

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
<b>Generic Main Modifications</b>					
<b>MM0.4</b>	MOD-NRF001  GPS Planning and Design Limited	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Reduced minimum housing requirement figure from 10,476 to 9,720 dwellings - No comment other than pointing out that this is a 'minimum' requirement.		Noted.
<b>MM0.8</b>	MOD-REF020  David Lock On behalf of Hallam Land Management and IBA Planning	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	It is understood that the proposed Main Modifications (MMs) relating to adjusted housing supply figures within the plan period are in response to the comments from the Inspector in their note dated 9th May 2023. The Inspector references Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) and Ordsall South's delivery assumptions as 'overly optimistic' and the 'windfall contribution is also very high.' The Inspector's view that the housing requirement is not necessary for soundness has resulted in a revised figure from 582 to 540 dpa (from 10,476 dwellings by 2038 to 9,720 dwellings by 2038) in MM5.7. Note that the explanation for the change is given as ' <i>To ensure that the Plan is effective in addressing the objectively assessed housing needs of the Plan</i> ', consider there is a lack of clarity published to justify the differential reduction in delivery from two of the strategic urban extensions. Despite the Inspector confirming that Ordsall South's delivery assumptions are 'overly optimistic', the approximate net new dwellings within the plan period (by 2038) has increased from 890 dwellings to 960 dwellings (MM0.9), whilst the delivery trajectory for Peaks Hill Farm (PHF) has reduced from 1080 to 655 dwellings to 2038 (MM0.8). MM0.8 results in a delivery figure for PHF of	No evidence to justify an adjustment to the delivery rates at PHF from those set out in the Submitted Plan and that these rates should remain unadjusted. Should MM.08 (and related Modifications) are accepted, suggest a minor amendment to the wording of Policy 16 to maintain the appropriate degree of clarity around what is proposed for the site (see Response to MM7.14a)	Delivery assumptions for Peaks Hill Farm are informed by a range of matters including the Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010, the site promoters previous representations, discussions at the hearings, average delivery assumptions, the expected provision of the initial phase of a distributor road and the planning status of the site. As such, it is considered a pragmatic approach has been taken to delivery assumptions for the site.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>approximately 58.5% of the site's total capacity by 2038, compared with Ordsall South's delivery of 76.8% of the site's total capacity by 2038. This equates to a 35.5% reduction at PHF in the dwellings that are assumed to be delivered during the plan period (the proportion of the total capacity anticipated to be delivered during the plan period for PHF was set at 96% in the Submission Plan). Part of the reasoning for the adjustments was that an outline application is lodged for Ordsall South and one is not submitted for PHF. The authority is aware of the progression of the PHF application and the programme for its imminent submission. Query the logic behind increasing the delivery rate for one strategic allocation whilst reducing the delivery rate for another; this risks providing an unrealistic and inaccurate picture for stakeholders and local communities, increasing the uncertainty and lack of clarity around what is to be expected to be delivered at these sites within the plan period. The Outline Planning Application is at an advanced stage, submission is imminent, its determination will run in parallel with the Local Plan. There are no land ownership or site constraints to prevent delivery in accordance with the submitted trajectory, and no evidence to the contrary has been submitted as part of the examination. There is no justification to suggest the delivery of PHF will not meet the Local Plan's anticipated trajectory. Nonetheless, appreciate that Local Plan housing trajectories are subject to flex and change over time, and that the Annual Monitoring report will pick up any adjustments in delivery through the plan period. Also understand that in proposing to reduce the anticipated delivery of PHF to 2038 the Council are not proposing any change to the overall capacity of the PHF allocation and that the site as allocated</p>		

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			remains capable of delivering an urban extension of 1,120 dwellings. On that basis, a planning application for 1,120 dwellings, associated employment and other supporting land uses will remain in accordance with Policy 16 HS1.		
<b>MM0.9</b>	MOD-REF023  Marrons for Vistry Group	Legally Compliant – Not stated  Soundness - No	The Main Modifications consultation includes an updated Housing Background Paper, responding to the Examination Hearings into Matter 7 (Housing Supply) and the Inspector’s Post Hearing advice, that maintaining the submitted housing requirement was not necessary for soundness, and that a revised figure of 540 dwellings per annum (9,720 by 2038) should be adopted. The Main Modifications also respond to the Inspector’s advice that within the identified housing supply, the ‘delivery assumptions’ for the proposed strategic allocations at Peaks Hill Farm and Ordsall South were ‘overly optimistic’ (INS10). The updated housing trajectory reflects the amended figures for each proposed allocation. The adjustment at Peaks Hill Farm aligns with the Inspector’s findings, concerning over optimistic assumptions. At Ordsall South, the revised 960 dwelling figure is higher than the submitted Local Plan. First completions have been brought forward, so that the assumptions are more optimistic. The delivery rates are unchanged from the housing trajectory in the January 2023 Publication Version Addendum. This conflicts with the Inspector’s Note. It does not reflect the evidence, whereby the Land Availability Assessment indicates an average of 3.6 years from the grant of outline to first completions for outline consents. Even with a Local Plan adoption in 2023 and the subsequent granting of consents in 2024, these lead-in times appear optimistic.		Prior to receipt of INS-010 the Council had responded to the Inspectors queries at the hearings with BDC-048 in which the overall delivery assumptions for Ordsall South were increased. In our view it was this revised figure the Inspectors considered to be overly optimistic. To address the Inspectors concerns the delivery in the first three monitoring periods has been staggered more than in the submitted plan and BDC-048, and delivery rates are lower overall than those in BDC-048. As the planning application is pending it is considered that 2026/27 is a realistic timeframe for first completions taking into account the amount of work undertaken for the application to date, and that the first phase of development is not reliant on any strategic infrastructure.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM0.9	MOD-REF023  Marrons for Vistry Group	Legally Compliant – Not stated  Soundness - No	<p>The Housing Background Paper notes that an outline planning application (22/01633/OUT) is pending for Ordsall South for up to 1,250 dwellings and associated infrastructure. The planning application appears to be the basis on which the Council assumed that delivery of the first dwellings at Ordsall South would commence in 2026-27, earlier than the 2027/28 previously assumed. The Background Paper indicates this change is based on 'average' lead in times for outline and reserved matters applications, plus no significant requirement for up front infrastructure (para 2.63). Bringing forward the start date is not justified and conflicts with the interim findings of the Planning Inspectors regarding overly optimistic assumptions. It ignores context in relation to the local highway network, and objection from the Local Highway Authority to the draft allocation and the application. The extent of infrastructure prior to development is dependent on agreement with the Local Highway Authority in terms of contributions to strategic transport infrastructure required due to the cumulative transport implications. MM7.61 and MM7.62a to Policy 27 recognise that highways infrastructure in the locality may require improvements and traffic management scheme in Ordsall Old Village and at Main Road, Eaton will help to manage traffic flows in the wider area. Policy 27 identifies improvements to off-site highways infrastructure as identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in the locality of the site in part m(iii) a-e of the Policy and include a significant number of off-site junctions (10no. in total) requiring interventions. The LHA's objection to the planning application (dated 20 September 2023) focuses on the submitted Transport Assessment, highlighting the site's dependency on off-site improvement works: "As there is likely to be some <i>uncertainties over</i></p>	<p>The first completions at Ordsall South should be reviewed and pushed back in the housing trajectory to 2028/29 at the earliest, recognising it takes an average of 3.6 years from the grant of outline planning permission to first completions and that in this case, it will take time to agree the off-site highway improvement works for permission to be granted.</p>	<p>The lead in times from determination of outline application to first completion in Bassetlaw as per the 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report are 27 months. As the planning application is pending it is considered that 2026/27 is a realistic timeframe for first completions taking into account the work undertaken for the application to date, and that the first phase of development is not reliant on any strategic infrastructure. This was confirmed at the hearings by the Highways Authority. The Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010 highlighted overly optimistic assumptions at Ordsall South. It is our understanding that it is the figure in BDC-048 that the Inspectors were referring to. The Council has positively responded to the Inspectors request by staggering delivery rates for the first three monitoring periods more than in the submitted plan and lowering the annual delivery rates more than in BDC-048. Modified Policy 27 does not identify 10 off-site junctions requiring interventions. The details of the planning application are a matter for the decision-making process. The Local Plan housing supply has a 15% buffer which is designed to provide flexibility should unforeseen circumstances result in a delay in bringing sites forward and will provide a choice of sites. It is considered that no additional site allocations are required.</p>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p><i>long term delivery, the TA should also include triggers for off-site infrastructure and a review mechanism such that the timing of the delivery and the continued appropriateness of off-site infrastructure is checked periodically” (Pg. 1) (our emphasis). It identifies points that need to be addressed at Babworth Road / Mansfield Road / Straight Mile / Sutton Lane junction; Babworth Road / Ordsall Road junction; London Road / Whinney Moor Land / Bracken Lane junction; London Road / Whitehouses Road. The LHA’s submissions to the Examination and objection to the planning application highlight a technical constraint to the site to be resolved before it can begin to deliver new dwellings. The decision to apply ‘average’ lead in times for Ordsall South is questioned. Because of its strategic scale and delivery continuing beyond the plan period, if the allocation is delayed, dwellings would be lost to the plan period and local housing need could go unmet. Should mitigate this by allocating smaller sites to diversify the housing land portfolio, including land at Tiln Lane, Retford.</i></p>		
<b>MM0.9</b>	MOD-REF023  Marrons for Vistry Group	Legally Compliant – Not stated  Soundness - No	The Housing Background Paper states the Ordsall South promotor assumes at least two delivery outlets and three housebuilders. In the absence of written evidence from an agent / developer, the Paper further assumes that each housebuilder would deliver 30 dwellings per year from 2029-2030, 90 dwellings per year for the remaining plan period. This is optimistic. An increased number of outlets affects the number of completions. One outlet might deliver 30 dwellings per annum, the delivery rates achieved at the other two outlets would typically be lower. This is supported by the Start to Finish (Second Edition, 2020): whilst there is a positive impact from additional outlets on building rates overall, there are limits to this -	Amend the delivery rate of 90 dwellings per year, to 66 dwellings per year. The Housing Background Paper and Five Year Housing Land Supply Report indicate that historic build out rates in Bassetlaw achieve 30 dwellings per year, on the majority of	The site promotors have signed a statement of common ground indicating that a higher than average delivery rate could be achieved, and this has informed the Council’s assumptions. However, the Housing Background Paper at paragraph 2.21 assumes two delivery outlets, whereas the site promotors assume three. The Housing Background Paper paragraph 2.61 also acknowledges that larger sites with more than one outlet can achieve higher delivery rates than average. It is considered two outlets is realistic

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>most likely due to the additional capacity from the outlets as well as competition for buyers (Pg. 15). The number of completions per outlet reduce with every additional outlet. Start to Finish indicates a reduction of circa 26% on average completion rates per outlet where three outlets operate. Given the 30 dwellings per year has been assumed, an equivalent reduction would see actual delivery rates of 22 dwellings per year, or 66 dwellings per year at Ordsall South in total, from the three outlets operating. The Plan's focus on strategic sites reduces the ability to increase the pace of supply if sites are delayed which would result in a loss of housing completions from the plan period. Allocating smaller sites such as Tilm Lane to diversify the housing land supply would protect against the risk of delay in housing delivery at larger sites.</p>	<p>larger sites (over 50 dwellings). Based on evidence from Start to Finish a reduction in the number of completions should be applied, to account for additional outlets. Based on three outlets operating, the delivery rate should be reduced to 66 dwellings per year.</p>	<p>particularly given the different housing products promoted. Suggesting that there is a focus on two strategic sites in Retford is misleading; within the housing supply there are 11 major developments underway in Retford all smaller in size than the strategic sites referred to. These will contribute to the housing land supply for the Plan, with the other smaller Retford site allocations thereby providing an appropriate mix of sites to support Local Plan delivery.</p>

**Section 2: Structure of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan**

<b>MM2.2</b>	MOD-NRF013  R Troop and Son	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	<p>Completions data is used to hamstring rural development and should be removed until post 31st March 2023. This date is being touted as a cut off - it's disingenuous to cast back to 2020 and add those units to the trajectory. The legal timeframe for a Local Plan is 15 years and this is 2023, so the Plan should run 2023 to 2028. See response at MM3.2 ref: West Burton where the Local Plan will not be reviewing the STEP programme until 2028 – 5 years after 2023 as per legislation – not 8 years after 2020. The Local Plan starts in 2023. Using % growth rhetoric to paint the historic picture of development in Bassetlaw is also misleading. The number of “small settlements” in Bassetlaw is huge because the labelling is generic. If “settlement” was used the growth rate in that category would be 100% of all categories. Bassetlaw is a large rural landmass and previous responses show that the generic</p>	<p>Take out “completions” from text and from trajectory calculations if occurring prior to 31st March 2023</p>	<p>The Local Plan period runs from 1 April 2020. It is appropriate that housing completions delivered from the 1 April 2020 therefore contribute to the housing requirement for the Local Plan to help address objectively assessed housing needs over the plan period, as per national policy. The strategic policies in the Local Plan look ahead for a minimum 15 years from the expected date of adoption, as per the NPPF.</p>
--------------	-----------------------------------	--	---	--	---

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>“Small Settlements” could be split (historically Everton used to be a Rural Service Centre). Merging categories is a deliberate anti rural agenda – we’ve gone backwards. The current iteration is trying to change this but the headwinds have been strong for years. Latent demand for housing outside the main Towns under the LDF was suppressed so the District ended up without a five year supply. This changed when the government altered the calculation formula which had the unintended consequence of providing massive surpluses of supply in low value areas (Bassetlaw) whilst producing the desired effect in high value areas outside Bassetlaw (forcing higher targets/delivery). Taking housing delivery over the last 40 years using the generic ‘small settlement’, the percentage delivery would be much smaller. Appreciate that “flooding” settlements have been taken out.</p>		
<b>Section 3: Context</b>					
<b>MM3.2</b>	MODNRF-005  Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of EDF	Not stated	Reference to the Government-announced STEP programme at EDF’s West Burton site is welcomed. EDF looks forward to engaging further with the Council in this regard when the next Local Plan review commences.		Noted.
<b>MM3.2</b>	MOD-NRF013  R Troop and Son	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	The A631 is still absent from the Local Plan – this is not legally compliant or sound. Bassetlaw constituents who rely upon this road/live in this part of the district are being dis-served in Economic Development terms – which is not legally compliant or sound. The Spatial Strategy for the district is lop-sided. ST1 is not Spatial; proposals for West Burton and Cottam provide an opportunity to REMEDY the current focus and provide balance. 2028 is not far away and markers should be put down now to ensure that the plan is legally compliant and sound. The A631 is a	The Government announced in October 2022 that the West Burton Power Station site and wider brownfield land is expected to host a prototype fusion plant (known as STEP), which will drive the	As stated in MM3.2, the STEP programme remains at a very early stage. The approach to Cottam is set out in Policy ST6. The changes proposed are not considered justified by evidence or necessary for inclusion in this Plan.



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>dedicated wide load route enabling easy access to West Burton from the Beckingham roundabout, passing only through Everton (un-bypassed) en route. Upgrade of rural roads from Sturton le Steeple (north end only) to Coates and by passing Cottam village will access the Cottam Regeneration site WITHOUT slicing through the multitude of villages that the proposed A57/Dunham on Trent route would entail. The advantage of the route shown at fig 1 and 2 attached, is that it will skirt the nationally important Roman Settlement of Littleborough providing new Visitor Attraction/economic development opportunity BETWEEN Cottam and West Burton in a neglected corner of the District. MM3.2 asserts that the STEP programme is not expected to grow to a size that will adversely affect the spatial strategy until Plan review by 2028 – yet the spatial strategy needs to be “adversely affected” because it is neither legally compliant or sound.</p>	<p>evolution of the UK nuclear fusion delivery industry. The STEP programme is at a very early stage <del>Future reviews of the Local Plan will address potential implications for the area's spatial strategy, as the STEP programme is not expected to grow to a size which will adversely affect the spatial strategy until Plan review, expected by 2028.</del> <u>but it is vital to recognise the potential benefits to the east and north of the district, in addition to exciting synergy with Cottam proposals (Policy ST6). Access routes, housing and services needed to support both proposals will take the currently heavy focus of the Spatial Strategy away from the south and western side of</u></p>	



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>the district, providing much needed balance through use of the A631. Owing to the national importance of the STEP programme, LPA allocations will be used in preference to Neighbourhood Planning in order to demonstrate to national government, the District's determination to deliver. This in turn, will enable some small settlements to grow by a minimum 10% margin, others with frontage onto the A631, by significantly more, according to their ability to accommodate growth. The 540 unit target plus 15% buffer, will need to be increased.</p>	
<b>Section 4: Vision and Objectives</b>					
<b>MM4.1</b>	MOD-NRF013  R Troop and Son	Legally Compliant – No	Does not recognise that some rural settlements have frontage onto intra county, dedicated wide load routes eg: the A631, that are widely used as commuter routes between Lincs/Notts/S.Yorks. Everton is a service centre for people travelling from a wide radius because it has not	Take out the word “appropriate.”	It is considered that the policies in the Local Plan together with the vision and objectives provide a positive framework within which proposals for rural economic growth can be

