomes for the A57. However, the Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022 has assessed the potential impact of Local Plan growth upon highway capacity and has identified proportionate necessary mitigation for relevant development. The Council is currently working with relevant partners to look at the feasibility of a wider improvement plan for the A57. The May 2022 Second Addendum withdraws the Bassetlaw Garden Village from the Local Plan. It is considered that the SA has been carried out in line legislation, national policy, and the methodology set out in the SA Report.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>wider highway network) the impacts on the wider highway network would be severe (para 10.1.19) This has not informed the Plan. Elsewhere in the Council's evidence base (particularly the Sustainability Appraisal) Apleyhead is noted as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approximately 500m from a SSSI • a local wildlife site is located within the site (Top Wood/Great Whin Covert). • entirely within a 5km buffer around the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. • the HRA identifies that this site could support ppSPA birds. • constrained by mature trees pointing to significant negative effects which do not apply to the Markham South site. <p>There are differences between the sites, but the economic and social benefit applies in the context of critical differences in the impact and delivery of these sites. Markham South is a reasonable alternative to Apleyhead in the context of the</p>		

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			significant negative effects revealed by the SA.		
Representation Reference: REF033.11 Name: Stone Planning Services Limited on behalf of Charterpoint (NG22) Limited	Refers to: Cottam Power Station Headline Transport Issues prepared by WYG	Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound	Comments: At 2.7.2 states “The site currently has very poor accessibility by sustainable modes of transport. Whilst opportunities exist to provide improved connections to local villages for walking and cycling these villages offer very few facilities. The nearest settlement providing key services is Retford, approximately 9 miles to the west and this distance effectively rules out walking and cycling to access these services or the nearest railway station which is also in Retford”. Quotes 2.7.5 and 2.7.6. The Council has correctly not allocated Cottam PRA because of uncertainty of delivery. However, it has “safeguarded” the site for future redevelopment. Fail to see how this can be justified. The Council’s own report highlights	Suggested changes: Allocation of Land at Marnham South.	Officer comments: The Cottam Power Station site is identified by the Local Plan as a broad location where growth could take place subject to the identified policy criteria being met. It is not considered that this land is being safeguarded for future redevelopment.

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>the site's poor sustainability credentials. The site will not become more sustainable over time. The evidence does not support the "safeguarding". There are more sustainable sites that are capable of early delivery. Land at Marnham South is one such site.</p>		
<p>Representation Reference: REF036.6</p> <p>Name: Marrons Planning on behalf of Vistry Group</p>	<p>Refers to: Site Selection Methodology</p>	<p>Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>Plan is unsound.</p>	<p>Comments: Locating new housing at Retford is justified because it is a sustainable settlement and a focus for local employment growth (LP para 5.1.42 and Policy ST7 – Provision of Land for Employment Development). Retford is the second largest town in the District and it has a wide range of services, shops and employment opportunities, and good public transport links. Development here provides an opportunity to maximise sustainable transport choices such as the East Coast Mainline Railway Station (LP para 5.1.46 refers). New allocations at Retford will provide for about</p>	<p>Suggested changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing requirement should be amended to take account of likely lapse rates in housing delivery from those sites without detailed planning permission. • The housing supply should be justified with evidence, and assumptions in relation to windfalls updated and kept under review. • The Local Plan should allocate additional sites to achieve a balance in the portfolio of sites, including land west of Tiln Lane, Retford. 	<p>Officer comments: The May 2022 Second Addendum included an updated housing land supply position, showing at 31 March 2022 a 17% buffer in the supply. This provides for a contingency against non-delivery.