

Council confirmed that this formal announcement had been authorised by the district council with [REDACTED]

EVIDENCE: Appendix D email to parish council (the announcement was taken down).

- e. Once the Everton neighbourhood plan had been made, the district council immediately, disingenuously, uploaded the discredited site assessments thus rubbishing our site in the context of the windfall policy.

EVIDENCE: <https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-services/neighbourhood-plans/all-neighbourhood-plans/everton-neighbourhood-plan/>

And as a result, a formal complaint was made reference the Head of Regeneration (12.8.21) covering her role in involving the former Ward Councillor (Appendix A), her role in denying the 2016 SHLAA (Appendix E), her dereliction of Duty of Care towards us, her (easily refuted) rebuttal to Council contra Examiner judgement of site assessments and finally, for allowing the discredited site assessments to be re-uploaded. [REDACTED] Director of Corporate Resources refused to investigate (24.9.21), articulating instead that we should go to the Ombudsman.

- f. The scrubbed site at Hall Farm secured planning approval in 2021 despite not complying with the Everton neighbourhood plan ref: unit sizes and despite the site having failed to meet Basic Conditions at Examination in Public/being scrubbed.
- g. The site promoted by ourselves has been refused twice, despite being positively assessed by the SHLAA, despite being recommended for allocation by Examiner John Slater, despite complying with all elements required by the Everton neighbourhood plan. Both refusal reports are extremely flimsy [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The refusals are structural. During the first submission, the site promoter was attacked by an ex-Parish Councillor (crime number 0571_20072020 PC Wiznycia (2517)). This occurrence was relayed to both the district council and the Parish Council making [REDACTED] refusal to consider breach in the dereliction of the Duty of Care both frightening and negligent. [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 18 October 2021, 18:12:23 BST
Subject: Re: Plymouth shootings Bassetlaw gun control (Case Ref: BC17625)

Good evening, Danielle,

Thank you for your reply and I fully understand your frustrations.

I think it would be a prudent move to collate all your evidence on this matter. I am happy to review this with you, if you would like to setup an appointment to come to our office or if you wish to discuss on the telephone, then please do let me know.

Best Wishes

[REDACTED]
Senior Caseworker | Brendan Clarke-Smith MP

From: Danielle Troop
Sent: 12 October 2021 10:21
To: "CLARKE-SMITH, Brendan"

Subject: Re: Plymouth shootings Bassetlaw gun control (Case Ref: BC17625)

Dear [REDACTED]

I had thought that this was good news and failed to thank you properly in a timely manner (albeit, I still wanted clarification that he could not get a firearms license from anywhere else in the country and come back).

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Thank you for your work to date

Regards

Danielle Troop

Solution

1. Bassetlaw District Council must not be allowed to oversee Neighbourhood Planning in the district. Submitted evidence demonstrates that they have no regard for the statutory process, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I do not want anyone else to have to go through what we have experienced – ergo being targeted for having a deliverable site.
2. Figure 8 must have yellow highlighted column 3 removed and instead be replaced by allocations via a new statutory process. This is because Everton has been unfairly, deliberately, excluded from the new Local Plan process on the basis of a windfall policy that the district council insisted had to take the place of allocations (see Appendix X).
3. As part of this process, it must be recognised that the purported 1793-unit growth for the 35 Rural Settlements over 18years, is too low to deliver sustainability. The Worksop allocation is too high with vociferous objections to strategic urban extensions in both Worksop and Retford, regularly in the local papers. In this regard, objectors/objections are not weighted equally across the district – those in rural areas are weighted more highly despite the absence of landscape designations in the district. Appendix F
4. The Garden Village is not supported and its allocation should be redistributed. It is justified via poor employment evidence that deliberately conflates B2/B8 and overstates the role of the A57 when in truth, both use classes deliver low skill employment. Contrary to suggestion in the Emerging Local Plan, D2N2 strategies do NOT portray logistics/warehousing (B8) as high skill roles. The Garden Village is intended instead, to house D2N2 skilled workers, employed further south when these workers would be more likely to purchase housing in one of Bassetlaw's Rural Service Centres as opposed to a soulless new settlement bolted onto multiple logistics sheds, on the A1. Home working is not referenced. The Garden Village proposal is inherently risky, a supply side gambit (despite all reference to supply side now deleted in favour of "completions scenario" and the like – highlighted yellow) because the evidence base has been distorted. Worksop allocations are sky high in the current emerging Local Plan because post 2038, everything will go to Apleyhead, risking Worksop's regeneration.

Danielle Troop 17/2/22

I wish to attend the Emerging Local Plan Examination/Hearing. Appendices to follow.