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
		Soundness - No	been by-passed (previous Everton traders voted against bypassing). Wish to enhance the offer and view “appropriate” as likely to be used against us when we apply for new retail/other services on the A631 (recognising that the West Burton/Cottam proposals increase this). Do not wish to be yoked to policy ST1 (do not view as “spatial”) by “appropriate”. POLICY ST13 does not recognise Local Centres other than those at point 1. This would not matter if the subheading “Local Shops and Services” articulated the creation of new and not just mitigation ref: loss? Do not wish to be yoked to policy ST13 by the word “appropriate”.		considered. The change proposed is not considered necessary for soundness.
<b>MM4.2</b>	MOD-NRF013  R Troop and Son	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	MM4.2 may be extremely helpful but request greater certainty in view of the concerns re MM4.1. Everton is a sustainable location accessible to the Main Towns (inc Bawtry and Gainsborough) and to the A1 growth corridor. Those seeking to cross the Trent from/to the A1 will use the A631 because it is a faster/bigger, toll free bridge. Focus of MM4.2 is to stop out commuting...why can't the District secure economic benefit from those “passing through” and create Bassetlaw jobs? Ongoing dismay that the A631 is being ignored despite many responses. It's been there for 2000 years, the bridge at Gainsborough is strategically important .....yet through the Local Plan, the A631 AND the bridge at Gainsborough, have disappeared? This will be less credible if West Burton and Cottam proposals come to fruition.	Add the A631: “in sustainable locations accessible to the Main Towns, <u>the A631</u> , and A1/A57 growth corridors”.	It is considered that the policies in the Local Plan together with the vision and objectives provide a positive framework within which proposals for economic growth outside the Main Towns and A1 growth corridor can be considered. There is no evidence to suggest that the A631 should be identified as an economic growth corridor. Figure 1 shows the A631 and connection to Gainsborough. The change proposed is not considered necessary for soundness.
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness – No	There is much in this Plan to recommend and support its overall ambition. Key points for Tuxford's consideration are that growth (economic and population) in Bassetlaw is expected to outpace national average, with population growth of 17.8% over the Plan, which will support economic activity driven mainly by expansion in large scale logistics on “Sustainable locations accessible to the		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>Main Towns and A1/A57 growth corridors” along with renewable energy infrastructure and technology (with a focus on wind turbines and the eventual STEP site). Support this focus, but the new Strategic site at Apleyhead Junction, along with the former Bevercotes Colliery and the expansion of other sites, including Manton Wood, will result in significant B2/B8 space which have direct, unimpeded access to the A1/A57 corridor. This will have a long-term negative outlook on the cost-effectiveness of the logistics and freight components of the three modest industrial estates in Tuxford. Support the re-invention of these sites to create other types of employment; the Ollerton Road site (EES20) was the location of technical and engineering support for the Nottinghamshire Coal industry; such uses, updated are perfectly viable. Housing growth based upon expanded Economic Need rather than average population growth is supported. Support the advanced stage of identified delivery, both from an overall Plan perspective and 5 years’ supply.</p>		
<b>Policy ST1: Bassetlaw’s Spatial Strategy</b>					
<b>MM5.8</b>	MOD-NRF013 R Troop & Son	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	States the plan started in 2020 and that completions since that date are relevant. Only completions post March 31 2023 should be relevant to this plan. At 5.1.26, a Main Modification has been added that from the point of Local Plan adoption expected 2023, the District will have a 5 year supply of land. Detail describing the 5 year trajectory running from 2020, has been crossed out. So why are we counting completions from 2020 as part of the trajectory.....why can't those units be couched under LDF delivery?	Remove completions since 2020 from text and trajectory. Articulate that the plan period starts 2023. Use previous delivery before 2023 to evidence LDF “attainment”.	The Local Plan period runs from 1 April 2020. It is appropriate that housing completions delivered from the 1 April 2020 contribute to the housing requirement for the Local Plan to help address objectively assessed housing needs over the plan period, as per national policy. The strategic policies in the Local Plan look ahead for a minimum 15 years from the expected date of adoption, as per the NPPF.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response														
MM5.12c	MOD-NRF013 R Troop & Son	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Housing completions prior to 31 March 2023 should be removed. Trajectory likewise should be shortened from 18 years to 15 years. No need to separate NP allocations without planning permission from Windfall. Windfall rises to 1863 or 124 per annum once 15% buffer added thus taking this allowance closer to that originally proposed – 1200. 124 across the district is a small number and the Main Towns and Large Villages should not be eligible to share in this number because it subsumes Neighbourhood Plan allocations without planning permission. If STEP comes to fruition, the 540 unit target will need to increase at 5 year review. References to minimum and development boundaries noted.	As per below and text excluding Towns and large villages above. Ergo, all paragraphs that refer to these numbers (in table above), to be amended.  <table border="1" data-bbox="1384 592 1650 719"> <thead> <tr> <th>Housing Supply as at 31 March 2023 AS AMENDED</th> <th>No. Dwelling</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>COMMITTED MAJOR SITES WITH EXTANT PLANNING AT 31 MARCH 2023</td> <td>4281</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NEW LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS</td> <td>2387</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS IN WORKSHOP CENTRAL DPD</td> <td>238</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SMALL SITES ALLOWANCE</td> <td>540</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WINDFALL ALLOWANCE</td> <td>1863</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Supply 2023 - 2038 (INC. 15% BUFFER)</b></td> <td><b>9315</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Housing Supply as at 31 March 2023 AS AMENDED	No. Dwelling	COMMITTED MAJOR SITES WITH EXTANT PLANNING AT 31 MARCH 2023	4281	NEW LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS	2387	PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS IN WORKSHOP CENTRAL DPD	238	SMALL SITES ALLOWANCE	540	WINDFALL ALLOWANCE	1863	<b>Total Supply 2023 - 2038 (INC. 15% BUFFER)</b>	<b>9315</b>	Windfall is defined by the NPPF as 'Sites not specifically identified in the development plan'. Neighbourhood Plan site allocations without planning permission are identified in a development plan. To be consistent with national policy the housing supply should make a distinction between the two categories. Also see response to MM5.8.
Housing Supply as at 31 March 2023 AS AMENDED	No. Dwelling																		
COMMITTED MAJOR SITES WITH EXTANT PLANNING AT 31 MARCH 2023	4281																		
NEW LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS	2387																		
PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS IN WORKSHOP CENTRAL DPD	238																		
SMALL SITES ALLOWANCE	540																		
WINDFALL ALLOWANCE	1863																		
<b>Total Supply 2023 - 2038 (INC. 15% BUFFER)</b>	<b>9315</b>																		
MM5.14a	MOD-REF023 Marrons for Vistry Group	Legally Compliant – Not stated  Soundness - No	The Housing Background Paper notes that an outline planning application (22/01633/OUT) is pending for Ordsall South for up to 1,250 dwellings and associated infrastructure. The planning application appears to be the basis on which the Council assumed that delivery of the first dwellings at Ordsall South would commence in 2026-27, earlier than the 2027/28 previously assumed. The Background Paper indicates this change is based on 'average' lead in times for outline and reserved matters applications, plus no significant requirement for up front infrastructure (para 2.63). Bringing forward the start date is not justified and conflicts with the interim findings of the Planning Inspectors regarding overly optimistic assumptions. It ignores context in relation to the local highway network, and objection from the Local Highway Authority to the draft allocation and the application. The extent of infrastructure prior to development is dependent on agreement with the Local Highway Authority in terms of contributions to strategic transport infrastructure required	The first completions at Ordsall South should be reviewed and pushed back in the housing trajectory to 2028/29 at the earliest, recognising it takes an average of 3.6 years from the grant of outline planning permission to first completions and that in this case, it will take time to agree the off-site highway improvement works for permission to be granted.	The lead in times from determination of outline application to first completion in Bassetlaw as per the 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report are 27 months. As the planning application is pending it is considered that 2026/27 is a realistic timeframe for first completions taking into account the work undertaken for the application to date, and that the first phase of development is not reliant on any strategic infrastructure. This was confirmed at the hearings by the Highways Authority. The Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010 highlighted overly optimistic assumptions at Ordsall South. It is our understanding that it is the figure in BDC-048 that the Inspectors were referring to. The Council has positively responded to the Inspectors request by staggering delivery rates for the														

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>due to the cumulative transport implications. MM7.61 and MM7.62a to Policy 27 recognise that highways infrastructure in the locality may require improvements and traffic management scheme in Ordsall Old Village and at Main Road, Eaton will help to manage traffic flows in the wider area. Policy 27 identifies improvements to off-site highways infrastructure as identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in the locality of the site in part m(iii) a-e of the Policy and include a significant number of off-site junctions (10no. in total) requiring interventions. The LHA's objection to the planning application (dated 20 September 2023) focuses on the submitted Transport Assessment, highlighting the site's dependency on off-site improvement works: <i>"As there is likely to be some <u>uncertainties over long term delivery</u>, the TA should also include triggers for off-site infrastructure and a review mechanism such that the timing of the delivery and the continued appropriateness of off-site infrastructure is checked periodically"</i> (Pg. 1) (our emphasis). It identifies points that need to be addressed at Babworth Road / Mansfield Road / Straight Mile / Sutton Lane junction; Babworth Road / Ordsall Road junction; London Road / Whinney Moor Land / Bracken Lane junction; London Road / Whitehouses Road. The LHA's submissions to the Examination and objection to the planning application highlight a technical constraint to the site to be resolved before it can begin to deliver new dwellings. The decision to apply 'average' lead in times for Ordsall South is questioned. Because of its strategic scale and delivery continuing beyond the plan period, if the allocation is delayed, dwellings would be lost to the plan period and local housing need could go unmet. Should mitigate this by allocating smaller sites to diversify</p>		<p>first three monitoring periods more than in the submitted plan and lowering the annual delivery rates more than in BDC-048. Modified Policy 27 does not identify 10 off-site junctions requiring interventions. The details of the planning application are a matter for the decision-making process. The Local Plan housing supply has a 15% buffer which is designed to provide flexibility should unforeseen circumstances result in a delay in bringing sites forward and will provide a choice of sites. It is considered that no additional site allocations are required.</p>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			the housing land portfolio, including land at Tiln Lane, Retford.		
<b>MM5.14a</b>	MOD-REF023  Marrons for Vistry Group	Legally Compliant – Not stated  Soundness - No	The Housing Background Paper states the Ordsall South promotor assumes at least two delivery outlets and three housebuilders. In the absence of written evidence from an agent / developer, the Paper further assumes that each housebuilder would deliver 30 dwellings per year from 2029-2030, 90 dwellings per year for the remaining plan period. This is optimistic. An increased number of outlets affects the number of completions. One outlet might deliver 30 dwellings per annum, the delivery rates achieved at the other two outlets would typically be lower. This is supported by the Start to Finish (Second Edition, 2020): whilst there is a positive impact from additional outlets on building rates overall, there are limits to this - most likely due to the additional capacity from the outlets as well as competition for buyers (Pg. 15). The number of completions per outlet reduce with every additional outlet. Start to Finish indicates a reduction of circa 26% on average completion rates per outlet where three outlets operate. Given the 30 dwellings per year has been assumed, an equivalent reduction would see actual delivery rates of 22 dwellings per year, or 66 dwellings per year at Ordsall South in total, from the three outlets operating. The Plan's focus on strategic sites reduces the ability to increase the pace of supply if sites are delayed which would result in a loss of housing completions from the plan period. Allocating smaller sites such as Tiln Lane to diversify the housing land supply would protect against the risk of delay in housing delivery at larger sites.	Amend the delivery rate of 90 dwellings per year, to 66 dwellings per year. The Housing Background Paper and Five Year Housing Land Supply Report indicate that historic build out rates in Bassetlaw achieve 30 dwellings per year, on the majority of larger sites (over 50 dwellings). Based on evidence from Start to Finish a reduction in the number of completions should be applied, to account for additional outlets. Based on three outlets operating, the delivery rate should be reduced to 66 dwellings per year.	The site promotors have signed a statement of common ground indicating that a higher than average delivery rate could be achieved, and this has informed the Council's assumptions. However, the Housing Background Paper at paragraph 2.21 assumes two delivery outlets, whereas the site promotors assume three. The Housing Background Paper paragraph 2.61 also acknowledges that larger sites with more than one outlet can achieve higher delivery rates than average. It is considered two outlets is realistic particularly given the different housing products promoted. Suggesting that there is a focus on two strategic sites in Retford is misleading; within the housing supply there are 11 major developments underway in Retford all smaller in size than the strategic sites referred to. These will contribute to the housing land supply for the Plan, with the other smaller Retford site allocations thereby providing an appropriate mix of sites to support Local Plan delivery.
<b>MM5.14b</b>	MOD-NRF010	Not stated	Support this modification - as a Main Town, it is appropriate that Retford is the focus of growth alongside Worksop and Harworth & Bircotes.		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited				
<b>MM5.14d</b>	MOD-REF006  Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	Should explain why there is a preference to build on good sustainable farming land at Peaks Hill, when Worksop town centre and other brownfield sites in the area are not being fully utilised. There are plenty of brownfield sites in and around Worksop e.g. the town centre has numerous empty shops and pubs that could be used to provide some of the required housing and bring life back into the depressed and underutilised town centre above what is outlined in the plan. A more extensive evaluation of available brownfield sites for development should be undertaken to reduce the new housing being built on the Peaks Hill site.		There is insufficient suitable, deliverable brownfield land available in Worksop and the District to meet housing needs over the plan period so some greenfield land has been identified. This is evidenced in detail through the Land Availability Assessment and the Worksop Central Land Availability Assessment. Policy ST5 provides a positive framework for the re-use of buildings and land within Worksop town centre.
<b>MM5.14d</b>	MOD-REF007  Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	Should explain why there is a preference to build on good sustainable farming land at Peaks Hill, when Worksop town centre and other brownfield sites in the area are not being fully utilised. There are plenty of brownfield sites in and around Worksop e.g. the town centre has numerous empty shops and pubs that could be used to provide some of the required housing and bring life back into the depressed and underutilised town centre above what is outlined in the plan. A more extensive evaluation of available brownfield sites for development should be undertaken to reduce the new housing being built on the Peaks Hill site.		There is insufficient suitable, deliverable brownfield land available in Worksop and the District to meet housing needs over the plan period so some greenfield land has been identified. This is evidenced in detail through the Land Availability Assessment and the Worksop Central Land Availability Assessment. Policy ST5 provides a positive framework for the re-use of buildings and land within Worksop town centre.
<b>MM5.14d</b>	MOD-REF008  Resident	Legally Compliant – no	Should explain why there is a preference to build on good sustainable farming land at Peaks Hill, when Worksop town centre and other brownfield sites in the area are not being fully utilised. There are plenty of brownfield sites in		There is insufficient suitable, deliverable brownfield land available in Worksop and the District to meet housing needs over the plan period so some greenfield land has



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
		Soundness - no	and around Worksop e.g. the town centre has numerous empty shops and pubs that could be used to provide some of the required housing and bring life back into the depressed and underutilised town centre above what is outlined in the plan. A more extensive evaluation of available brownfield sites for development should be undertaken to reduce the new housing being built on the Peaks Hill site.		been identified. This is evidenced in detail through the Land Availability Assessment and the Worksop Central Land Availability Assessment. Policy ST5 provides a positive framework for the re-use of buildings and land within Worksop town centre.
<b>MM5.14d</b>	MOD-REF009  Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	Should explain why there is a preference to build on good sustainable farming land at Peaks Hill, when Worksop town centre and other brownfield sites in the area are not being fully utilised. There are plenty of brownfield sites in and around Worksop e.g. the town centre has numerous empty shops and pubs that could be used to provide some of the required housing and bring life back into the depressed and underutilised town centre above what is outlined in the plan. A more extensive evaluation of available brownfield sites for development should be undertaken to reduce the new housing being built on the Peaks Hill site.		There is insufficient suitable, deliverable brownfield land available in Worksop and the District to meet housing needs over the plan period so some greenfield land has been identified. This is evidenced in detail through the Land Availability Assessment and the Worksop Central Land Availability Assessment. Policy ST5 provides a positive framework for the re-use of buildings and land within Worksop town centre.
<b>MM5.14d</b>	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited	Not stated	Ordsall South has the capacity for 1,250 dwellings. Confident that all 1,250 residential units can be delivered at the Site within the plan period. In keeping with paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to significantly boost the supply of homes, an allowance should be made at Policy ST15 and Policy 27 for the residual capacity of the allocation to be delivered within the plan period where there is demand.		It is considered that a pragmatic approach to housing delivery at Ordsall South has been taken informed by evidence supplied by the site promoters in previous representations and at the hearings and taking into account the content of the Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010.
<b>MM5.14d</b>	MOD-REF016  Resident	Legally Compliant – No	Don't want any development as an urban extension and that land is currently being farmed and needs to be left as sustainable farming land as there is plenty of brownfield sites especially now wilkinsons at manton wood will be available and also worksop town centre has so much	Utilise existing abundance of property that exists throughout the town and brownfield sites that	There is insufficient suitable, deliverable brownfield land available in Worksop and the District to meet housing needs over the plan period so some greenfield land has been identified. Policy ST5 provides a