</p> <p>It is considered the Sustainability Appraisal, Land Availability Assessment and Site Selection Methodology are consistent with national policy and provide a robust basis to determine the most sustainable sites to meet</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>1,194 dwellings. However, there is a reliance upon housing allocations HS7 (Trinity Road, 244 dwellings) and, more so, HS13 (Ordsall South, 800 dwellings) to meet the housing needs of the town. Any delay in these sites coming forward will affect the ability to meet the housing needs locally and the District as a whole, and undermine the important role that Retford plays within the settlement hierarchy. The housing trajectory shows that development at site HS13 (Ordsall South) is not expected to start until at least 2027 and is dependent on off-site junction improvements. As it extends beyond the plan period, any delay in this site coming forward would affect housing delivery later in the plan period. Allocating additional land for development at Retford would provide an appropriate buffer and certainty that housing needs will be met. A balanced portfolio</p>		<p>the identified housing requirement. Delivery is based on up to date evidence in the LAA and Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement, 2021.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>of sites is needed to ensure the identified housing requirement is met. The Council should consider allocating additional sites to protect against possible delivery issues at the larger sites, and which can make an early contribution to housing supply, helping to maintain the momentum that has been achieved in housing delivery in recent years and achieve the high levels of delivery that are required.</p>		
<p>Representation Reference: REF043.4 Name: Gladmans</p>	<p>Refers to: Housing Requirement – Housing Paper</p>	<p>Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is legally compliant and complies with Duty to Cooperate. Plan is unsound.</p>	<p>Comments: It is also vital to consider the economic impact of COVID-19 and the long-term role that housing will play in supporting the recovery of the economy, both locally and nationally. Support the Council in its positive approach to plan for above the minimum requirement, which will enable Bassetlaw to capture a larger proportion of the £7 billion yearly housebuilder contributions³. With 218,000</p>	<p>Suggested changes: The Council should ensure that there is a 20% buffer in the housing land supply for the whole Plan.</p>	<p>Officer comments: The May 2022 Second Addendum included an updated housing land supply position, showing at 31 March 2022 a 17% buffer in the supply. This provides for a contingency against non-delivery. This is considered appropriate and in line with national policy.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>homes predicted not to be built due to COVID- 19 from now to 2024/254, it is also imperative that Bassetlaw District Local Plan identifies sufficient land to support the delivery of homes. In order for the housing needs for the whole plan period to be met, it will also be essential to provide sufficient headroom within the housing supply. Support the Home Builders Federation’s recommendation that local plan should seek to identify sufficient deliverable sites to provide a 20% buffer between the housing requirement and supply.</p>		
<p>Representation Reference: REF048.26</p> <p>Name: Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	<p>Refers to: Bassetlaw Local Plan 2021 Transport Study Update August 2021</p>	<p>Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified</p>	<p>Comments: There are several errors in the Transport Study.</p>	<p>Suggested changes: Paragraph 1.5.7 should include and/or transport infrastructure improvements. Paragraph 4.7.2 – Nottinghamshire instead of Nottingham. Table 5- Fatal and Slight need to be switched around. Table 6 - Needs to be 2016/2017 instead of 2019. Table 7 – Should include more up to date data.</p>	<p>Officer comments: The Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022 has been accepted by the Local highways Authority. It is considered that these matters are now addressed.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>Paragraph 4.8.1 should refer to National Highways (NE) rather than Highways England (HE).</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.4 NH instead of HE.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.5 should state Nottinghamshire, Yorkshire, and Derbyshire rather than Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire Derbyshire.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.9 "(because half of the weekday peaks will have flows higher than average demand flow and <u>half lower</u>)". This does not make sense.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10 Data Sources - Route and timetable information is available from Traveline East not East Midlands. Note: The East Midlands traveline website was closed last year and consolidated with the existing arrangements within the national website.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.12 "service" not services.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.20 "In addition, Bassetlaw is one of the areas with the highest limiting long-term illness percentages among in the country".</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.21 Fifth bullet point should read "'My Journey' based in Mansfield is developing door-to-door and dial a ride services".</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>Paragraph 4.10.21 Should read around Retford and Worksop town centres. The final sentence is not necessary.