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
		Soundness - No	potential where housing could be revamped and bring life back to the town centre instead of pushing it out of town. Have not provided any clarity why good farming land is used when the town centre and brownfield sites have not been utilised first.	are derelict and would benefit those areas for growth and development rather than wasteland. this would save good farming land.	positive framework for the re-use of buildings and land within Worksop town centre.
MM5.14d	MOD-REF020  David Lock On behalf of Hallam Land Management and IBA Planning	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Refers to MM0.8 and the change in the anticipated quantum of delivery from the Peaks Hill Farm allocation within the Plan Period. The change has resulted in a changes to the supporting text to set out what is now expected to be delivered. Do not accept that there is evidence to justify a reduction in delivery within the plan period (see Representation to MM0.8), should the changes be accepted then additional clarification in the supporting text and site allocation policies is needed to ensure that it is made clear that the overall capacity of the site for the development proposed <u>has not changed</u> .	If the changes proposed in MM0.8 are approved, suggest that for soundness, para 5.1.40 needs further adjustment to make it clear that the overall capacity of the two urban extension allocations has not changed and that they remain allocated for their full capacity. Suggest the following (additions in <b>bold</b> , removal in <del>strikethrough</del> ): <i>5.1.40 : “To meet the residual requirement within this plan period; as well as redeveloping brownfield sites and identifying small scale greenfield sites within</i>	Agree that for clarification and to aid the implementation of the Plan MM5.14 would benefit from an amendment (underlined in bold): To meet the residual requirement within this plan period; as well as redeveloping brownfield sites and identifying small scale greenfield sites within the development boundaries of <u>Worksop and Retford</u> , two large urban extensions are identified; on the northern edge of Worksop at Peaks Hill Farm for <del>4,080</del> <u>655</u> dwellings; and, at Ordsall South in Retford for <del>890</del> <u>960</u> dwellings, <b><u>with the outstanding capacity on both sites to be delivered thereafter.</u></b>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response																																																												
				<p>the development boundaries of Worksop and Retford, two large urban extensions are identified; on the northern edge of Worksop at Peaks Hill Farm <del>for</del> <b>(at least 655 dwellings <u>within the Plan Period</u>)</b>; and, at Ordsall South in Retford <del>for</del> <b>(960 dwellings <u>within the Plan period</u>)</b>”</p>																																																													
MM5.14g	MOD-NRF001  GPS Planning and Design Limited	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	<p>Figure 8 Column 1 Competitions 1.04.2020 to 31.03.2023 Would the LPA explain how the total has been arrived at for the LRS's? Calculate 300 + 7 = 307 completions, whereas the LPA has 346 completions, a difference of 39 dwellings. Where are the 39 dwellings? Our calculations are from Housing Background Paper for each LRS.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="680 1050 1099 1356"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">Competitions 1.04.2020 to 31.03.2023</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Appendix 1: Rural Area Annex 1 Table 1.1 Part A</th> <th>Appendix 2: Housing Trajectory Completed 2020-2021</th> <th>Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory Completed 2021-2022</th> <th>Appendix 1: Housing Trajectory Completed 2022-2023</th> <th>Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory Completed 2022-2023</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Blyth</td> <td>10</td> <td>2 complete 20/01327/tul</td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carlton in Lindrick</td> <td>181</td> <td>1 complete 18/00697/tul</td> <td>37</td> <td>46</td> <td>42 18/01148/tul 56 19/01137/res</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Langold</td> <td>23</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>0</td> <td>1 complete 21/01720/tul 1 complete 13/00133/res</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tuxford</td> <td>86</td> <td>2 complete 17/00254/cou</td> <td>80</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>300</b></td> <td><b>7</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Competitions 1.04.2020 to 31.03.2023							Appendix 1: Rural Area Annex 1 Table 1.1 Part A	Appendix 2: Housing Trajectory Completed 2020-2021	Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory Completed 2021-2022	Appendix 1: Housing Trajectory Completed 2022-2023	Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory Completed 2022-2023	Blyth	10	2 complete 20/01327/tul	10			Carlton in Lindrick	181	1 complete 18/00697/tul	37	46	42 18/01148/tul 56 19/01137/res	Langold	23				23	Misterton	0	1 complete 21/01720/tul 1 complete 13/00133/res				Tuxford	86	2 complete 17/00254/cou	80	6		<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>7</b>				<p>Based on calculations set out below figure 8 should read as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1384 991 1653 1091"> <tr> <td>300</td> <td>189</td> <td>42</td> <td>1733</td> </tr> <tr> <td>782</td> <td>1007</td> <td>110</td> <td>1425</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>12</td> <td>1437</td> </tr> </table>	300	189	42	1733	782	1007	110	1425			12	1437	<p>It is considered that the housing completions total for 2020/21 – 2022/23 within Figure 8 of the Local Plan is correct. The Housing Background Paper does not provide a comprehensive breakdown of completions. Appendix 2: Annex 1 Table 1.1 Part A refers to permissions under construction. It does not contain a full list of all sites that have been completed as well. Appendix 3 only contains a breakdown of major sites and associated completions, it does not contain small sites completions. A separate schedule is attached to this paper (Appendix 1) to clarify the sites that contribute to the 346 total.</p>
Competitions 1.04.2020 to 31.03.2023																																																																	
	Appendix 1: Rural Area Annex 1 Table 1.1 Part A	Appendix 2: Housing Trajectory Completed 2020-2021	Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory Completed 2021-2022	Appendix 1: Housing Trajectory Completed 2022-2023	Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory Completed 2022-2023																																																												
Blyth	10	2 complete 20/01327/tul	10																																																														
Carlton in Lindrick	181	1 complete 18/00697/tul	37	46	42 18/01148/tul 56 19/01137/res																																																												
Langold	23				23																																																												
Misterton	0	1 complete 21/01720/tul 1 complete 13/00133/res																																																															
Tuxford	86	2 complete 17/00254/cou	80	6																																																													
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>7</b>																																																															
300	189	42	1733																																																														
782	1007	110	1425																																																														
		12	1437																																																														

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response														
MM5.14g	MOD-NRF001  GPS Planning & Design Limited	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	<p>Column 2: Extant planning permissions on major sites as at 31 March 2023. Concur with 786 dwellings. Calculations are from Appendix 2: Annex 1 Table 1.4: Part A – Major Sites with full permission – under construction and Appendix 2: Annex 1 Table 1.5: Part A – Major Sites with full permission.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="683 528 1279 703"> <thead> <tr> <th>Settlement</th> <th>Extant planning permissions on major sites as at 31 March 2023</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Blyth</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carlton in Lindrick</td> <td>4+58+58+58+58+54 = 348</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Langold</td> <td>48+48+46+22+40+40+40+40+40+34 = 438</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tuxford</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>786</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Settlement	Extant planning permissions on major sites as at 31 March 2023	Blyth		Carlton in Lindrick	4+58+58+58+58+54 = 348	Langold	48+48+46+22+40+40+40+40+40+34 = 438	Misterton	0	Tuxford		<b>Total</b>	<b>786</b>		Noted.
Settlement	Extant planning permissions on major sites as at 31 March 2023																		
Blyth																			
Carlton in Lindrick	4+58+58+58+58+54 = 348																		
Langold	48+48+46+22+40+40+40+40+40+34 = 438																		
Misterton	0																		
Tuxford																			
<b>Total</b>	<b>786</b>																		
MM5.14g	MOD-NRF001  GPS Planning & Design Limited	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	<p>Column 3: Extant planning permissions on small sites as at 31 March 2023. Concur with 110 dwellings. Calculations are from Appendix 2: Annex 1 Table 1.1: Part A – Small Sites with full permission – under construction, Appendix 2: Annex 1 Table 1.2: Part A – Small Sites with full permission and Appendix 2: Annex 1 Table 1.3: Part A – Small Sites with outline permission.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="683 932 1294 1350"> <thead> <tr> <th>Settlement</th> <th>Extant planning permissions on small sites as at 31 March 2023</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Blyth</td> <td>19 total capacity in table 1.1 although 17 dwellings remaining to be completed 16 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 33 remaining</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carlton in Lindrick</td> <td>4 total capacity in table 1.1, although 2 dwellings remaining to be completed 19 from table 1.2 3 from table 1.3 <b>Total 24 remaining</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Langold</td> <td>6 from table 1.1 1 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 7</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>6 total capacity in table 1.1, although 4 dwellings remaining to be completed 29 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 33 remaining</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Settlement	Extant planning permissions on small sites as at 31 March 2023	Blyth	19 total capacity in table 1.1 although 17 dwellings remaining to be completed 16 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 33 remaining</b>	Carlton in Lindrick	4 total capacity in table 1.1, although 2 dwellings remaining to be completed 19 from table 1.2 3 from table 1.3 <b>Total 24 remaining</b>	Langold	6 from table 1.1 1 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 7</b>	Misterton	6 total capacity in table 1.1, although 4 dwellings remaining to be completed 29 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 33 remaining</b>		Noted.				
Settlement	Extant planning permissions on small sites as at 31 March 2023																		
Blyth	19 total capacity in table 1.1 although 17 dwellings remaining to be completed 16 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 33 remaining</b>																		
Carlton in Lindrick	4 total capacity in table 1.1, although 2 dwellings remaining to be completed 19 from table 1.2 3 from table 1.3 <b>Total 24 remaining</b>																		
Langold	6 from table 1.1 1 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 7</b>																		
Misterton	6 total capacity in table 1.1, although 4 dwellings remaining to be completed 29 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 33 remaining</b>																		

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response														
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Tuxford</td> <td>7 total capacity table 1.1, although 5 dwellings remaining to be completed 8 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 13 remaining</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>33+24+7+33+13 =110 dwellings</b></td> </tr> </table>	Tuxford	7 total capacity table 1.1, although 5 dwellings remaining to be completed 8 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 13 remaining</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>33+24+7+33+13 =110 dwellings</b>												
Tuxford	7 total capacity table 1.1, although 5 dwellings remaining to be completed 8 from table 1.2 0 from table 1.3 <b>Total 13 remaining</b>																		
<b>Total</b>	<b>33+24+7+33+13 =110 dwellings</b>																		
<b>MM5.14g</b>	MOD-NRF001 GPS Planning & Design Limited	Legally Compliant – no Soundness - no	<p>Column 4: Made neighbourhood Plans allocations without PP from 1 April 2020. Concur with 95 dwellings. Calculations are as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Settlement</td> <td>Made Neighbourhood Plans allocations without PP from 1 April 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blyth</td> <td>NP Policy 6 55 dwellings NP Policy 4 2 dwellings <b>Total 57</b> (taken from Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carlton in Lindrick</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Langold</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>Policy NP6 Land at White House Farm, Haxley Road, Misterton <b>38 dwellings</b> (reduced from 50 to reflect new evidence). Taken from Appendix 4: Site Allocations in Made Neighbourhood Plans</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tuxford</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>95 dwellings</b></td> </tr> </table>	Settlement	Made Neighbourhood Plans allocations without PP from 1 April 2020	Blyth	NP Policy 6 55 dwellings NP Policy 4 2 dwellings <b>Total 57</b> (taken from Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory)	Carlton in Lindrick	0	Langold	0	Misterton	Policy NP6 Land at White House Farm, Haxley Road, Misterton <b>38 dwellings</b> (reduced from 50 to reflect new evidence). Taken from Appendix 4: Site Allocations in Made Neighbourhood Plans	Tuxford	0	<b>Total</b>	<b>95 dwellings</b>		Noted.
Settlement	Made Neighbourhood Plans allocations without PP from 1 April 2020																		
Blyth	NP Policy 6 55 dwellings NP Policy 4 2 dwellings <b>Total 57</b> (taken from Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory)																		
Carlton in Lindrick	0																		
Langold	0																		
Misterton	Policy NP6 Land at White House Farm, Haxley Road, Misterton <b>38 dwellings</b> (reduced from 50 to reflect new evidence). Taken from Appendix 4: Site Allocations in Made Neighbourhood Plans																		
Tuxford	0																		
<b>Total</b>	<b>95 dwellings</b>																		
<b>MM5.14g</b>	MOD-NRF001 GPS Planning & Design Limited	Legally Compliant – no Soundness - no	Column 5: Local Plan Site Allocations. Concur with 75 dwellings at Land off Ollerton Road, Tuxford LP ref HS14 as per Appendix 2: Part B: Table 1.2 Sites allocated in the Bassetlaw Local Plan trajectory.		Noted.														
<b>MM5.14h</b>	MOD-REF006 Resident	Legally Compliant – no Soundness - no	A huge amount of development has already taken place in Worksop and is ongoing especially in the Gateford area. The plan should explain why a huge volume of additional housing in Worksop is required, and who they are targeted at i.e., who do they expect to buy these newly built properties. The amended proposal does not consider the 100's of existing houses that are currently on the market in Worksop. A lot of people who buy houses will look at existing properties and not just the new houses. The plan should include the approximate volume of available		It is considered that the approach taken to identifying the housing requirement for Worksop is robust, justified and consistent with national policy and is clearly set out in the Local Plan in the supporting text to Policy ST1.														

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			housing that is up for sale in Worksop to improve accuracy of the estimated housing requirement. and further reduce the proposed number of new build properties on the Peaks Hill site.		
MM5.14h	MOD-REF007 Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	A huge amount of development work has already taken place in Worksop and is ongoing especially in the Gateford area. The plan should explain why a huge volume of additional housing in Worksop is required, and who they are targeted at i.e., who do they expect to buy these newly built properties. The amended proposal does not consider the 100's of existing houses that are currently on the market in Worksop. A lot of people who buy houses will look at existing properties and not just the new houses. The plan should include the approximate volume of available housing that is up for sale in Worksop to improve accuracy of the estimated housing requirement. and further reduce the proposed number of new build properties on the Peaks Hill site.		It is considered that the approach taken to identifying the housing requirement for Worksop is robust, justified and consistent with national policy and is clearly set out in the Local Plan in the supporting text to Policy ST1.
MM5.14h	MOD-REF008 Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	A huge amount of development work has already taken place in Worksop and is ongoing especially in the Gateford area. The plan should explain why a huge volume of additional housing in Worksop is required, and who they are targeted at i.e., who do they expect to buy these newly built properties. The amended proposal does not consider the 100's of existing houses that are currently on the market in Worksop. A lot of people who buy houses will look at existing properties and not just the new houses. The plan should include the approximate volume of available housing that is up for sale in Worksop to improve accuracy of the estimated housing requirement. and further reduce the proposed number of new build properties on the Peaks Hill site.		It is considered that the approach taken to identifying the housing requirement for Worksop is robust, justified and consistent with national policy and is clearly set out in the Local Plan in the supporting text to Policy ST1.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM5.14h	MOD-REF009  Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	A huge amount of development work has already taken place in Worksop and is ongoing especially in the Gateford area. The plan should explain why a huge volume of additional housing in Worksop is required, and who they are targeted at i.e., who do they expect to buy these newly built properties. The amended proposal does not consider the 100's of existing houses that are currently on the market in Worksop. A lot of people who buy houses will look at existing properties and not just the new houses. The plan should include the approximate volume of available housing that is up for sale in Worksop to improve accuracy of the estimated housing requirement. and further reduce the proposed number of new build properties on the Peaks Hill site.		It is considered that the approach taken to identifying the housing requirement for Worksop is robust, justified and consistent with national policy and is clearly set out in the Local Plan in the supporting text to Policy ST1.
MM5.14h	MOD-REF016  Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	This challenges for completed housing in Worksop but does not contain the current mass building of houses on Gateford Road and also the newly advertised homes for development on Gateford road (Countryside and bellway homes) heading out of Worksop.	Need to be open and honest rather than concealing and hiding details. provide clarity on all developments that are on going and already approved and not hide figures and details	It is considered that the approach taken to identifying the housing requirement for Worksop is robust, justified and consistent and is clearly set out in the Local Plan in the supporting text to Policy ST1. Details of each major site that contributes to the Local Plan delivery, including those being built and those with planning permission are set out in Appendix 3 of the Plan.
MM5.14h	MOD-REF017  Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	Because Peak Hill Farm is currently worked and is productive land. Don't want any further urbanisation of good land as is happening in Carlton, Langold towards Oldcotes, plus there are many brownfield sites available that would be better used before agricultural land. Have not said why want to destroy good land for development over the repurposing of brownfield sites		There is insufficient suitable, deliverable brownfield land available in Worksop and the District to meet housing needs over the plan period so the Plan recognises that some greenfield land needs to be identified. This is evidenced in detail through the Land Availability Assessment and the Worksop Central Land Availability Assessment.



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM5.14h	MOD-REF017  Resident	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	There is not enough clarity on the amount of houses completed or under construction. Not giving the true amount of houses - need to be more open and honest		It is considered that the approach taken to identifying the housing requirement for Worksop is robust, justified and consistent and is clearly set out in the Local Plan in the supporting text to Policy ST1. Details of each major site that contributes to the Local Plan delivery, including those being built and those with planning permission are set out in Appendix 3 of the Plan.
MM5.16a	MOD-NRF001  GPS Planning & Design Limited	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	Welcome the clarification in Policy ST2 that 20% is a minimum growth requirement for each Large Rural Settlement. Note that the percentage growth figure in Figure 8 across all the LRSs is only 13.7% which is below the minimum 20% growth figure set out in Policy ST2. Further land needs to be allocated for housing as either/both part of the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Planning review process.		The two figures quoted are different. The 20% growth for Large Rural Settlements is based on the number of existing homes within the relevant settlement as of 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2020. The 13.7% is the proportion of overall District housing growth attributed to Large Rural Settlements.
MM5.16a	MOD-REF021  IBA Planning Limited	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Reference to a 20% minimum growth requirement (rather than a cap) is welcomed, but reference in the final sentence of paragraph 5.1.56 to “appropriate infill development” is vague and imprecise in the absence of a definition confirming what is meant by infill development. If unaltered will only lead to reliance on appeal decisions to provide an informed interpretation of what the policy means –this is considered to amount to an ineffective Plan which will delay the delivery of otherwise suitable housing development in suitable locations during the Plan period. The alternative wording better reflects that set out in Policy ST2 – and provides a clear direction to Policy ST2, providing the clarity and precision required in a Plan-led system (and provides clarity on the scale of development envisaged and aligns with the provisions of Policy ST2 as per the stated reason for the modification). Whilst the	Either a definition of “infill development” should be provided, or (as preferred) replaced with “development on unallocated sites within a development boundary or within the built form of a settlement (where there is no development boundary)”.	To provide clarity and ensure the effective implementation of Policy ST2 it is proposed that the change be accepted (bold underlined/strikethrough):  <u>Policy ST2 sets out the approach to be taken to appropriate infill development <b>development on unallocated sites within a development boundary or within the built form of a settlement (where there is no development boundary)</b> or should a Neighbourhood Plan wish to promote more growth than identified by Policy ST1.</u>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			reason for the modification refers to the need to provide clarity on the scale of developments, the reference in paragraph 5.1.59 emphasises the need for alternative wording to provide clarity on the scale of developments envisaged in the Large and Small Rural Settlements.		
MM5.17	MOD-REF021  IBA Planning Limited	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Whilst not MM5.17, paragraph 5.1.60 would benefit from incorporation of a reference to a designated development boundary being shown in a Neighbourhood Plan – acknowledging that in many instances, Neighbourhood Plans provide a settlement boundary in circumstances where the Policies Map does not. Without an additional reference, the paragraph lacks precision leading to concerns over the effectiveness of this part of the Plan.	In the last sentence: boundary (as shown on the Policies Map <b>or in a Neighbourhood Plan</b> ) or the built form of a settlement ...	No comment – This part of the Plan is not identified as a Main Modification so has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process.
<b>Policy ST2: Housing Growth in Rural Bassetlaw</b>					
MM5.21b	MOD-REF021  IBA Planning Limited	Legally Compliant - Yes  Soundness - No	New paragraph after 5.2.2 is proposed to provide clarity on the role of other rural settlements. It states that other settlements are considered to be in the countryside by Policy ST1 and Policy ST2 – and this refers to an earlier reference in the policy that all other settlements other than those identified as Large and Small Rural Settlements will be treated as falling within the countryside. This sentence could be improved by including the word “All” before “Other settlements” to provide the clarity sought by way of the modification. Might question which other settlements? – and such ambiguity can only raise concerns over the effectiveness of this part of the Plan.	Proposed new paragraph after paragraph 5.2.2 should be amended as follows: “All other settlements are considered to be in the countryside by Policy ST1 and Policy ST2”.	To provide clarity and ensure the effective implementation of Policy ST2 it is proposed that the change be accepted (bold underlined/strikethrough): <b><u>All</u></b> <del>Other</del> <u>settlements are considered to be in the countryside by Policy ST1 and Policy ST2.</u>
MM5.22c	MOD-NRF013  R Troop and Son	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	20% of 4 times that of 5% and the discrepancy is too large.	See previous consultation responses – this has been answered many times.	Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM5.27	MOD-REF021  IBA Planning Limited	Legally Compliant - Yes  Soundness - No	Development of “isolated homes” in the countryside in this context is not considered to reflect national planning policy. The paragraph/this part of the Policy confuses development in the countryside and the NPPF that provides the exceptional circumstances in which development of “isolated homes” can be granted. As discussed in the hearings, the need for a clear and workable countryside policy is essential given the District is predominantly rural – and the absence of specific national planning advice dealing with proposals in the countryside other than for circumstances where the development of isolated homes can be exceptionally granted via paragraph 80 of the NPPF. It was clear that the Council did envisage a policy that provided such clarity – setting out those forms of development considered appropriate within the countryside. The Council acknowledged the distinction between general countryside policy and the development of isolated homes. The Plan as modified confirms that ‘countryside’ comprises all land beyond the development boundary, or the built form of a settlement where there is no development boundary, and all other settlements not identified as Large or Small Rural Settlements – and this would necessarily include sites immediately adjoining development boundaries which would not be considered isolated when applying paragraph 80 of the NPPF or its local Development Plan equivalent (where the exceptional circumstances referred to in paragraph 80 ought not be necessary). Part 3 of Policy ST2 should provide the framework within which proposals for housing development within the general countryside will be considered. If the Council wishes to further set out the exceptional circumstances where the development of isolated homes in the countryside may be	Part 3 of Policy ST2 should provide the framework within which proposals for housing development within the general countryside will be considered. The exceptional circumstances where the development of isolated homes in the countryside may be appropriate, should be a separate sentence/arm of Part 3 – or via a new Part 4 to mark the distinction between general countryside and isolated locations. An alternative approach would be for reference to be made within Part 3 to proposals for the development of isolated homes in the countryside to be assessed against national planning policy: “In addition, Part 3 of Policy ST2 provides the	It is considered that MM5.27 appropriately clarifies the approach to be taken to housing development in the countryside. It was acknowledged at the hearings that there was some overlap between Part 2 and Part 3 of Policy ST2; the proposed changes were discussed as providing a clearer framework for housing within settlements and for housing within the countryside to be considered, without unnecessarily duplicating national policy.


MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>appropriate, this should either be as a separate sentence/arm of Part 3 – or a new Part 4 of Policy ST2 to clearly mark the distinction between general countryside and isolated locations. The paragraph seeks to provide clarification as to what constitutes ‘countryside’ by the inclusion of “outside of settlements” within the brackets – elsewhere in the policy countryside includes all other settlements not identified as Large or Small Rural Settlements. This needs to be amended to provide a consistent approach throughout the policy to ensure this part of the Plan is effective.</p>	<p>framework within which proposals for housing development within the countryside (outside of a development boundary, or the built form of a settlement where there is no development boundary, or within all other villages not identified as Large or Small Rural Settlements) will be considered. This includes for rural workers’ accommodation, the extension or replacement of existing dwellings, the re-use of rural buildings, the redevelopment of previously-developed land, entry level exceptions homes and rural exception sites, as well as other uses consistent with national policy and this Local Plan.”</p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				Insert new paragraph after paragraph 5.2.13: “The development of isolated homes in the countryside will be strictly controlled and proposals for such will be assessed against the exceptional circumstances set out in national policy.”	
<b>MM5.29a</b>	MOD-REF001  Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	Legally Compliant – no  Soundness - no	Styrrup with Oldcotes was designated as a no growth area so cannot contribute to housing growth.	the figure of 15 should actually be 0	Styrrup with Oldcotes is classified as a Small Rural Settlement and therefore 5% growth applies in accordance with the provisions of Policy ST2.
<b>MM5.29a</b>	MOD-NRF001  GPS Planning & Design Limited	Not stated	Sets out increased 20% ‘minimum’ growth requirements across the LRSs, which is welcomed.		Noted.
<b>MM5.29a</b>	MOD-NRF001  GPS Planning & Design Limited	Not stated	In relation to Misterton the growth requirement figure has been increased marginally to 196 dwellings. At the start of March 2023 at the request of the Inspectors, BDC published BDC-48 and BDC-48a. An action within BDC-48 was to clarify where the 175 dwellings cited in earlier papers came from and how the figures in the Trajectory added up in relation to Misterton, as a number of discrepancies had been identified. Paragraph 3.7 acknowledge Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should align as they evolve and are reviewed. Paragraph 3.9 provides an explanation as to where the 175 dwellings	In light of the above and the latest growth requirement figure of 196 dwellings for Misterton, this would leave an outstanding minimum requirement of 42 dwellings. Given that a greater minimum quantum of new housing is still	The basis of the 175 dwellings for Misterton is set out within BDC-48. The Housing Background Paper sets out the Housing Trajectory as of 31 March 2023. It is acknowledged that there is an inaccuracy for site allocation NP10, the overall dwelling number should be 48 dwellings not 38. The content of the Rural Monitoring Framework is a tool used to inform communities and developers about the housing number position in each

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response																																																																								
			<p>came from. There appears to be no discrepancy in the identified number for site NP02 throughout BDC-01 and its appendices. ST2 indicates that the 20% figure for Misterton is 194 dwellings. The figure of 175 (within Appendix 1 table 1) appears to have come from deducting 12 units as proposed at site NP02 (in the made NP) rather than the 4 units they have permission for. It was confirmed in BDC-48 that there is an outstanding minimum requirement of 20 dwellings at Misterton, given the reduced number of dwellings coming forward across the Neighbourhood Plan allocated sites that have occurred as they have come to fruition.</p> <p>APPENDIX 1: Rural area: housing monitoring as at 31 January 2023</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="689 715 1196 831"> <thead> <tr> <th>Settlement</th> <th>Requirement Figure</th> <th>Number of Units</th> <th>Which NP and its status</th> <th>No of dwellings completed since 2023 "start" date</th> <th>No of dwellings with outstanding PP</th> <th>No of dwellings allocated in a made NP/PP without PP</th> <th>Outstanding requirement</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>20%</td> <td>194</td> <td>Misterton Made NP (Review 2 underway)</td> <td></td> <td>41</td> <td>175</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Housing Background Paper (MOD-008) (dated August 2023) shows the outstanding requirement at Misterton to be significantly lacking showing a requirement of 124 dwellings in the extract of Appendix 1 below:</p> <p>APPENDIX 1: Rural area: housing monitoring as at 31 March 2023</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="689 991 1227 1107"> <thead> <tr> <th>Settlement</th> <th>Requirement Figure</th> <th>Number of Units</th> <th>NP and status</th> <th>No of dwellings completed since 1 April 2020</th> <th>No of dwellings with extant PP</th> <th>No of dwellings allocated in made NP/PP without PP</th> <th>Outstanding requirement</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>20%</td> <td>195</td> <td>Misterton Made NP (Review 0 underway)</td> <td></td> <td>33</td> <td>33</td> <td>124</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It is believed that the 33 dwellings with extant PP comprise the following:</p> <p>Appendix 2: Annex 1 Table 3.3: Part A – Small Sites with full permission – under construction</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="680 1203 1223 1350"> <thead> <tr> <th>Settlement</th> <th>Site Name</th> <th>Street/Flood Name</th> <th>Area (ha)</th> <th>Application Number</th> <th>Superseded Application</th> <th>Date Granted</th> <th>Total Net Dwellings</th> <th>Total Dwellings Remaining</th> <th>Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>30</td> <td>Grigley Road</td> <td>0.47</td> <td>2101720/FUL</td> <td>3390/0006</td> <td>24/04/2006</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>Permission for 1 dwelling completed; 2 under construction as at 31/03/23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>11</td> <td>Grigley Road</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>1301133P/RES</td> <td>30160047 &amp; 300610061</td> <td>24/05/2019</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>Permission for 1 dwelling under construction as at 31/03/23. Permission for 1 dwelling under construction as at 31/12/2022. No further development later than since June 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Misterton</td> <td>Flux 1 Marsh Close</td> <td>Blackwith Road</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>1901000/RES</td> <td>1703300/OAIT</td> <td>20/07/2020</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Settlement	Requirement Figure	Number of Units	Which NP and its status	No of dwellings completed since 2023 "start" date	No of dwellings with outstanding PP	No of dwellings allocated in a made NP/PP without PP	Outstanding requirement	Misterton	20%	194	Misterton Made NP (Review 2 underway)		41	175	20	Settlement	Requirement Figure	Number of Units	NP and status	No of dwellings completed since 1 April 2020	No of dwellings with extant PP	No of dwellings allocated in made NP/PP without PP	Outstanding requirement	Misterton	20%	195	Misterton Made NP (Review 0 underway)		33	33	124	Settlement	Site Name	Street/Flood Name	Area (ha)	Application Number	Superseded Application	Date Granted	Total Net Dwellings	Total Dwellings Remaining	Comments	Misterton	30	Grigley Road	0.47	2101720/FUL	3390/0006	24/04/2006	3	2	Permission for 1 dwelling completed; 2 under construction as at 31/03/23	Misterton	11	Grigley Road	0.07	1301133P/RES	30160047 & 300610061	24/05/2019	2	1	Permission for 1 dwelling under construction as at 31/03/23. Permission for 1 dwelling under construction as at 31/12/2022. No further development later than since June 2021	Misterton	Flux 1 Marsh Close	Blackwith Road	0.1	1901000/RES	1703300/OAIT	20/07/2020	1	1		<p>required at Misterton above the maximum numbers stipulated in the Neighbourhood Plan Allocations, further land needs to be allocated for housing at Misterton to meet the expected minimum housing delivery rates envisaged by the Plan. As the development boundary around Misterton has been tightly drawn it leaves little or no opportunities for infill development, further land on the edge of the settlement needs to be allocated to achieve the minimum outstanding requirement of 42 dwellings which our clients land fronting Grovewood Road could accommodate</p>	<p>settlement/parish. The content of the monitoring framework is not before the Inspectors. Its content will be updated appropriately in due course.</p> <p>The Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Review is at Regulation 16 stage. The NP is allocating land for 151 dwellings, two sites have planning permission. The housing requirement in the Local Plan is 196, but it is considered the difference of 45 dwellings can be addressed through other NP policies (1R and 2R) relating to general development and infill development. In the submission NP review, the following sites are allocated:          NP01 = 38 dwellings          NP02 = 4 dwellings (has planning permission)          NP06 = 17 dwellings          NP11 = 44 dwellings          NP12 = 49 dwellings (has planning permission for 48 dwellings, housebuilder attached)*          *full planning permission granted since 31 March 2023</p> <p>As such, a change is proposed to MM13.16: <b>48</b> instead of <b>38</b>..This results in consequential changes proposed for MM5.12c, MM5.12d, MM5.14g, MM5.14k, MM5.14l, MM5.20d, MM5.22a and MM13.2 monitoring framework targets for</p>
Settlement	Requirement Figure	Number of Units	Which NP and its status	No of dwellings completed since 2023 "start" date	No of dwellings with outstanding PP	No of dwellings allocated in a made NP/PP without PP	Outstanding requirement																																																																						
Misterton	20%	194	Misterton Made NP (Review 2 underway)		41	175	20																																																																						
Settlement	Requirement Figure	Number of Units	NP and status	No of dwellings completed since 1 April 2020	No of dwellings with extant PP	No of dwellings allocated in made NP/PP without PP	Outstanding requirement																																																																						
Misterton	20%	195	Misterton Made NP (Review 0 underway)		33	33	124																																																																						
Settlement	Site Name	Street/Flood Name	Area (ha)	Application Number	Superseded Application	Date Granted	Total Net Dwellings	Total Dwellings Remaining	Comments																																																																				
Misterton	30	Grigley Road	0.47	2101720/FUL	3390/0006	24/04/2006	3	2	Permission for 1 dwelling completed; 2 under construction as at 31/03/23																																																																				
Misterton	11	Grigley Road	0.07	1301133P/RES	30160047 & 300610061	24/05/2019	2	1	Permission for 1 dwelling under construction as at 31/03/23. Permission for 1 dwelling under construction as at 31/12/2022. No further development later than since June 2021																																																																				
Misterton	Flux 1 Marsh Close	Blackwith Road	0.1	1901000/RES	1703300/OAIT	20/07/2020	1	1																																																																					

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response																																																																																																																																																																																																
			<p>Total 6 dwellings less 2 completed dwellings leaves 4 dwellings</p> <p>Appendix 2: Annex 1 <b>Table 1.2</b>, Part A – Small Sites with full permission</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="678 424 1227 596"> <thead> <tr> <th>Settlement</th> <th>Name/number</th> <th>Street/Road Name</th> <th>Area (Ha)</th> <th>Application Number</th> <th>Superseded application</th> <th>Date granted</th> <th>Total Net Dwelling</th> <th>Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>Plot 2 Marsh Close</td><td>Stoneworth Road</td><td>0.07</td><td>1501933MRE3</td><td>17/01399CJKT</td><td>28/07/2023</td><td>1</td><td>Previous use is garden land.</td></tr> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>Mil House</td><td>Stoneworth Road</td><td>0.13</td><td>2051186PFJL</td><td></td><td>30/07/2021</td><td>2</td><td>Permission is extant VGC pending start of</td></tr> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>West of 6</td><td>Deans Close</td><td>0.5</td><td>2051478PFJL</td><td></td><td>21/10/2021</td><td>0</td><td>Permission extant. Discharge of conditions accepted Jan 22</td></tr> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>7</td><td>Gillingey Road</td><td>0.14</td><td>2100394PFJL</td><td></td><td>03/06/2021</td><td>1</td><td>Previous use is agricultural building.</td></tr> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>2</td><td>Wharf Road</td><td>0.02</td><td>2100444CJOU</td><td></td><td>14/10/2021</td><td>1</td><td>Permission is extant. Discharge of conditions accepted Dec 22.</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="678 611 1227 691"> <tbody> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>Land off 9</td><td>Ashdown Way</td><td>0.49</td><td>2200466PFJL</td><td></td><td>06/09/2022</td><td>0</td><td>NEW PERMISSION - Neighbourhood Plan Allocation</td></tr> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>Former Langthorne Cottage</td><td>Thistle Bank Road</td><td>0.10</td><td>2200367PFJL</td><td></td><td>20/06/2022</td><td>0</td><td>Redevelopment dwelling.</td></tr> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>West of The Old Barn</td><td>Church Street</td><td>0.24</td><td>2200786MRE3</td><td>19/00799CJKT</td><td>01/11/2022</td><td>4</td><td>Moved from Outline PP to Rev PP</td></tr> <tr><td>Misterton</td><td>The Thorns, 61</td><td>Cleewood Road</td><td>0.23</td><td>2201070PFJL</td><td></td><td>16/11/2022</td><td>2</td><td>NEW PERMISSION</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Total 29 dwellings Overall Total 33 dwellings</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="678 775 1238 922"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site Name</th> <th colspan="5">Land off Fox Covert Lane, Misterton</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Local Plan Ref</td><td colspan="5">NP12</td></tr> <tr><td>Site Area (ha)</td><td colspan="5">1.9 ha</td></tr> <tr><td>Total Capacity</td><td colspan="5">38</td></tr> <tr><td>Plan period completions</td><td colspan="5">38</td></tr> <tr><td>Five Year completions</td><td colspan="5">38</td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2023/24</td> <td>2024/25</td> <td>2025/26</td> <td>2026/27</td> <td>2027/28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Completions</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>20</td> <td>8</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Developer's delivery intentions including anticipated start and build out rates</b> A planning application (21/01811/FUL) has been approved subject to S106 agreement, with a housebuilder (Gleeson Homes) attached. The housebuilder indicates delivery is achievable within the five year period.</p> <p><b>Current planning status and progress towards the submission of an application</b> Site is an allocation in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan. A planning application (21/01811/FUL) has been approved subject to S106 agreement, with a housebuilder (Gleeson Homes) attached.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="678 1026 1238 1201"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site Name</th> <th colspan="5">Land off Fox Covert Lane, Misterton</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td colspan="6"><b>Progress with site assessment work</b></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="6">Site assessment work for the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan review is complete. Gleeson Homes have undertaken technical work to inform a planning application.</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="6"><b>Site viability</b></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="6">Planning application shows that to achieve affordable housing with CIL will cause viability issues. To be considered as part of the application process.</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="6"><b>Availability: ownership, any existing uses, etc</b></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="6">Site is in private ownership, with a housebuilder attached. Submission of a full planning application by a housebuilder shows clear progress.</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="6"><b>Infrastructure provision</b></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="6">None required.</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Other allocations in the made Neighbourhood Plan are as follows:</p>	Settlement	Name/number	Street/Road Name	Area (Ha)	Application Number	Superseded application	Date granted	Total Net Dwelling	Comments	Misterton	Plot 2 Marsh Close	Stoneworth Road	0.07	1501933MRE3	17/01399CJKT	28/07/2023	1	Previous use is garden land.	Misterton	Mil House	Stoneworth Road	0.13	2051186PFJL		30/07/2021	2	Permission is extant VGC pending start of	Misterton	West of 6	Deans Close	0.5	2051478PFJL		21/10/2021	0	Permission extant. Discharge of conditions accepted Jan 22	Misterton	7	Gillingey Road	0.14	2100394PFJL		03/06/2021	1	Previous use is agricultural building.	Misterton	2	Wharf Road	0.02	2100444CJOU		14/10/2021	1	Permission is extant. Discharge of conditions accepted Dec 22.	Misterton	Land off 9	Ashdown Way	0.49	2200466PFJL		06/09/2022	0	NEW PERMISSION - Neighbourhood Plan Allocation	Misterton	Former Langthorne Cottage	Thistle Bank Road	0.10	2200367PFJL		20/06/2022	0	Redevelopment dwelling.	Misterton	West of The Old Barn	Church Street	0.24	2200786MRE3	19/00799CJKT	01/11/2022	4	Moved from Outline PP to Rev PP	Misterton	The Thorns, 61	Cleewood Road	0.23	2201070PFJL		16/11/2022	2	NEW PERMISSION	Site Name	Land off Fox Covert Lane, Misterton					Local Plan Ref	NP12					Site Area (ha)	1.9 ha					Total Capacity	38					Plan period completions	38					Five Year completions	38						2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	Completions		10	20	8		Site Name	Land off Fox Covert Lane, Misterton					<b>Progress with site assessment work</b>						Site assessment work for the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan review is complete. Gleeson Homes have undertaken technical work to inform a planning application.						<b>Site viability</b>						Planning application shows that to achieve affordable housing with CIL will cause viability issues. To be considered as part of the application process.						<b>Availability: ownership, any existing uses, etc</b>						Site is in private ownership, with a housebuilder attached. Submission of a full planning application by a housebuilder shows clear progress.						<b>Infrastructure provision</b>						None required.							ST1 and ST2. A separate schedule is attached as Appendix 2.
Settlement	Name/number	Street/Road Name	Area (Ha)	Application Number	Superseded application	Date granted	Total Net Dwelling	Comments																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	Plot 2 Marsh Close	Stoneworth Road	0.07	1501933MRE3	17/01399CJKT	28/07/2023	1	Previous use is garden land.																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	Mil House	Stoneworth Road	0.13	2051186PFJL		30/07/2021	2	Permission is extant VGC pending start of																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	West of 6	Deans Close	0.5	2051478PFJL		21/10/2021	0	Permission extant. Discharge of conditions accepted Jan 22																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	7	Gillingey Road	0.14	2100394PFJL		03/06/2021	1	Previous use is agricultural building.																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	2	Wharf Road	0.02	2100444CJOU		14/10/2021	1	Permission is extant. Discharge of conditions accepted Dec 22.																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	Land off 9	Ashdown Way	0.49	2200466PFJL		06/09/2022	0	NEW PERMISSION - Neighbourhood Plan Allocation																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	Former Langthorne Cottage	Thistle Bank Road	0.10	2200367PFJL		20/06/2022	0	Redevelopment dwelling.																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	West of The Old Barn	Church Street	0.24	2200786MRE3	19/00799CJKT	01/11/2022	4	Moved from Outline PP to Rev PP																																																																																																																																																																																													
Misterton	The Thorns, 61	Cleewood Road	0.23	2201070PFJL		16/11/2022	2	NEW PERMISSION																																																																																																																																																																																													
Site Name	Land off Fox Covert Lane, Misterton																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Local Plan Ref	NP12																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Site Area (ha)	1.9 ha																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Total Capacity	38																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Plan period completions	38																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Five Year completions	38																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28																																																																																																																																																																																																
Completions		10	20	8																																																																																																																																																																																																	
Site Name	Land off Fox Covert Lane, Misterton																																																																																																																																																																																																				
<b>Progress with site assessment work</b>																																																																																																																																																																																																					
Site assessment work for the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan review is complete. Gleeson Homes have undertaken technical work to inform a planning application.																																																																																																																																																																																																					
<b>Site viability</b>																																																																																																																																																																																																					
Planning application shows that to achieve affordable housing with CIL will cause viability issues. To be considered as part of the application process.																																																																																																																																																																																																					
<b>Availability: ownership, any existing uses, etc</b>																																																																																																																																																																																																					
Site is in private ownership, with a housebuilder attached. Submission of a full planning application by a housebuilder shows clear progress.																																																																																																																																																																																																					
<b>Infrastructure provision</b>																																																																																																																																																																																																					
None required.																																																																																																																																																																																																					