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.24 Final bullet point should read “Car ownership increases”.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.25 “2.5” requires deleting.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.29 – The bus station in Worksop opened to the public in August 2015. Paragraph 4.10.30 “noted 98% of the satisfaction with the passenger transport facilities”. Yearly passenger numbers at Worksop and Retford bus stations should be added to be consistent with rail statistics. Paragraph 4.11.9 Table 11 states that the Retford Station parking cost is £5 not £10. After 5.4.2 Title HS2?</p> <p>Paragraph 5.5.9 Surely the draft 2017-18 Nottinghamshire Integrated Transport Programme is not draft anymore if it exists. The Goosemoor bridge improvement has been completed.</p> <p>Table 12 Why does the Harworth Colliery development not appear in full?</p> <p>The sites in Table 24 Worksop Central Area are not consistent with the sites in the Draft Worksop Central Development Plan Document 2021 Infrastructure Delivery Plan June 2021.</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>Paragraph 8.5.2 The route assignment has been described as “all or nothing”. There are destinations in the Retford TA with a potential choice of routes being similar in terms of travel time/distance. This is also likely to be true for other areas. Paragraph 9.6.1 for ease of refence, a supporting plan would be useful to identify locations.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.5.3 should refer to National Highways.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.6.13 – This is going to be a very important study. The A57 requires a major upgrade and will be curtail if the BLP is to be delivered. Paragraph 11.6.4 TA 79/99 and TA 46/97 has been withdrawn without replacement. Figures 17 and 18 – The figures require checking. Are these meant to show AADT as in Figure 6? This in turn will change all the line colours if incorrect. Table 32 – Has the VISUM model run included improvements already made to A57?</p> <p>Paragraph 11.7.5 The junction upgrade costs should be checked for robustness. Cumulative shortfalls could be significant these are under estimates.</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
Representation Reference: REF048.27 Name: Nottinghamshire County Council	Refers to: Retford Transport Assessment (RTA) August 2021 Version 2	Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified	Comments: Paragraph 1.1.2 The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (BLP) proposes 800 dwellings at Ordsall with the potential to increase to 1250 in the next plan period. The Bassetlaw Transport Study (BTS) similarly assumes that the site would be allocated for 800 dwellings in the plan period. Therefore, to inform the BLP, it would seem most appropriate for the RTA to assess the impact of 800 dwellings, potentially with a sensitivity test to cover the addition of a further 450 dwellings. Paragraph 1.1.3 The GV appears in both the BLP and BTS for 500 dwellings and 10 hectares of employment. The RTA is not capable of informing the BLP with the omission of the GV.	Suggested changes: Paragraph 2.3.2b) The Highway Authority would wish to see junction improvements secured by planning condition, potentially split between the large urban extensions and GV unless to be delivered by CIL. There is no certainty that pooled contributions would be sufficient, particularly if third party land is required. Nor would there be sufficient certainty as to when a particular improvement could be delivered if funding is awaited from other development yet to commence. Any mitigation would then likely be retrospective. Paragraph 2.3.2b) There is no indication as to what the proposed “traffic management scheme in Ordsall Old Village” is for. Potential issues on High Street, All Hallows Street, and at the Goosemoor Lane bridge could occur with a significant increase in through traffic. A route assessment should be included that demonstrates that any issues can be mitigated rather than a vague statement and such that traffic is not likely to divert through Eaton. Paragraph 2.3.2c) A marked cycle lane on Brecks Lane, and along Ollerton Road/West Hill Road and Ordsall Park Road to Ordsall Primary School, Retford Leisure Centre and	Officer comments: It is considered that the Local Plan is underpinned by a robust evidence base that is adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals, thereby aligned with the NPPF. It is considered that the Retford Transport Assessment 2022 addresses all grammatical matters identified by the Highways Authority. The 2022 Assessment also ensures all appropriate sensitivity tests have been modelled, though it should be noted that the May 2022 Second Addendum withdraws the Garden Village from the Local Plan. The transport evidence base has been