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response																																			
			<p>Appendix 4 – Site Allocations in Made Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plans: Site Allocations in Made NPs Updated: 31-03-23</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ward</th> <th>Policy</th> <th>Location / Description</th> <th>Permission</th> <th>Status / Updates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Melton</td> <td>Policy 6 (12R) / NP01</td> <td>Land at White House Farm, Heavy Road, Melton</td> <td>No</td> <td>Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage). Capacity reduced from 50 to 38 to reflect new evidence.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Melton</td> <td>Policy 7 (13R) / NP02</td> <td>Land at Town End Farm, Church Street, Melton</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>4 dwellings granted (19/0795/OUT and 22/01786/RES). Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">86</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plans: Site Allocations in Made NPs Updated: 31-03-23</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>NP</th> <th>Site / Policy</th> <th>Location / Description</th> <th>Permission</th> <th>Status / Updates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Melton</td> <td>Policy 8 (14R) / NP06</td> <td>Land south of Meadow Drive</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>9 dwellings granted (22/00456/FL). Under construction. Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Melton</td> <td>Policy 9 (15R) / NP11</td> <td>Land east of Orange Walk</td> <td>No</td> <td>Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage). Capacity reduced from 60 to 44 to reflect new evidence.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Melton</td> <td>Policy 10 (16R) / NP12</td> <td>Land north of Fox Covert Lane</td> <td>No</td> <td>48 dwellings approved subject to S106 agreement (24/01811/FL). Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Set out below is our commentary on each of the allocated sites listed above:</p> <p><b>Policy 6 (12R) NP01</b> - It is noted that the allocation capacity from this site has been reduced from 50 to 38 dwellings to reflect new evidence. <b>Therefore allocation for 38 dwellings.</b></p> <p><b>Policy 7 (13R) NP02</b>- Officer report for application 19/00795/OUT states:  <i>'When originally submitted the planning application was in outline form with all matters reserved for the erection of up to 9 dwellings. Concerns were expressed by the district conservation officer that insufficient information has been provided to allow the LPA to fully assess the impact that up to 9 dwellings would have on the setting of nearby heritage assets, especially the adjacent Listed Building. ... In light of these comments the applicants agent has amended the application reducing the number of dwellings to 4 and submitted details of the scale and layout of the proposal.'</i></p> <p>In light of the above heritage concerns, it is therefore highly questionable as to whether the remaining quantum of dwellings expected to be delivered from this allocated site (a further 8 dwellings to deliver the expected total of 12 dwellings) is achievable.</p> <p><b>Policy 8 (14R) NP06:</b> extract of approved SLP below:</p>  <p>Based on the above layout there appears to be no capacity for any further dwellings upon the allocated site. <b>Deficiency of 8 units as the allocation was for 12 dwellings.</b></p> <p><b>Policy 9 (15R) NP11:</b> It is noted that the capacity from this allocated site has been reduced from 60 to 44 dwellings to reflect new evidence. There is therefore a allocation deficiency of 16 units. <b>Therefore allocation is for 44 dwellings, which is 16 less than original allocation.</b></p> <p><b>Policy 10 (16R) NP12:</b> 48 dwellings approved subject to signing of S106.</p>	Ward	Policy	Location / Description	Permission	Status / Updates	Melton	Policy 6 (12R) / NP01	Land at White House Farm, Heavy Road, Melton	No	Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage). Capacity reduced from 50 to 38 to reflect new evidence.	Melton	Policy 7 (13R) / NP02	Land at Town End Farm, Church Street, Melton	Yes	4 dwellings granted (19/0795/OUT and 22/01786/RES). Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).	NP	Site / Policy	Location / Description	Permission	Status / Updates	Melton	Policy 8 (14R) / NP06	Land south of Meadow Drive	Yes	9 dwellings granted (22/00456/FL). Under construction. Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).	Melton	Policy 9 (15R) / NP11	Land east of Orange Walk	No	Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage). Capacity reduced from 60 to 44 to reflect new evidence.	Melton	Policy 10 (16R) / NP12	Land north of Fox Covert Lane	No	48 dwellings approved subject to S106 agreement (24/01811/FL). Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).		
Ward	Policy	Location / Description	Permission	Status / Updates																																				
Melton	Policy 6 (12R) / NP01	Land at White House Farm, Heavy Road, Melton	No	Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage). Capacity reduced from 50 to 38 to reflect new evidence.																																				
Melton	Policy 7 (13R) / NP02	Land at Town End Farm, Church Street, Melton	Yes	4 dwellings granted (19/0795/OUT and 22/01786/RES). Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).																																				
NP	Site / Policy	Location / Description	Permission	Status / Updates																																				
Melton	Policy 8 (14R) / NP06	Land south of Meadow Drive	Yes	9 dwellings granted (22/00456/FL). Under construction. Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).																																				
Melton	Policy 9 (15R) / NP11	Land east of Orange Walk	No	Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage). Capacity reduced from 60 to 44 to reflect new evidence.																																				
Melton	Policy 10 (16R) / NP12	Land north of Fox Covert Lane	No	48 dwellings approved subject to S106 agreement (24/01811/FL). Proposed for re-allocation in the NP Review (currently at Reg 14 stage).																																				

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>38 dwellings in Annex 1 Rural area housing monitoring table under heading 'allocated in a made NP/LP without PP' relates to Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP6 Land at White House Farm, Haxley Road, Misterton which is for 38 dwellings (reduced from 50 to reflect new evidence). Site NP12 note there is a resolution to grant planning permission ref 21/01811/FUL subject to signing s106. The permission is for 48 dwellings rather than 38 dwellings. In light of the latest evidence above the figure in Annex 1 under heading 'allocated in a made NP/LP without PP' should be 82 dwellings. Based on 38 dwellings from NP01 and 44 dwellings from NP11. Site Assessment and Concept Indicative Layout Plan attached to representation. Maintain our objection and continue to question the accuracy of the figures cited as well as the Growth Requirement rates for the LRCs, in particular Misterton, under Policy ST2. The housing trajectory appendix is inaccurate, and the plan should be found unsound.</p>		
<b>MM5.29a and d</b>	MOD-REF011 Resident	Legally Compliant – Yes  Sound - No	<p>Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has looked for the support of the community. The plan reflects the ideas of the community in terms of how many and what type of houses should be built where and areas where houses should not be built. As such, have managed to produce a plan which has wide support in the community, as demonstrated at the Referendum, with its objective to meet the housing requirement developed by the Council. This is seen as Lound's contribution to the national housing shortage. Having once met the local requirement for the houses that are needed, and not in usurping the role of the Planning Authority, strongly believe, in the spirit of Localism, that the local community with their local knowledge should be trusted to decide on issues of further</p>	In favour of the original wording.	The Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010 requested clarity around the figures within Policy ST2. Proposed MM5.29a looks to provide clarity about the housing requirement and the settlements affected and to be consistent with national planning policy.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			growth, using a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, as set out in the original wording of Part 3 of Policy ST2.		
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness – No	Note the likelihood of additional need for housing in the lifetime of the Plan, which is not unexceptional. The 20% growth for Tuxford is 252; at least 90 of these have been delivered. There is sufficient scope within Tuxford to expand this, if there is community support and if there are benefits to Tuxford. This must be done within the sites which will be allocated in the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan		Noted. The Council is committed to continue to support the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Group so that the community are able to progress a Neighbourhood Plan review, to include site allocations should they wish.
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness – No	Support the economic-led housing model; the ensuing requirement for 252 dwellings in Tuxford is supported; and note the change in the LPMM from this being a hard number to a minimum and support that. Draw attention to the major issue below. There are sufficient sites within the current LAA which are considered suitable for development that the Town Council could aim to support growth beyond 252. May be necessary as don't consider the potential supply issue for housing within the Worksof/Retford sub-area has been evaluated properly. As Tuxford goes into the Neighbourhood Plan process, commit to providing the required number of sites, agreed with the community, and sustainable in nature, provided they are build according to the Design Codes Document which has just been approved. Must re-evaluate the draft Plan to confirm (or otherwise) whether sufficient deliverable and developable sites remain to meet the Plan's goals. Committed to bringing at least the balance of the 252 dwellings under our next Neighbourhood Plan. Happy to see Ollerton Road as part of this, given a new S106 agreement that brings the same level of funding to Tuxford but links funding to provision of necessary infrastructure in Tuxford. Happy to commit to supporting a smaller development on that site (<50 houses) provided		The Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010 states that 'Taking into account changes to both the housing requirement and housing supply we are satisfied that the Plan would provide an appropriate level of housing and that it will not be necessary to make changes to the site allocations.' As such it is considered that the site allocations are not identified as a Main Modification and have already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process. Provision of schools and their expansion is a matter for the County Council as Local Education Authority not by the District Council. The Council supports the ambitions of the Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Group in progressing a Neighbourhood Plan review with site allocations.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			the CIL funds that go to Bassetlaw are used to support school expansion as required. In any case we will need to bring other sites forward. Our next NP will be positively prepared and will include a call for sites. The Inspector may well feel that the above means that the overall Plan is sound, without HS14 as an identified Policy site.		
<b>MM5.29a</b>	MOD-REF022  P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estates	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Very disappointed that have not taken into consideration the addition of a further settlement category between large and rural settlements. Have consistently argued that in the absence of an additional category for ‘medium rural settlements’, the settlement hierarchy is fundamentally flawed and is not sound. Support the amended wording to Policy ST2, which now explicitly recognises the housing targets apportioned to large and small settlements to be a minimum. The policy is now more positively worded that better reflects the intention of the NPPF. Welcome the removal of the growth caps, but it is not considered that the policy as a whole is sound, in the absence of the addition of a ‘medium rural settlement’ tier to the settlement hierarchy.		No comment - This issue is not identified as a Main Modification so has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process.
<b>MM5.29b</b>	MOD-REF021  IBA Planning Limited	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness – No	Part 2 of Policy ST2 has been amended to omit the first two criteria of the originally worded policy. Modification is welcomed and aligns with the discussions held in the hearings. The residual criteria (as modified) are also supported – and all considered to be sound. The criteria need to be re-numbered/formatted following the omission of the original criteria a) and b) for clarity.	The criteria to Part 2 of Policy ST2 need to be re-numbered/formatted following the omission of the original criteria a) and b) for clarity. Suggest inserting the word “and” after the penultimate criterion for good order.	Changes to numbering and formatting will be addressed by the Council on adoption as Additional Modifications to the Plan.
<b>MM5.29b</b>	MOD-NRF012	Not stated	Clause c the policy would benefit from being positively worded to seek opportunities to protect and enhance the		It is considered that MM5.29b provides a positive framework and an effective

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Historic England		existing character and local distinctiveness of settlements, rather than a clause which states not significantly harm.		approach to manage new development within rural settlements.
<b>MM5.29c</b>	MOD-REF021  IBA Planning Limited	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness – No	Part 3 provides the framework within which development in the countryside will be considered appropriate. Confirms elsewhere that the countryside comprises land outside of the development boundary of a settlement, or outside the existing built form of a settlement where there is no development boundary. It confirms that countryside applies to all other settlements not identified as Large or Small Rural Settlements. Part 3 as drafted omits reference to those other settlements not identified as Large or Small Rural; Settlements – and this should be amended for completeness and consistency, and to ensure that this part of the Plan is effective. A better approach would be to refer to proposals for residential development in the countryside (as the countryside is defined elsewhere). Criteria a) to d) set out what types of development are considered appropriate within the countryside. The current approach to development within the countryside confuses general countryside with isolated locations referred to in paragraph 80 of the NPPF – the two are clearly distinct and materially different. As worded, the development types appear to be restricted to those in the NPPF. However, there will be many instances (given the definition of ‘countryside’) where the countryside location will not be isolated – and the types of development considered appropriate should not necessarily be the same as those exceptionally permitted via paragraph 80. Whilst criterion b) allows for the replacement of an existing dwelling, consider this should be amended to include the extension of an existing dwelling – otherwise the policy is more restrictive than national Green Belt policy (which allows both). Whilst criterion c) allows for the re-use of a rural building, the	Suggested amendments are below: “3. Proposals for residential development <b>in the countryside</b> will be supported where it is consistent with Part 2 (a-f) above and where they: a) are supported within a made neighbourhood plan (including a review); or b) <b>provide for the essential need for a rural worker; or</b> c) <b>provide for the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; or</b> d) <b>provide for the extension to or replacement of an existing dwelling. Extensions should respect the scale and character of the original dwelling. Replacement</b>	Policy ST2 was discussed in detail during the Hearings. It was agreed that submitted Part 3 included reference to exception sites and rural workers dwellings for example, but because these are covered by other policies within the Local Plan it was unnecessary duplication and Part 3d) would appropriately address such matters. It was also considered that infill development should be more appropriately addressed by Part 2. A new Part 4 is not considered necessary as it duplicates national policy. However, for clarity and to ensure the effective implementation of the policy a change is proposed to Part 3b): <u>provide for the replacement of <b>or extension to an existing dwelling; in this case the replacement dwelling should be of a similar size and scale to the original dwelling and be located on the footprint of the original dwelling unless an alternative position within the existing residential curtilage would have no adverse impact on the wider setting, and an extension is in keeping with the design of the existing dwelling and would not result in an extended dwelling disproportionate in size and scale to the original</b> ; or</u>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>provisos listed are taken from paragraph 80 of the NPPF which deals with the exceptional circumstances in which the development of isolated homes can be approved. The re-use of a barn within one of those villages not identified as a Large or Small Rural Settlement, or immediately adjoining the development boundary/fabric of a Large or Small Rural Settlement, need not be considered isolated for the purposes of the NPPF – and as such need not be subject to the same strict provisos. Part 3 as drafted omits reference to limited infilling in villages, the redevelopment of previously developed land and rural exception sites (both forms of development permitted in the Green Belt) and entry level exception homes – and is considered inconsistent with national policy. It is not considered that Part 4 as presently drafted needs amending, other than for it to be re-numbered as ‘Part 5’ – if the insertion of new Part 4 is accepted.</p>	<p><b> dwellings should be of a similar size and scale to the original dwelling and be located on the footprint of the original dwelling unless an alternative position within the existing residential curtilage would have no adverse impact on the wider setting; or</b>  <b> e) provide for the limited infilling in villages; or</b>  <b> f) provide for the re-use of rural buildings provided they are of permanent and substantial construction and capable of conversion without significant re-build and that any extension or alteration would not adversely affect the form, scale, massing</b></p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>or proportion of the building; or  g) provide for the limited infilling, or the partial or complete redevelopment, of previously-developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the countryside than the existing development; or  h) provide for rural exception sites required to meet an identified affordable housing need within the District, including entry level exception homes adjacent to the development boundary; or  i) are consistent with other policies in this Plan.”</p>	