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>Retford Oaks School via West Carr Road is not achievable in compliance with DfT LTN1/20.</p> <p>Table 3 The summary of bus services stopping near the site is incorrect.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.6 The Sherwood Arrow offers only a semi-frequent service.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.8.5 To central Newark, Google Maps suggests London Road to A1 via Markham Moor (30mins 19.3m) or London Road, B6387, A616 (41mins 22.7m). However, if the route is adjusted onto A1 Jockey Lane the journey time is 31mins 20.8. I suspect that may be as equally attractive as London Road to A1 Markham Moor. It is easier with less junctions, avoids High Street which can be restricted by parked vehicles, and the Goose Moor Lane junction that lacks forward visibility.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.8.6 According to Google Maps, Eaton is the preferred route choice.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.8.8 The A620 to Mansfield Road is just as likely a route as the A1. There's nothing in it in terms of time or distance and the A1 is avoided.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.9.1 The 7th July 2021 traffic counts will require adjustment to consider the difference in travel patterns due to Covid.</p>	<p>appropriately updated to reflect this.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>Paragraph 4.2.1 We would expect a 0.5 margin adjacent the shared use cycle track. Paragraph 4.2.1 and Appendix D - The land available for the southern of the two roundabouts has necessitated a couple of geometric quirks. Firstly, the bend to the south at the boundary of the site sharpens up to move the junction westward into the land available for building it. This might make the bend radius quite sharp for northbound drivers arriving from the rural section. This would need to be checked to see if it meets geometric standards. Secondly the northbound entry probably meets the entry deflection requirements, however it arrives at a slightly shallow angle. This looks likely to be due to a) the short distance from the aforementioned bend, so it hasn't had time to align without having a nasty reverse curve, and b) this may be to accommodate the fourth arm off to the east. This slightly slack entry is OK if it meets the entry deflection criterion, except that northbound traffic may find the exit a bit tortuous, resulting in a succession of vehicles exiting the carriageway on the nearside of the northbound exit. There does not appear to be many options to tweak without making something else</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>worse without additional land even though this is only a concept plan. The lack of land availability to the southeast could be a major problem. Paragraph 4.2.2 The first sentence should be the last bullet point in 4.2.1. Paragraph 5.1.2 quotes the 'Grey to Green Retford Walking and Cycling Audit' prepared by Tetra Tech in December 2020. There is a June 2021 version that is being considered. Paragraph 5.1.5 It is unlikely that DfT LTN 1/20 compliant cycling facilities could be provided from the site beyond Ordsall Primary School. Once you go over the bridge there is nothing you can implement that would be worthwhile as the road is constrained on both sides, as is High Street. Whilst there may be some potential for improvements on Babworth Road and London Road. There would be a substantial disconnect from the site. It is also unlikely that the aforementioned routes could extend into the town centre. Paragraph 7.1.2 These trip rates are challenging for Ordsall when compared to person trips and travel to work census data. The rates are only likely to be achievable by providing a high frequency bus service, exemplar walking and cycling connections into Retford, and smarter choices/travel</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>planning. There does not appear to be any possibility of providing connected cycling facilities to Retford town centre and walking is unlikely to be an attractive option for most people due to the distances involved. Paragraph 8.1.4 Note comments in relation to 3.8.5 and 3.8.8</p> <p>Paragraph 8.2.1 Note comments in relation to 3.8.5 and 3.8.8. These could be 50/50 split. Paragraph 8.2.2 Are examples available where the VISUM model has been adjusted to reflect observed driver behaviour? Paragraph 8.2.4 appears to conflict with para 8.2.1 and the “all or nothing” assignment but does address the point re paragraph 3.8.5 and journeys to Markham Moor. Table 18 – “Capacity Assessment Results” is incomplete.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.2 The A620 Amcott Way/A620 Moorgate/A638 Arlington Way junction, the A638 Arlington Way/Grove Street junction, and the A638 Arlington Way/A638 London Road/Carolgate junction are absent from the text despite appearing in 10.2.2 as junctions shown to experience capacity issues. Paragraph 10.2.3 The performance of the A620 Babworth Road/A6420 Mansfield Road/A620 Straight Mile/Sutton Lane junction (Junction 6)</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>would be much worse if the GV was included in the RTA.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.2.2 Challenging trip rates have been included in the RTA. To achieve these rates would require a high frequency bus service, and exemplar walking and cycling connections into Retford from the development outset. The latter is unachievable. It is difficult to see what bond payments could then achieve if Travel Plan target are not met.