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				Suggested new Part 4: “The development of isolated new homes in the countryside will be assessed against national policy.”	
<b>Policy ST6: Cottam Priority Regeneration Area</b>					
<b>MM5.34e</b>	MOD-NRF012 Historic England	Not stated	Support the reference to archaeological mitigation now included		Noted.
<b>MM5.34i</b>	MOD-NRF005 Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of EDF	Not stated	This follows previous representations submitted through the Local Plan and EDF’s participation at the Hearings on 30 November 2022, which dealt with Policy ST6. This continues EDF’s wider and ongoing communications with BDC regarding future opportunities to regenerate the Site. The Inspectors note on 9 May 2023 did not include any reference to the soundness of Policy ST6 or the strategic objectives relating to the inclusion of the Site within the current Local Plan. It is acknowledged that the MMs are included to address the discussion at the Hearing, which primarily related to the effectiveness of the policy. Welcome the MMs to Policy ST6 as they result in a more concise and effective policy overall. In particular, MM5.34i will help to remove any ambiguity as to what a future developer will need to demonstrate in respect of transport matters.		Noted.
<b>MM5.34i</b>	MOD-REF019 Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes	There is insufficient consideration given to the traffic impact of future development at Cottam Power Station; recognise it is unclear at present what use should be on site though a Renewable Energy centre is supported. It is somewhat remote, though the A57 passes nearby; as a		MM5.34i clearly requires proposals for the former power station site to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan that demonstrates that the highway capacity and highway safety

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
		Soundness - No	"Rural Site", there is a risk of B2/B8 focus with a renewed negative impact on Tuxford. Such use is inappropriate, absent a detailed assessment and provision of transport routes to the A57 at Markham Moor. This should be explicit in the Plan.		impact(s) of the regeneration of the site, including individual and cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated; and maximises opportunities to enhance sustainable and active travel to the site to reduce transport movements by private vehicles. This is considered to be an appropriate approach to manage transport impacts associated with the re-development of the site.
MM5.34m	MOD-NRF005  Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of EDF	Not stated	The removal of MM5.34m will help to reduce the volume of evidence required to address the policy overall, enabling a developer to focus on the sustainable masterplanning and successful regeneration of the Site.		Noted.
MM5.34m	MOD-NRF011  Nottinghamshire County Council	Not stated	The opportunity to promote sustainable travel to the site is likely to be limited in this isolated location (ST6 3.f)). Use of the existing railway line and River Trent may provide such opportunities during construction and potentially once the site is redeveloped. The requirement to consider such opportunities for the transportation of construction and waste materials has now been removed (ST6 3.j) Query why this is needed to make the Plan more effective and if the feasibility of transportation by river and rail been comprehensively assessed and ruled out.		The site promoters through the Transport Assessment and masterplan for the site are able to consider a range of transport options to support construction and occupation of the site which could include rail/river. The scope of the Transport Assessment would be through agreement with the Local Highways Authority. To require a feasibility study is considered to be onerous.
<b>Policy ST7: Provision of Land for Employment Development</b>					
MM6.1	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM6.3	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
MM6.5	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Inclusion of this paragraph is strongly supported. Refers to BDC43 (pg 5-7) Central Lincolnshire statement. May be concerned if this were to be amended from the proposed wording.		Noted.
MM6.5	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership	Not stated	This is on behalf of the local planning authorities (LPAs) of Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Erewash Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council, Nottingham City Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council. Together with Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils, they constitute the Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership (GNPP). Refer to previous correspondence dated 4 January 2023, in connection with the examination raising concerns about the proposed strategic site at Apleyhead. Confirm that the proposed main modifications address these concerns.		Noted.
MM6.5	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership	Not stated	Support the main modifications in so far as they relate to the proposed strategic site allocation at Apleyhead and our common interest to meet evidenced need for regional / sub regional logistics. Modifications are supported by evidence, including the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study - August 2022. ( <a href="https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf">https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf</a> ) and the Bassetlaw A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment 2021 and Update 2022.		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM6.5	MOD-REF012  Sheffield City Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Support the inclusion of the Apleyhead site to meet an evidenced need for regional/subregional logistics.		Noted.
MM6.6	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Amendments are supported. Refers to comment made by Central Lincolnshire in BDC43 (pg 5-7).		Noted.
MM6.6	MOD-REF003  Stantec on behalf of Caddicks Development	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Should be read alongside previous representations and Hearing Statements including OTH-05. Continue to actively promote land at Apleyhead Junction for large scale employment uses (predominantly B8 with some B2 and ancillary uses), are actively assessing the options for delivery of this key strategic opportunity. Support the principle of the proposed employment allocation of Apleyhead. The site remains deliverable within the plan period. Consider that a number of proposed Main Modifications are not necessary for plan soundness or do not address matters raised in INS-10 which states ‘: ... the Transport Assessment demonstrates that the site can be developed to the extent set out in the assessment, without the need for carriage widening to the A57. We are therefore satisfied that the allocation would be acceptable in highways terms. However, we do not consider it necessary that the policy be amended to include a floorspace “cap” as such matters would more appropriately be dealt with by way of a planning application when a full Transport Assessment would be provided. In the interests of clarity, the criteria in Part 3) should be removed as these	Propose the following change to MM6.6: ‘The site is considered to be sub-regionally unique; capable of delivering <del>up to 4.75m sqft 440,175sqm</del> of employment space, and <u>which meets</u> the widest range of <del>logistics</del> occupier needs including the largest floorspace and site requirements in the market...’ (Note: Strikethrough text being deleted text and replaced with underlined text)	As per the Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010, Policy ST7 does not require a floorspace cap. MM6.6 in the supporting text provides context by setting out the amount of employment space that could be accommodated at Apleyhead. The figure identified was that discussed at the hearings and referenced in various evidence base documents including those submitted by the site promotor so provides useful context for the strategic policy and helps justify the identification of the site allocation to address regional/sub-regional large scale logistics needs.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>are duplicated in Policy 9. Furthermore, in the interests of clarity, and to ensure that the site is developed for its stated purpose as a strategic employment site the wording of the policy should be amended to make clear the circumstances when non-B8 uses would be appropriate...'</p> <p>The Inspector was clear that a floorspace cap is not required and follows on from previous representations. A cap would place an unnecessary constraint on the delivery of the site and potentially restrict the significant benefits of delivering a major employment site in this location. Welcome the Inspector's conclusions, fully agree a floorspace cap is not required and welcome that a floorspace cap is not proposed in Policy ST7. MM6.6 continues to include a floorspace figure in the supporting text. Consider MM6.6 is unsound and is not needed to address issues of soundness, particularly as the Inspector has confirmed there is no requirement for a floorspace cap. For consistency, clarity, and to avoid confusion, as the floorspace cap was correctly not included in ST7, the floorspace reference should be removed from the supporting text.</p>		
<b>MM6.6</b>	MOD-REF003  Stantec on behalf of Caddicks Development	Not stated	Continue to progress and update the technical work required to support a robust planning application. There is further active B8 and B2 occupier interest in the site which shows the continued strength of the market and the attractiveness of Apleyhead Junction as a location for major development. Assessing how these occupiers could be accommodated within the development and then how the resultant phases could be delivered. Whilst an Outline planning application has been prepared it could be updated to a Hybrid application to respond directly to this occupier interest. This means a favourable and supportive site allocation policy can assist in unlocking this significant		Noted. It is considered that occupier interest may be an indication of anecdotal demand but that the Council's evidence demonstrates a need for sub-regional/regional large scale logistics only.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			investment and opportunities for major growth in Bassetlaw and Worksop.		
<b>MM6.5, MM6.7-6.14</b>	MOD-REF003  Stantec on behalf of Caddicks Development	Not stated	Note other suggested modifications related to Apleyhead, and refer to previous representations, Hearing Statements, and evidence presented at hearing sessions.		Noted.
<b>MM6.6</b>	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership	Not stated	Support the main modifications in so far as they relate to the proposed strategic site allocation at Apleyhead and our common interest to meet evidenced need for regional / sub regional logistics. Modifications are supported by evidence, including the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study - August 2022. ( <a href="https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf">https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf</a> ) and the Bassetlaw A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment 2021 and Update 2022.		Noted.
<b>MM6.7</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Amendments are supported. Refers to comment made by Central Lincolnshire in BDC43 (pg 5-7).		Noted.
<b>MM6.7</b>	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership	Not stated	Support the main modifications in so far as they relate to the proposed strategic site allocation at Apleyhead and our common interest to meet evidenced need for regional / sub regional logistics. Modifications are supported by evidence, including the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study - August 2022. ( <a href="https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf">https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf</a> ) and the Bassetlaw A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment 2021 and Update 2022.		Noted.

<b>MM Number:</b>	<b>Representation Reference: Name:</b>	<b>Legal compliance and soundness:</b>	<b>Summary of Comments made:</b>	<b>Suggested changes by consultee:</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
<b>MM6.7</b>	MOD-REF012  Sheffield City Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.8a</b>	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership	Not stated	Support the main modifications in so far as they relate to the proposed strategic site allocation at Apleyhead and our common interest to meet evidenced need for regional / sub regional logistics. Modifications are supported by evidence, including the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study - August 2022. ( <a href="https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf">https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf</a> ) and the Bassetlaw A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment 2021 and Update 2022.		Noted.
<b>MM6.8a</b>	MOD-REF012  Sheffield City Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.8b</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	The inclusion of this paragraph is strongly supported. Refers to comment made by Central Lincolnshire in BDC43 (pg 5-7).		Noted.
<b>MM6.8b</b>	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership	Not stated	Support the main modifications in so far as they relate to the proposed strategic site allocation at Apleyhead and our common interest to meet evidenced need for regional / sub regional logistics. Modifications are supported by evidence, including the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study - August 2022.		Noted.



<b>MM Number:</b>	<b>Representation Reference: Name:</b>	<b>Legal compliance and soundness:</b>	<b>Summary of Comments made:</b>	<b>Suggested changes by consultee:</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
			<a href="https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf">https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf</a> ) and the Bassetlaw A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment 2021 and Update 2022.		
<b>MM6.8b</b>	MOD-REF012  Sheffield City Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.8c</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	The inclusion of this paragraph is strongly supported. Refers to comment made by Central Lincolnshire in BDC43 (pg 5-7).		Noted.
<b>MM6.8c</b>	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership	Not stated	Support the main modifications in so far as they relate to the proposed strategic site allocation at Apleyhead and our common interest to meet evidenced need for regional / sub regional logistics. Modifications are supported by evidence, including the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study - August 2022. ( <a href="https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf">https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf</a> ) and the Bassetlaw A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment 2021 and Update 2022.		Noted.
<b>MM6.8c</b>	MOD-REF012  Sheffield City Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.9c; MM6.9e</b>	MOD-REF014  National Trust	Legally Compliant – Not stated	Remain concerned by the level of greenfield development promoted by this plan, with potential ramifications for the capacity of the highway network and for the local	The proposed employment supply for the district should be	It is considered that the Local Plan has appropriately considered environmental and transport impacts and the capacity of

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
		Soundness - No	environment. Chapter 11 of the NPPF sets out the ways in which planning policies and decisions should seek to make effective use of land, making as much use as possible of previously-developed 'brownfield' land and taking account of the availability and capacity of infrastructure. Welcome the addition of the criteria within Policy ST7 as MM6.9e.	reviewed with the aim of providing a reasonable, sustainable level of development. This should have regard to environmental and transport impacts and the capacity of existing highway infrastructure.	existing highways infrastructure when identifying the employment supply.
<b>MM6.9c</b>	MOD-REF022  P and D Group on behalf of Welbeck Estates	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Previously made representations highlighting the importance of a degree of flexibility in Policy ST7 to accommodate future needs not anticipated in the Plan, and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances, as per Paragraph 82 of the NPPF. The amended wording to Policy ST7, which now ensures that there is greater flexibility in the policy to allow for complementary uses or other uses that would adversely affect the character and appearance of the employment site, is supported. This flexibility better supports the diverse regeneration potential of the former Welbeck Colliery site (ref: EM004).		Noted.
<b>MM6.9d</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Amendments are supported. Refers to comment made by Central Lincolnshire in BDC43 (pg 5-7).		Noted.
<b>MM6.9d</b>	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham	Not stated	Support the main modifications in so far as they relate to the proposed strategic site allocation at Apleyhead and our common interest to meet evidenced need for regional / sub regional logistics. Modifications are supported by		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Planning Partnership		evidence, including the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study - August 2022. ( <a href="https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf">https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf</a> ) and the Bassetlaw A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment 2021 and Update 2022.		
<b>MM6.9d</b>	MOD-REF012  Sheffield City Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Support the focus of the site on delivering 'large-scale' logistics.		Noted.
<b>MM6.9e</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Amendments are supported. Noted that bullet c) only refers to "sub-regional need for large scale logistics" it is considered for consistency should also refer to "regional need". Refers to comment made by Central Lincolnshire in BDC43 (pg 5-7).		Agree. For clarity, consistency and to ensure the effective implementation of Policy ST7 MM6.9e Part 4 c) should be amended to (bold underlined): <u>when considered individually or cumulatively with other existing or consented development on site it would not affect the character and appearance of the area or undermine the capacity of the site to meet an identified sub-regional <b>and/or regional</b> need for large scale logistics.</u>
<b>MM6.9e</b>	MOD-NRF004  Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership	Not stated	Support the main modifications as they relate to the proposed strategic site allocation at Apleyhead and our common interest to meet evidenced need for regional / sub regional logistics. Modifications are supported by evidence, including the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study - August 2022. ( <a href="https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf">https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/3375066/nottinghamshire-logistics-study-august-2022.pdf</a> ) and the Bassetlaw A1 Corridor Logistics Assessment 2021 and Update 2022.		Noted.

<b>MM Number:</b>	<b>Representation Reference: Name:</b>	<b>Legal compliance and soundness:</b>	<b>Summary of Comments made:</b>	<b>Suggested changes by consultee:</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
<b>MM6.9e</b>	MOD-REF012  Sheffield City Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>Policy 9: Apleyhead Junction</b>					
<b>MM6.10</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.10</b>	MOD-REF012  Sheffield City Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.11</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.12</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
<b>MM6.12</b>	MOD-REF014  National Trust	Legally Compliant – Not stated  Soundness - No	Remain concerned by the uncertainty around transport impacts on the A57, the ability of the road network to cope with increased traffic levels, and the cost/feasibility and environmental impacts of required transport improvements. Welcome the amendment at paragraph 6.3.7 which confirms that the Bassetlaw Transport Study 2022 considers the potential transport impacts of Apleyhead at a strategic scale and sets out recommended transport mitigation; appreciate that the extent of transport mitigation is now proposed to be confirmed through a detailed Transport Assessment(s) and Travel Plan(s) at planning application stage, in line with the provisions of Policy ST54 and Policy ST58. Should the level of additional traffic generated require road widening at the eastern end of the A57, this is likely to have direct impacts on a local nature site and/or National Trust 'inalienable' land within Clumber Park Grade I Registered Historic Park and Gardens. The feasibility of this has not been established and it is not considered that the approach set out in paragraph 6.3.7 would enable consideration ahead of an advanced development stage.	The proposed employment supply for the district should be reviewed with the aim of providing a reasonable, sustainable level of development. This should have regard to environmental and transport impacts and the capacity of existing highway infrastructure.	The Inspectors state in INS-10 that: 'We note the views of Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) and the Council's Transport advisers, that the Transport Assessment demonstrates that the site can be developed to the extent set out in the assessment, without the need for carriage widening to the A57. We are therefore satisfied that the allocation would be acceptable in highways terms.' Additionally, the Council considers that the Local Plan has appropriately considered environmental and transport impacts and the capacity of existing highways infrastructure when identifying the employment supply.
<b>MM6.14d</b>	MOD-REF014  National Trust	Legally Compliant – Not stated  Soundness - No	Remain concerned that Apleyhead Junction is within close proximity to Clumber Park (within 500m of the boundary). Do not support the proposed allocation on the grounds of the likely impact on heritage and nature conservation. Welcome the amendment to Policy 9 2 which confirms that: The proposed development on land at Apleyhead Junction will be expected to deliver a scheme in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan framework for the site consistent with Policy ST58 which makes provision for... Should the site be allocated as an employment site, a robust evidence base is required to inform the comprehensive masterplan framework for the	Should this policy be retained Part (b) be amended to '... a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment, including winter bird surveys to establish the contribution that the site makes to foraging habitat, and that if significant populations	The matters raised are not identified as a proposed Main Modification so have already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process. However, it is considered that the scope of the project level Habitat Regulations Assessment including the winter bird surveys should be agreed at planning application stage; and Policy 9 states that when considering heritage impacts a scheme should be appropriate in terms of scale. Scale is defined by the National Design Guide as

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>site to control development. Reiterate our point that Policy 9 2b) should be amended to provide more details relating to winter bird surveys. Appreciate that this policy provision will set the baseline for considering the impact of the development of land at Apleyhead Junction on the special designations and character of Clumber Park, however consider that part 2d) remains unacceptably broad referencing a scheme of an appropriate scale, layout, form and materials which respects the significance and setting of affected heritage assets supported by a heritage statement and archaeological assessment comprising a geophysical survey and intrusive site investigations, and mitigation strategy. Request that Part (d) is amended.</p>	<p>are found appropriate mitigation is provided in the form of areas of optimal foraging habitat (e.g. seed-rich set aside land) either within the site or in the wider landscape'. Request that Part (d) is amended to 'a scheme of an appropriate scale, <b>height</b>, layout, form and materials which respects the significance and setting of affected heritage assets and is supported by a heritage statement including an assessment of impact and mitigation measures...'</p>	<p>including the height, width and length of each building proposed within a development in relation to its surroundings. It is not necessary to add height to Policy 9 as it duplicates other parts of the criterion.</p>
<b>MM6.13</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.14a</b>	MOD-REF002	Legally Compliant – Yes			Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Central Lincolnshire	Soundness - Yes			
<b>MM6.14b</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.14c</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.14e</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.14g</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.
<b>MM6.14i</b>	MOD-REF002  Central Lincolnshire	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes			Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
<b>Policy ST10: Existing Employment Sites</b>					
<b>MM6.15 and MM6.18b</b>	MOD-REF010 Rapleys/CEG (Dooba Developments Ltd)	Not stated	MM6.15 proposes the removal of the word 'Existing' from the title of the paragraph 6.4. Do not have an issue with this understand that the text in paragraph 6.4.4 (MM6.18b) is describing the intent of protection existing and rural employment sites, the word 'Existing' in this context should not have a capital letter.	'Existing' in this context should not have a capital letter.	The proposed Main Modifications make a distinction between Existing Employment Sites and Rural Employment Sites, known collectively as Employment Sites. For clarity, it is therefore appropriate to capitalise the collective name of the sites.
<b>MM6.21a and MM6.21h</b>	MOD-REF010 Rapleys/CEG (Dooba Developments Ltd)	Not stated	Policy ST10 as a title is now proposed to be consistent with MM6.15 above, however, in part 1, the word 'Existing' has not been removed – to be consistent with the other modifications, it needs to be removed. The same point applies to MM6.21h (proposed as part 4). Part 1 of the policy should acknowledge the ability to accommodate alternative uses as per part 3 of the policy.		The proposed Main Modifications make a distinction between Existing Employment Sites and Rural Employment Sites, known collectively as Employment Sites. Part 1 applies only to Existing Employment Sites, therefore 'existing' should remain. The same point applies to MM6.21h. Part 3 (MM6.21d) is clear that the subsequent criteria apply to Existing Employment Sites through the reference to 'Part 1 above'. There is no need to repeat the ability of such sites to accommodate alternative uses.
<b>MM6.21b; MM6.21c</b>	MOD-REF013 Heatons on behalf of Tarmac	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Previous iterations of the Local Plan have shown Chainbridge Lane, Lound, as a draft Existing Employment Allocation in Policy ST10 (EES27). Propose to add a distinction between different existing employment sites in the District based on their geographical location, between existing employment allocations considered to be in rural locations from those that are not. EES27 comprises a permitted operational precast concrete manufacturing facility with significant built form, external storage, and landscaped areas. The facility falls within EES27 and extends beyond it. MM6.21b and MM6.21c propose to allocate EES27 as a Rural Employment Site rather than as	Removal of text proposed to be added as per MM6.21c that restricts land uses that could be appropriate in RES allocations. This is not justified or consistent with national policy. Provide certainty regarding the site reference of draft	The justification for the policy change is set out in the Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010. The Use Classes Order 2020 states that Class E(g) are uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to its amenity. It follows that employment sites that sit within the countryside that are separate from a settlement/built form of a settlement are not considered suitable for Class E(g) uses as they are not within a residential area. The Main Modifications Schedule has



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response																				
			<p>an Existing Employment Site. MM6.21c adds text to draft Policy ST10. The reason is: "To clarify the approach that would apply when determining applications for B2, B8 uses on Rural Employment Sites, and to clarify the list of protected rural employment sites." The proposed modification is not justified. It appears only to exclude E(g) use from employment locations that are potentially appropriate locations for E(g) uses. To exclude certain uses from being carried out at potentially appropriate locations is contrary to the spirit of the NPPF. It is inconsistent with national policy which aims to facilitate sustainable development and sustainable growth where possible. It is unjustified and unclear why the proposed modification was warranted. There appears to be an error in the Main Modifications Local Plan August 2023 which refers to our client's land as RES27 whereas Main Modifications Schedule refers to it as RES28</p>	<p>allocation RES / RES28. This appears to be an <u>error in the Plan</u>;</p>	<p>been approved by the Inspectors so the reference numbers therein take precedence over those within the Main Modifications Version of the Local Plan which sets out the proposed changes in a more accessible format. The site reference should be RES28.</p>																				
<b>Not stated</b>	<p>MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council</p>	<p>Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No</p>	<p>Tuxford includes three main employment sites: EE20 – Ollerton Road (known as Walkers' Industrial Estate) EE21 – Ashvale Road EE 22 - Lodge Lane. The Officer Assessed split of current land use is as:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="689 1002 1122 1187"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Employment Land use, Tuxford (%)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>B2/Eng</th> <th>B8</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ollerton Road</td> <td>EE20</td> <td>40 (B2)</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ashvale Road</td> <td>EE21</td> <td>90</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lodge Lane</td> <td>EE22</td> <td>50</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Table 2: Assessed Use Split, Employment Land, Tuxford</i></p> <p>Ollerton Road is the largest, and incorporates a range of medium scale engineering, as well as logistics, specialised transport and freight/storage space. It lies directly to the north of Ollerton Road (A6075) in fields, a mile from</p>	Employment Land use, Tuxford (%)						B2/Eng	B8	Ollerton Road	EE20	40 (B2)	60	Ashvale Road	EE21	90	10	Lodge Lane	EE22	50	50	<p>The status of the industrial sites identified in Policy 10 proposed as RES22 and RES23 revert to EE21 and EE22 under Existing Employment Sites (section 1) such that their use is not limited to B2/B8; and the acceptable use of these two sites be updated to include all E sub-category uses.</p>	<p>The justification for the policy change is set out in the Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010. It is acknowledged that as the Ashvale housing development is now developed RES21 would better align with the definition of an Existing Employment Site as it sits within the built form of Tuxford. However, Lodge Lane and Ollerton Road are separate from the development boundary/built form of Tuxford so are considered to be in the countryside and Rural Employment Sites. To ensure the effective implementation of Policy ST10 a change is proposed: MM6.21b: <b>EES20 Ollerton Road, Tuxford</b></p>
Employment Land use, Tuxford (%)																									
		B2/Eng	B8																						
Ollerton Road	EE20	40 (B2)	60																						
Ashvale Road	EE21	90	10																						
Lodge Lane	EE22	50	50																						

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>Tuxford centre and 0.8 miles from the Development Boundary. The assessed split is a fair one. A recent application looked to extend its boundary (but hidden from) the A6075. A third application is pending supported by TTC but rejected by BDC that “there is sufficient employment land elsewhere in Bassetlaw” and that a field cannot be spared, even though a larger area indirectly opposite is proposed for development (HS14). Ashvale Road Industrial Estate lies directly to the south of the new Ash Vale Estate; they are contiguous as the attached photographs show. This site is assessed as general industry not suitable for sites adjacent to residential areas. This is inaccurate. There are several small units, a catering firm, a manufacturer of hi-tech pods as well as small engineering sites. Lodge Lane lies just to the east of Ashvale Road Industrial Estate; separated by a field from the Ashvale housing and from Tuxford Academy. Both fields in the LAA considered suitable for development. This site also hosts the Network Rail, Innovation and Development Centre – a nationally important research unit. The rural one is EE20. The others are adjacent to, or at most one field from current housing, and adjacent to ‘suitable’ sites on the LAA. Ashvale Road and Lodge Lane have incorrectly been re-assigned as “Rural”; RES23 and RES24; yet both closer to housing than EE20. The impact is that any use, other than B2/B8 is banned. This shows up in the LPMM but there is no reference to it on the schedule; without reading of the LPMM it would have been invisible. See no question from the Inspector prompting such a change so challenge why it is reasonable to make a change. Do not see how one of these sites remains an EE, whilst the other two which are closer to housing and will be in the future, are re-classified as Rural, limiting their</p>		<p><b><u>EES21 Ashvale Road, Tuxford</u></b> MM6.21c: <b><u>RES21 Ashvale Road, Tuxford</u></b> <b><u>RES20 Ollerton Road, Tuxford</u></b></p>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>future potential. The removal of E(g) would be used to block any expansion of either site by any current E(g) user and the change of use of any current developed area to E(g) contrary to policy. Understand overall in Bassetlaw there may be sufficient E(g) land vacant; within Tuxford there are some vacant buildings which could be used for general retail, office, hospitality within the town centre; but this is limited and there is no space for innovative start-ups, or expansion of current businesses on those sites. These two sites should be returned to EE to include general E category of use; they could retain B2/B8 use, not be limited to this. This will permit TTC to propose more creative use. The general focus on large-scale logistics, freight and storage in the A1/A57 corridor is supported. However, <i>all of the other sites have direct A1/A57 access, without having to go through a town centre.</i> EE20 traffic must traverse the centre of Tuxford, going through the Conservation area, to go on the A1. EE21 and EE22 have reasonable access to the A1 southbound via an exit on Ashvale Road, northbound traffic must pass through the centre to reach the A1 resulting in heavy traffic through the centre and delays. HGV traffic is the most significant negative in the Community Priorities – 75% of respondents disliking it. TTC takes a nuanced approach as these sites bring employment but consider a gradual change – at Ashvale Road and Lodge Lane - away from B2/B8 to a “science and innovation” park with some retail to provide higher grade employment. Forcing these to be limited to general industry, logistics, transport and storage is not necessary or positive. With STEP and potential green energy use at Cottam in future, it is a good fit. See no support or justification of it other than to support bringing empty E(g) sites in the main Towns back into use. For</p>		

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			places like Tuxford whose employment sites do NOT have direct access to the A1/A57 routes, an alternative use for the employment land would help ensure their sustainability. Consider ST11 to be unjustified.		
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Tuxford could have a major role to play in supporting the visitor economy. At present, the HGVs thundering through the Georgian town centre make it unattractive and perceived as unsafe. Developing Ash Vale and Lodge Lane as non-B2/B8 use would remove a significant proportion of that traffic; building a short bypass between EE20 and the northbound B1164, as recommended in the Community Priorities Statement. All access for HGVs and other heavy through traffic to join the A1 would then be at the pre-existing Markham Moor roundabout junction without the increasingly significant delays incurred going through the centre fo Tuxford Conservation Area. This would transform Tuxford without compromising its (or Bassetlaw's) economy; it would allow some expansion of EE20 and permit EE21 and EE22 to develop into higher value mix sites.		No comment - This issue is not identified as a Main Modification so has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process.
<b>MM6.21d</b>	MOD-REF010  Rapleys/CEG (Dooba Developments Ltd)	Not stated	Welcome the deletion of the word 'and' at the end of each criterion within part 3 of the policy.		Noted.
<b>MM6.21d</b>	MOD-REF010  Rapleys/CEG (Dooba Developments Ltd)	Not stated	Criterion 3a) should not require, or define, a 12-month marketing campaign. It is arbitrary and cannot capture any given set of economic or market circumstances at points in time over the life of the plan, ie, it does not offer sufficient flexibility. It increases the risk of a site or part of a site being left undeveloped/underutilised during that marketing period when there may well be demand from other		It is considered that a 12 month period is a reasonable marketing time to sell/lease a property at its market value and is able to capture economic and market conditions for a sustained period of time. However, to ensure the effective implementation of the policy a change is proposed to the timeline

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			employment uses for that space. It is also imprecise, through use of words such as “reasonable” and “realistic” as these will be open to interpretation in their definition. If the marketing clause is to remain, it should set maximum timelines and have greater regard to agent feedback/commentary on the economic and market circumstances.		(bold underlined/strikethrough): <u>through comprehensive marketing for the lawful use with registered commercial agents, for a <del>minimum period</del> of 12 months, ...</u>
<b>MM6.21e</b>	MOD-REF010  Rapeleys/CEG (Dooba Developments Ltd)	Not stated	Criterion 3b) is too narrow. Alternative uses should not be confined just to economic regeneration benefits. Should acknowledge wider economic benefits (rather than be limited to regeneration) and reference the social and environmental advantages which may also arise.		Employment sites are those currently in an economic use. It follows that change of use should promote regeneration of the economic use of the wider site.
<b>MM6.21f</b>	MOD-REF010  Rapeleys/CEG (Dooba Developments Ltd)	Not stated	Criterion 3c) does not need to reference any assessment as being “appropriate” and “robust”. The terminology is superfluous and imprecise. It may not be a question of E(g), B2, B8 being financially viable – it may be that there is not the demand for those uses on all or part of the site.		It is considered necessary to include ‘appropriate’ and ‘robust’ to ensure that the inputs and the level of detail used in an assessment is correct and fit for purpose.
<b>MM6.21h</b>	MOD-REF010  Rapeleys/CEG (Dooba Developments Ltd)	Not stated	Part 4 needs further clarity to emphasise that it only applies to existing operations. It cannot sensibly relate to undeveloped employment land or vacant employment buildings.		Where vacant plots and/or buildings exist within Employment Sites it is considered appropriate that the re-use of such land/buildings is compatible with neighbouring uses and that such proposals do not prejudice their ongoing operation.
<b>New strategic policy: Large Brownfield Sites in the Rural Area</b>					
<b>MM6.24</b>	MOD-NRF011  Nottinghamshire County Council	Not stated	Should require proposals to demonstrate that the cumulative highway impacts and impacts on highway safety can be satisfactorily mitigated and ensure that the opportunities to enhance sustainable and active travel to the site to reduce transport movements by private vehicles		Part 1 of the new strategic policy states that proposals should be consistent with other relevant policies in the Plan and relevant criteria in that policy. Policy ST54 Part 2 states that where a development has significant transport implications

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			are maximised to be evidenced by a Transport Assessment(s) and Travel Plan(s) for the site (1.f)).		individually or cumulatively these are addressed through a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan alongside an application. Additionally, Policy ST54 Part 3 requires that major development provide an adequate level of accessibility by all modes of transport and to mitigate the impacts of development upon the transport network. As such, no changes are considered necessary.
MM6.24	MOD-REF022  P & DG on behalf of Welbeck Estates	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - Yes	Support MM6.24. It is an effective way to acknowledge the development potential of brownfield regeneration sites in the countryside, such as Welbeck Colliery. This better reflects the weight that is given to the redevelopment of brownfield sites contained within the NPPF. The addition of the policy is supported on the basis that it is 'sound'.		Noted.
MM6.24 and MM6.25	MOD-NRF015  The Land and Planning Company	Not stated	These focus on ST11 and the New Strategic Policy. INS-10 says: <i>“At the hearing we identified that there are a number of large brownfield sites in the rural parts of the District that have previously been in economic use. The Plan does not contain any specific provision for these. For the Plan to be effective it should provide guidance on how development and investment opportunities at large brownfield sites with the potential to accommodate development at a strategic scale should be considered. In some cases, rural brownfield sites can have attributes that are of importance beyond the District and the Plan should set out how it seeks to capitalise on these. We note that since the hearing the Council has been in dialogue with representors and that a policy has been drafted which seeks to address this. This should now be finalised and included in the list of proposed main modifications.”</i> [emphasis added] It will be a matter of fact that large	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed wording: the emphasis is not 'at' sites, but 'on' them. This is not consistent with INS-10</li> <li>• The narrative blurs the role of strategic policy: a strategic policy articulated in terms of 'exceptional' consideration is not a strategic policy.</li> <li>• Cottam Power Station Site referred to; the narrative uses the phrase 'such</li> </ul>	The provision of a positive policy framework to support the appropriate re-use of a strategic scale site is a strategic policy matter. The large rural brownfield sites are situated in the countryside so in terms of the spatial strategy typically countryside policies would apply. As such, proposals on these sites are considered as exceptions to the spatial strategy. Cottam Power Station site is referred to in the supporting text to clarify that the new policy does not apply to that site and to explain why and to signpost users to the appropriate policy in the Local Plan. The second and sixth paragraph of the supporting text explains the features a large brownfield site in the rural area

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>brownfield sites include roadside service areas and the uses agglomerated with these. These have attributes and can be capitalised on in the same way as any other large brownfield site. The new policy addresses Large Brownfield sites and can be considered distinct to ST11. The narrative on p70 of the Proposed Modifications refers to ST11 in terms of operational and locational requirements, extension and intensification. A minor modification is proposed: the removal of the word 'established'. The policy supports the growth of business outside employment sites/allocations. ST11 is welcomed and supports growth at small-scale sites. However, the new policy is articulated in terms of development on large brownfield sites in the rural area where they are consistent with the new strategic policy and other relevant policies in this Plan. INS-10 refers to strategic scale opportunities 'at' brownfield sites. As proposed, the new policy is restrictive and not consistent with INS-10 and the NPPF, September 2023: Positivity and proactivity; Specific locational requirements of different sectors; Accessible locations. Para 85 (NPPF, Sept 2023) is important.</p>	<p>sites' and there is no clarity as to what is actually meant by a large brownfield site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategic policy is further restricted in that the re-use of such sites should be principally for uses that are not and could not be provided for in more sustainable locations in the District, such as within or on the edge of the Main Towns or Large Rural Settlements</li> <li>• The narrative appears to restrict the scope of the new policy to power station sites</li> <li>• Attributes are restricted: connectivity to national electricity grid infrastructure, the national rail network or to main rivers</li> <li>• Locational advantage and</li> </ul>	<p>should contain. The policy is not considered restrictive; the spatial strategy directs development and growth to the more sustainable locations within the development boundaries/built up areas of settlements so it follows that the re-use of large brownfield sites in the rural area should only be for uses that cannot be accommodated within or on the edge of the Main Towns or Large Rural Settlements as they are the most sustainable locations in the District for development to be located. The policy is designed to provide a positive framework to all relevant large brownfield sites in the District's rural area and not just the former power station sites, which are referenced by way of example evidenced by 'such as'. Reference to connectivity to national electricity infrastructure, the national rail network or to main rivers are examples of how such sites could have attributes of national, regional or sub-regional importance but is not a definitive list evidenced by 'such as'. The supporting text qualifies locational advantage by explaining that there should be no unacceptable impact on local roads and proposals should maximise opportunities to make a location more sustainable. It is considered that the majority of changes proposed to the new policy significantly dilute the purpose and focus of the new strategic policy to provide a positive</p>