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.3 Bus Transport it is suggested that the following text be inserted: In March 2021 the government published its document 'Bus Back Better (https:// assets.publishing.service.gov.uk / government / uploads / system / uploads / attachment_data/ file/ 980227 / DfT-Bus-Back-Better-nation): National Bus Strategy for England', as part an initiative to build back better services post pandemic. The County Council has published its intention to implement an Enhanced Partnership in April 2022 and provide a Bus Service Improvement Plan by 31st October 2021. These arrangements will cover all services and infrastructure in Nottinghamshire including Bassetlaw.</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>Paragraph 11.3.1 Bus services should also meet the aspirations of the National Bus Strategy and supporting agreements.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.3.3 Typically a bus service enhancement and access into the site should be introduced from early occupancy, with temporary turning facilities where required, with the service introduction potentially phased.</p> <p>After 11.3.9 the following text is suggested: In spring 2021 Nottinghamshire County Council were successful with a £1.5m bid to the Department of Transport Rural Mobility Fund. This funding will be used to pilot flexible Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) services across Nottinghamshire using new route planning and booking software and new vehicles. The areas to be served in Bassetlaw will be based on a revised network of services in the Ollerton Area with a new hub for interchange to mainline services. The services are expected to commence in 2022.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.4.1 In accordance with LTN 1/20 (paragraph 6.5.4), the conversion of footways to shared use cycle tracks should be considered as a last resort. To achieve the suggested vehicle trip rate, exemplar cycle facilities would be required. A marked</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>cycle lane along Brecks Road is unlikely to fit and would be parked on. Most people would be comfortable cycling with mixed traffic where the speed of traffic is <20mph and there are <2000 vehicles/day</p> <p>Providing meaningful DfT LTN 1/20 compliant cycling facilities on Ollerton Road/West Hill Road beyond Ordsall Primary School and within the wider highway network appears unlikely due to the road space available</p> <p>Paragraph 11.4.4 On carriageway cycle lanes are not appropriate in areas where the speed of traffic is ≥ 30mph.</p> <p>Part 11.9 A620 AMCOTT WAY / BRIDLEGATE / A620 HOSPITAL ROAD / A638 NORTH ROAD / HALLCROFT ROAD</p> <p>Paragraph 11.9.3 The RTA already assumes a significant modal shift from existing travel patterns that currently occur in Ordsall. It is therefore unlikely that a switch to sustainable transport could reduce trips any further than already assessed to minimise the traffic impact at the junction.</p> <p>The BTS at paragraph 10.5.4 states: It should be reasonable to assume that, as an initial target, car use should aim to be reduced from the existing level (81%) to the same level as the County average (77%),</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>equivalent to a 5% reduction in car use (or a 4% modal shift). A 4% modal shift to public transport would achieve this if the walking and cycling modal share remained constant at 14%, taking public transport use to approximately 6% and approximately equal to the County average of 7%.</p> <p>From the RTA Table 8; 68% and 76% of residents will travel by vehicle in the AM and PM peak hours respectively.</p> <p>Part 11.10 A620 AMCOTT WAY / A620 MOORGATE / A638 ARLINGTON WAY Paragraph 11.10.3 and 11.10.4 The use of demand management measures as the sole means to mitigate the traffic impact at the junction is not realistic, see comment in relation to 11.9.3. The trips that could potentially be managed have already be removed from the assessment due to the low trip rate. It is likely that housing numbers would need to be revised downwards to a level where there is not a material impact. It would need a dramatic Retford public transport policy to achieve nil detriment at this and the following junctions where demand management is suggested.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.11.3 and 11.11.4 A638 ARLINGTON WAY / GROVE STREET</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>The use of demand management measures as the sole means to mitigate the traffic impact at the junction is not realistic, see comment in relation to 11.9.3. Paragraph 11.12.3 and 11.12.4 A638 ARLINGTON WAY / A638 LONDON ROAD / CAROLGATE</p> <p>The use of demand management measures as the sole means to mitigate the traffic impact at the junction is not realistic, see comment in relation to 11.9.3. Part 11.14 LONDON ROAD / WHINNEY MOOR LANE / BRACKEN LANE Paragraph 11.14.3 There is no plan at Appendix K Paragraph 11.14.4 The pine and other deciduous trees are providing a very high level of visual amenity and are maintained and managed as a collection of trees rather than individually. If for example the first few trees are to be removed nearest to the junction, this may impact upon the long-term safe retention of the remaining trees as these may not be able to withstand exposures of strong winds etc. Paragraph 11.15 Main Road (Eaton) Paragraph 11.15.3 There is no plan at Appendix K. A quiet lane scheme may be appropriate.</p>	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>Paragraph 12.1.9 NCC will seek junction improvements to generally be delivered in full secured by condition if not to be delivered by CIL. It may be necessary to split which junctions are improved by development. S106 pooled contributions may fall short, there is little control of when the full level of funding would be available, and it would be likely that the improvements could only be implemented after the respective junctions have exceeded capacity due to development being built out prior to being in a position to fund the delivery of an improvement scheme.</p>	
<p>Representation Reference: REF048.28</p> <p>Name: Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	<p>Refers to: Junction Layouts</p>	<p>Legal compliance and soundness: Not specified</p>	<p>Comments: See suggested changes.</p>	<p>Suggested changes: Junction layouts: <u>Babworth Road/ Mansfield Road:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction layout is too stretched out, it would be better to try to square up Mansfield Road and Sutton Lane (requiring land from the corners) to form a more conventional crossroads arrangement • The radius from Babworth Road East into Mansfield Road is far too slack. Speeds will not be moderated leading to potential accidents. The radius is similar to how it is at the moment, but the current junction 	<p>Officer comments: It is considered that the Local Plan is underpinned by a robust evidence base that is adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals, thereby aligned with the NPPF. It is considered that the Retford Transport</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>does not have vehicles waiting in the direct line of anyone losing control on the corner as they are further forward at the give-way line</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consideration has been given to the private access to the east of Sutton Lane. This is not a minor access, it serves what looks to be a couple of sizeable private properties and All Saints Church, Babworth. It is not clear how it is to be treated other than it is not signalised meaning that there could be a significant traffic demand going in and coming out uncontrolled into the centre of a traffic signalled junction whenever there is a church service. • Squaring up the junction takes the signals away from this access point. • No consideration is given to pedestrian facilities – maybe not a priority at this mainly rural site. • A tracking exercise should be submitted for larger vehicles. There is doubt as to whether large vehicles serving the farms on Sutton Lane could still make the left turn with the proposed refuge in place. • The westbound A620 offside (ahead) lane will be a major component of the A620 flow so this should be the default lane so 	<p>Assessment 2022 has looked to appropriately address matters identified by the Highways Authority.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>that unfamiliar drivers don't end up in the left lane by mistake. This would lead to an ad hoc two into one merge on the westbound exit and probable braking/weaving collisions. A smooth alignment into the ahead lane looks feasible, with the left turn lane peeling off for use by those who want to go left.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The right turn to Sutton Lane (east to north) will block the A620 ahead flow, which may lead to shunts, as well as queues and unusual undertaking manoeuvres. The movement would have to be insignificant, or some form of place to sit will be required while waiting for a gap in traffic, assuming the A620 arms aren't running separately. • The small refuge on the A620 eastern arm could be tweaked to offer some assistance for pedestrians • Street Lighting and high friction surfacing will be required. <p>Modelling analysis Existing priority junction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelled on Picady. • Geometry reasonable except for main road (Babworth Road) width which is modelled as 6m in total. Measuring from Google (not the most accurate measure I 	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>know) I measure the width as approximately 8.0m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With corrected geometry, the performance improves. In the AM the worst movement (Mansfield Rd RT to Babworth Rd – to Retford) the RFC goes up from 0.61 to 0.83. This is a worsening of performance, however it is still just about working. In the PM the RFC on Mansfield Road goes up to 1.13 which is significantly over capacity (but better than the WYG model) justifying the need to suggest mitigation measures. Please note that it is only Mansfield Road which is suggested to be over capacity. <p>Proposed mitigation traffic signals junction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelled on Linsig3. • Staging is sensible with both directions of the main road running together in stage 1 and the side roads running separately. The pedestrians across Sutton Lane run separately and appear every second cycle in the model which, for this site is a legitimate approach to take. • The lane saturation flows look to be reasonable. 	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the modelling looks to have been well carried out – I have adjusted a number of intergreen and phase minimum values, however, I still get a positive result so do not doubt TT’s conclusion with regard to the junction’s predicted capacity performance. • My main issues still lie with the geometry as per my previous comments above. <p><u>Babworth Road/ Ordsall Road:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simple signalised T-junction is proposed to replace the existing mini roundabout. This appears to be a slightly expanded version of what was considered for the Persimmon development in Ordsall. • This version looks to take land off the east corner. Is this available? • No pedestrian facilities are provided. The previous version had pedestrians across Babworth Road east side to link to the bus stop from Worksop to Retford. • The right turn from A620 onto Ordsall Road may be best separately signalled given the rural setting and potential high speeds of opposing westbound ahead traffic. 	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The westbound A620 bus stop will block westbound traffic. This may be acceptable in an urban environment. However, following A620 drivers are unlikely to wait patiently behind a bus whilst watching the westbound green signal. This would be likely to encourage drivers to venture into the hatching or opposing A620 flow to get past, possibly at speed, which may lead to head-on collisions with eastbound motorcyclists for example. • Street lighting and high friction surfacing would be required. <p>Modelling analysis</p> <p>Existing mini-roundabout junction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelled on Arcady. • Geometry looks to be reasonable/ slightly pessimistic. • Performance indicates junction to be at total capacity in 2021 AM base flow conditions. Junction reaches practical capacity in PM peak at 2031 base + committed flows. Ordsall devt takes the junction over capacity in 2031 PM. <p>Proposed mitigation traffic signals junction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelled on Linsig3. 	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staging is sensible with the exception of the omission of pedestrian facilities across Babworth Road (included in previous Persimmon development mitigation proposal which was subsequently dropped). Pedestrian facilities are required here due to the proximity of housing and bus stops. • The lane saturation flows look to be reasonable. • I have adjusted a number of intergreen and phase minimum values with minimal effect on the performance. • My main issues with the modelling are the lack of pedestrian facility mentioned previously, and the cycle times. TT have used 120 seconds for a single cycle which is really too long, especially for a significant gap seeking right turn flow. My suggestion would be a maximum single cycle time of 90 seconds. Modelled this way the junction is predicted to be just over it's practical capacity in the 2031 AM design flow scenarios. PM is not predicted to be an issue • Modelled with a pedestrian stage added in and run every second cycle (using the same assumptions as at Sutton Lane 	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>with regard to pedestrian usage) the performance in 2031 goes negative in terms of practical reserve capacity in the AM peak.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the modelling looks to have been well carried out - however, I do have issues with the predicted performance when pedestrian facilities are factored in. • I also still have concerns regarding the geometry as per previous comment. <p>London Road/ Whitehouses Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simple signalised T-junction is proposed to replace the existing mini roundabout. • The widening is to the west side of London Road where there is a significant level difference between the current road level and the fields at the back of the highway. • The proposed kerb line alignments and tie ins are crude. These will need refining considerably before they can be accepted. • Staggered pedestrian facilities are shown across Whitehouses Road and London Road south. They should be provided across all arms and the simplest form will be to have them all straight across, 	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>running a separate all-round pedestrian stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The refuge on London Road south has been placed directly in line with the access to/ exit from the Whitehouses pub and pedestrians are landed in the middle of this access. • There is a private access for the property next to the Whitehouses which will come out in the middle of the signalled junction. • In addition to the pedestrian issues at the pub access, people driving into and out of the pub car park will have to be considered in the signal design and operation. • Street lighting and high friction surfacing would be required. <p>Modelling analysis</p> <p>Existing mini-roundabout junction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelled on Arcady. • Geometry looks to be reasonable overall although I have amended a couple of geometric values. • Performance indicates junction to be at total capacity in both 2021 base flow peaks. The critical approach in the AM is Whitehouses Lane, in PM it is London Road south. 	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junction is predicted to be significantly over capacity in the design flow scenarios. <p>Proposed mitigation traffic signals junction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelled on Linsig3. • Staging has the right turn from London Rd north into Whitehouses Lane fully signalled rather than a right turn indicative arrow and the pedestrian facilities provided (across London Rd south and Whitehouses Lane only) are split. I would want to see pedestrians across all approaches and to have these provided straight across rather than staggered, running in a separate pedestrian stage. • The model runs at a cycle time of 120 seconds which is excessive, I would prefer to see a cap of 90 seconds for a single cycle. Even allowing for this long cycle time the PM performance is not stellar – it's better than the predicted performance of the mini-roundabout, but still negative in the PM (PRC of 23.6% in the AM and -6.5 in the PM, 2031 base+committed+Ordsall. • I have run an edited version with peds across all 3 arms, running in a separate 	

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
				<p>stage with this stage coming up every second cycle (at a multiple of a 90 seconds cycle) – consistent with the TT model at Ordsall Road and my modelling across the board. Not surprisingly , the results are not as good as those reported by TT: PRC of 10.4% in the AM and - 17.8% in the PM 2031 base+committed+Ordsall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I also still have concerns regarding the geometry as per previous comment. 	
<p>Representation Reference: NRF-REF016.2</p> <p>Name: Heaton Planning on behalf of land owner</p>	<p>Refers to: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources and Infrastructure</p>	<p>Legal compliance and soundness: Plan is not legally compliant as it does not comply with National Planning Policy.</p>	<p>Comments: As per our November 2020 and July 2021 representations wish to highlight the importance of considering safeguarding of mineral resources and minerals infrastructure. The Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan was adopted on 25th March 2021 and forms part of the development plan for Bassetlaw. Mineral Safeguarding Areas within Bassetlaw District are identified by Nottinghamshire County Council in their role as minerals planning authority for the county. The purpose of the mineral safeguarding areas is to</p>	<p>Suggested changes: Include Minerals Safeguarding Areas on the Local Plan Policies Map</p>	<p>Officer comments: All proposals should be in accordance with the development plan for the district. This includes adopted Minerals and Waste Plans. Following discussion with Nottinghamshire County Council, the Mineral Planning Authority, it has been agreed that to ensure compliance with national policy and also to aid legibility the Local Plan would refer users to the Minerals and Waste Local Plans on the NCC</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>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 Publication Version Policies Maps (August 2021). 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”. 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). In light of the above, the Plan cannot be considered ‘sound’ as it has not been prepared in a manner consistent with Minerals PPG. In addition, it is not consistent with the NPPF (2021) which is explicit</p>		<p>website, rather than replicate the safeguarding areas and designations on the Local Plan Policies Map.</p>

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			<p>at paragraph 210 that: <i>“planning policies should ... c) safeguard mineral resources by defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas; and adopt appropriate policies so that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this should be avoided (whilst not creating a presumption that the resources defined will be worked)”</i></p> <p>The NPPF does not restrict the identification and use of Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) or Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs) to mineral planning authorities. As the purpose of MSAs and 3. MCAs is to minimise the potential for the sterilisation of mineral resources by non-minerals development, we maintain that it is prudent for MSAs and MCAs to be included on the Bassetlaw Local Plan Policies Maps in order to minimise the potential risk of</p>		

Representation Reference: Name:	Refers to:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Comments:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Comments
			sterilisation of mineral resources and the potential for non-minerals development to adversely impact on the operational capabilities of minerals infrastructure.		