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>sustainability is not clearly expressed: "Such sites tend to be in locations that are some distance away from existing centres of population and activity, so are often not the most sustainable in terms of access and linkages"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• can support a holistic view and masterplanning; 'minimising significant harm' impact and 'no significant impact' reveal inconsistency</li> </ul> <p>To ensure consistency with INS-10, we suggest the following to the policy:</p> <p>1. Proposals for <del>the re-use and re-development of</del> <u>masterplan-led development</u> at large brownfield sites in the countryside that make effective and efficient use of land for</p>	<p>framework to manage the re-use and re-development of strategic brownfield sites in the rural area that have previously been in economic use, by maximising opportunities to meet national, regional and sub-regional economic and environmental needs. The outcome of the proposed changes is that the remaining criteria are addressed by other policies in the Plan so the new policy would not be addressing the vision and objectives of the Plan. The title of the section refers to development 'on' brownfield sites and not 'at' brownfield sites. For consistency a proposed change is considered appropriate which would also better align with the Inspectors Post Hearing Note: Development <del>on</del> <u>at</u> large brownfield sites in the countryside.</p>



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>economic and/or environmental activity, and which are consistent with other relevant policies in the Plan will be supported subject to meeting the following criteria:</p> <p>a) <del>The proposal makes provision for an evidenced national, regional or subregional economic need;</del> [Explanation: a matter for the application to support]</p> <p>b) The development cannot be reasonably provided elsewhere in the District and does not undermine the aims and objectives of other policies in the Plan;</p> <p>c) The nature of the proposed development will capitalise on the locational attributes of the site to achieve demonstrable economic and/or environmental</p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>benefits compared with the current use and condition of the site;</p> <p>d) <del>The scale and nature of the proposal will have no significant adverse impact upon the character of the location, the surrounding landscape, biodiversity or heritage assets;</del> [Explanation: a matter for the application to support]</p> <p>e) <del>The proposal would not lead to significant harm to the amenity of local residents;</del> [Explanation: a matter for the application to support]</p> <p>f) <del>The need to travel by private vehicle has been minimised, and the need for appropriate sustainable transport measures and any highway improvements have been identified;</del></p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>[Explanation: a matter for the application to support]</p> <p>2. Any non-economic and environmental uses within a large brownfield site will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it is consistent with Part 1 above and:</p> <p>a) There is a clear functional relationship with the primary economic and/or environmental purpose of <u>at</u> the site; and</p> <p>b) It is of a scale that is appropriate to that relationship; <del>and</del></p> <p>[Explanation: a matter for the application to support]</p> <p>e) <del>When considered individually or cumulatively with other existing or consented development on site it would not result in an over-concentration</del></p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p><del>that might affect the function and appearance of the area. [Explanation: a matter for the application to support]</del>  <del>3. All proposals should be supported by a comprehensive masterplan framework for the site consistent with other relevant policies in this Plan. Where a proposal materially departs from an existing masterplan, clear justification will need to be provided for the approach.</del>  [Explanation: repeats 1, above]</p>	
<b>MM6.24;</b> <b>MM6.25</b>	MOD-NRF015  The Land and Planning Company	Not stated	Policy ST11 is subject of one word amendment (removal of 'established') and, as proposed, supports the growth of businesses <i>outside</i> employment sites. The policy supports growth. This provides welcome flexibility. Welcome the continued reference at 6.5.1 to <i>"The National Planning Policy Framework states that a Local Plan should positively encourage sustainable economic growth and support the expansion of existing businesses, as well as supporting economic growth in rural areas. There are a number of established businesses in the District that are either based within, or on the edges of settlements or</i>	To POLICY ST11 1. Proposals for the <del>growth of businesses</del> <u>business growth</u> in the rural area and outside <del>established</del> employment sites/allocations will be supported where all of the following are met:	The proposed change is not considered necessary for soundness.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<i>within the countryside (outside the development boundaries) that are outside the Existing Employment Sites and the employment allocations. However, these businesses play an important role in the local economy.”</i>		
<b>MM6.25</b>	MOD-NRF012  Historic England	Not stated	Would support a specific clause for the historic environment which seeks to ensure that the significance of heritage assets including their setting are protected and where possible, enhanced		Part 1 of the new strategic policy states that proposals should be consistent with other relevant policies in the Plan and relevant criteria in that policy. It is considered that Policy ST42 and Policy 43 provide an appropriate, positive framework to consider proposals and their implications for the historic environment effectively. As such, no changes are considered necessary.
<b>Policy ST12: Visitor Economy</b>					
<b>MM6.28</b>	MOD-NRF013  R Troop & Son	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	The added words “where appropriate” will stifle innovation and generate restrictive practice in conflict with soundness tests. For example, the Plan does not articulate the Roman Legacy yet an alternative Ermine Street traverses the District culminating in the nationally important Roman settlement of Littleborough. This is where the Romans crossed the Trent.....it has been forgotten by the Authorities – not even the Google car has driven there. The roads on Notts and Lincs side of the river still exist – all that is needed is the connector over the Trent for tourists (walkers and cyclists). A form of zip-wire might be cost effective but it would no doubt be fettered by someone saying that it wasn’t “appropriate.”	Take out added words “where appropriate.”	It is considered that ‘where appropriate’ builds in flexibility as it will not be necessary or appropriate for all proposals to enhance the environment.
<b>MM6.28b</b>	MOD-REF022	Legally Compliant – Yes	Previously made representations highlight the significant value the Welbeck Estate contributes to tourism in Bassetlaw. It is critical that planning policy ensures sufficient flexibility to meet the development needs of the		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	P&DG on behalf of Welbeck Estates	Soundness- Yes	Estate to support its continued tourism offer. Whilst a specific policy pertaining to the Welbeck Estate would have been preferable to guide its future development, it is recognised that the increased flexibility in Policy ST12 provides sufficient scope to support the Estate's growth needs during the Plan period. MM6.28b is supported.		
<b>Policy ST15: Provision of Land for Housing</b>					
<b>MM7.8</b>	MOD-REF020  David Lock On behalf of Hallam Land Management and IBA Planning	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness – No	Support the proposed modification to the wording of para 7.2.1 in respect of the site areas and quantum of development quoted for Peaks Hill Farm. The changes proposed reflect the correct site area of 63.7 ha and the correct quantum of allocated employment land (6.5 ha).		Noted.
<b>MM7.9</b>	MOD-REF020  David Lock On behalf of Hallam Land Management and IBA Planning	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness – No	Refers to comments made to MM0.8 and MM5.14d, relating to the proposed change to the anticipated delivery of net new dwellings within the Plan Period for Peaks Hill Farm. MM7.9 refers to 655 dwellings as being an appropriate Local Plan growth target. Do not agree with this (see response to MM0.8), if the figure of 655 dwellings is to be accepted as a Main Modification, then suggest that this figure is referred to as a minimum.	If MM0.8 are approved, then suggest that for soundness, the supporting text of para 7.2.4 should include reference to the 655 dwellings as a minimum figure (additions in <b>bold</b> , removal in strikethrough): <i>“Given the complex nature of delivering a large urban extension, it is considered appropriate to set a</i>	For consistency with the other site specific policies a change is proposed to MM7.9 ( <b>bold underline/strikethrough</b> ): Given the complex nature of delivering a large urban extension, it is considered appropriate to set a Local Plan growth target of <b>approximately</b> <del>4080</del> <u>655</u> dwellings to...

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p><i>Local Plan growth target of <b>a minimum of 655 dwellings</b> to help meet local housing needs and strategic infrastructure priorities in this plan period, with the remaining homes to be delivered thereafter. On that basis, the Housing Trajectory shows that housing delivery is not expected to start on site until at least 2026-2027.”</i></p>	
<b>Policy 16: Site HS1: Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop</b>					
<b>MM7.14a</b>	MODREF-006 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	States 655 dwellings will be developed on Peaks Hill Farm followed by further dwellings and employment and associated infrastructure. The plan needs to confirm the timeline for the completion of the road that is being built across Peaks Hill to accommodate this infrastructure. It vaguely refers to building “the balance of housing and associated infrastructure thereafter”. The section of the plan needs to state what the full scale of housing development will be on the Peaks Hill site, i.e., is it just 655, or will there be additional housing, and if so, how much more.		Agree that for clarification and to aid the implementation of the Plan MM7.14a would benefit from an amendment (underlined in bold): Land at Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop, as identified on the Policies Map will be developed for <b>a total of 1120 dwellings, of which</b> approximately <del>4080</del> <u>655</u> dwellings, 5ha of employment land and supporting infrastructure as identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023 <sup>7-13</sup> <b>will be delivered</b> in this plan period; <u>with the balance of housing, and a further 40 dwellings, 5.6ha</u> of employment land and
<b>MM7.14a</b>	MODREF-007 Resident	Legally Compliant – No	States 655 dwellings will be developed on Peaks Hill Farm followed by further dwellings and employment and associated infrastructure. The plan needs to confirm the		

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
		Soundness - No	timeline for the completion of the road that is being built across Peaks Hill to accommodate this infrastructure. It vaguely refers to building “the balance of housing and associated infrastructure thereafter”. The section of the plan needs to state what the full scale of housing development will be on the Peaks Hill site, i.e., is it just 655, or will there be additional housing, and if so, how much more.		associated infrastructure thereafter <sup>1</sup> , as part of a safe, sustainable, quality living and working environment. The delivery of the road will reflect the phasing of development, which will be confirmed through the planning application process.
MM7.14a	MODREF-008 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	States 655 dwellings will be developed on Peaks Hill Farm followed by further dwellings and employment and associated infrastructure. The plan needs to confirm the timeline for the completion of the road that is being built across Peaks Hill to accommodate this infrastructure. It vaguely refers to building “the balance of housing and associated infrastructure thereafter”. The section of the plan needs to state what the full scale of housing development will be on the Peaks Hill site, i.e., is it just 655, or will there be additional housing, and if so, how much more.		For consistency, clarity and to ensure the effective implementation of the Plan it is considered that the change should also apply to MM7.62a for Ordsall South: Land at Ordsall South, Retford (106.5ha), as identified on the Policies Map will be developed <b>for a total of 1250 dwellings, of which in this plan period for</b> approximately <del>890</del> <u>960</u> dwellings and supporting infrastructure, <u>as identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023<sup>13</sup> will be delivered in this plan period with the balance of housing and a further 360 dwellings</u> and associated infrastructure <del>thereafter as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan<sup>7</sup></del> as part of a safe, sustainable, quality living environment.
MM7.14a	MOD-REF009 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	States 655 dwellings will be developed on Peaks Hill Farm followed by further dwellings and employment and associated infrastructure. The plan needs to confirm the timeline for the completion of the road that is being built across Peaks Hill to accommodate this infrastructure. It vaguely refers to building “the balance of housing and associated infrastructure thereafter”. The section of the plan needs to state what the full scale of housing development will be on the Peaks Hill site, i.e., is it just 655, or will there be additional housing, and if so, how much more.		
MM7.14a	MOD-NRF011	Not stated	A material part of the transport mitigation to be provided by Peaks Hill would likely result from the provision of the distributor road linking Blyth Road (B6045) to Carlton Road		To confirm, the overall number of dwellings (1120) at Peaks Hill Farm has not changed. MM7.14m states that all



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Nottinghamshire County Council		(A60). It is not clear whether the provision of the distributor road would remain viable, as required by ST16 2.I)i. within the plan period with the housing numbers reduced to 655 dwellings or what effect that this would have on the affordability and delivery of other off site highway infrastructure at an appropriate time.		necessary transport infrastructure improvements through direct mitigation or contributions to new and improved infrastructure will be secured, as evidenced by the development's Transport Assessment(s) and Travel Plan(s). Policy ST54 ensures that such evidence will inform the infrastructure requirements at each phase.
MM7.14a	MOD-REF016 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	The council admitted at a local meeting that they won't be providing the infrastructure for this development and that there is huge deficit in the CIL. This development must be stopped as the council are not being truthful and will badly damage the area and affect health, education, welfare etc	The development must not proceed as there will not be the health, education, welfare not to mention the destruction of farming but increased development of industry !! Cant be allowed to proceed - not sustainable	The Council have not said that there wouldn't be the infrastructure to support this development or that there is a huge deficit in CIL. It was clearly stated in meetings that health, education and other infrastructure previously associated with this development remain in the Plan and that appropriate mechanisms will be used to ensure the developers provide appropriate infrastructure to support each development phase.
MM7.14a	MOD-REF017 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	The council are not been open and honest about the number of proposed houses, employment development and associated infrastructure, plus the council have admitted in a meeting that there would be no infrastructure for the development so the development needs to be stopped because again they are NOT BEING TRUTHFUL		The Local Plan sets out the number of homes, employment land and infrastructure expected to be delivered on this site in this Plan period. The Council have not said that there wouldn't be the infrastructure to support this development or that there is a huge deficit in CIL. It was clearly stated in meetings that health, education and other infrastructure previously associated with this development remain in the Plan and that appropriate mechanisms will be used to ensure the developers provide appropriate

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
					infrastructure to support each development phase.
<b>MM7.14a</b>	MOD-REF020  David Lock On behalf of Hallam Land Management and IBA Planning	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Refers to MM0.8 and the change in the anticipated quantum of delivery from the Peaks Hill Farm allocation within the Plan Period. This proposed change has resulted in a number of changes to the supporting text of the Plan. Do not accept that there is evidence to justify a reduction in delivery within the plan period (Representation to MM0.8), should the changes be accepted consider that additional clarification in the wording Policy 16 Site HS1 is needed to ensure that it is made clear that the overall capacity of the site for the development proposed has not changed.	If the changes proposed in MM0.8 are to be approved, for soundness, para 1. of Policy 16 Site HS1 should be amended to clarify that the overall allocation of the Peaks Hill Farm remains as per the Submitted Plan. This is considered important to secure a clear and unequivocal policy framework against which to judge planning applications for development. The following are made to make the plan sound (additions in <b>bold</b> , removal in strikethrough): <i>1. Land at Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop as identified on the Policies Map <b>for an urban extension totalling 1,120 dwellings,</b> will be developed for</i>	Agree that for clarification and to aid the effective implementation of the Plan MM7.14a would benefit from amendment (strikethrough/underlined in bold): Land at Peaks Hill Farm, Worksop, as identified on the Policies Map will be developed for <b>a total of 1120 dwellings, of which</b> approximately <del>400</del> <u>655</u> dwellings, 5ha of employment land and supporting infrastructure as identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan <del>2023</del> <sup>713</sup> <b>will be delivered</b> in this plan period; <u>with the balance of housing and a further 40 dwellings,</u> <del>5.6ha</del> of employment land and associated infrastructure thereafter, as part of a safe, sustainable, quality living and working environment.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p><i>approximately a <del>minimum of 1080</del> <b>655</b> dwellings, 5ha of employment land and supporting infrastructure as identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan <b>2023</b> in this plan period; with the balance of housing and employment land and associated infrastructure thereafter, as part of a safe, sustainable, quality living and working environment.</i></p>	
<b>MM7.14b</b>	MOD-REF016 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	This plan needs challenging as the scheme is not going to be delivered in accordance with the masterplan as the local council have admitted they will not be providing the infrastructure	The council need to be brought to justice for lying to its people and the development of peaks hill farm be thrown out the local plan due to lies by the council and their new admittance that they wont provide infrastructure	The Council have not said that there wouldn't be the infrastructure to support this development. It was clearly stated in meetings that health, education and other infrastructure previously associated with this development remain in the Plan and that appropriate mechanisms will be used to ensure the developers provide appropriate infrastructure to support each development phase.
<b>MM7.14b</b>	MOD-REF017 Resident	Legally Compliant – No	That the development should not go ahead at Peak Hill Farm because the scheme cannot be delivered without the infrastructure as previously mentioned		The health, education and other infrastructure previously associated with this development remain in the Plan and the Plan continues to ensure that

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
		Soundness - No			appropriate mechanisms will be used to ensure the developers provide appropriate infrastructure to support each development phase.
<b>MM7.14b to MM7.14q</b>	MOD-REF020  David Lock On behalf of Hallam Land Management and IBA Planning	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Do not object to the remainder of the proposed changes to Policy 16 HS1 MM7.14b to MM7.14q. These reflect the representations have made to date to the Local Plan, including our participation in the Examination, and that carrying forward these Modifications into the adopted Local Plan will result in a sound and effective policy framework for the purposes of bringing forward a sustainable urban extension at Peaks Hill Farm.	Not necessary for soundness, for clarity suggest a minor grammatical error in a subheading in MM7.14b: <i>“Good quality design and reflecting local character”</i>	The sub-heading is clear and provides appropriate structure for the subsequent criterion. No change required.
<b>MM7.14c</b>	MODREF-006  Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Refers to the inclusion of sensitive planting to protect Peaks Hill Wood from Carlton and create a soft landscaping on the development. It is equally important that a buffer is in place between the new houses and existing housing on Westerdale. The existing hedges behind houses on Westerdale should also be retained. Do not want a foot path/cycle path to join the new Housing estate to Westerdale as this will only increase anti-social behaviour to this street (e.g. increased littering, and dog fouling etc).		The buffer between the new development and Westerdale is covered by MM7.14f. The Main Modifications do not include reference to a foot/cycle path between the new development and Westerdale. As such, this has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process so does not form part of the consultation.
<b>MM7.14c</b>	MODREF-007  Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Refers to the inclusion of sensitive planting to protect Peaks Hill Wood from Carlton and create a soft landscaping on the development. It is equally important that a buffer is in place between the new houses and existing housing on Westerdale. The existing hedges behind houses on Westerdale should also be retained. Do not want a foot path/cycle path to join the new Housing estate to Westerdale as this will only increase anti-social behaviour to this street (e.g. increased littering, and dog fouling etc).		The buffer between the new development and Westerdale is covered by MM7.14f. The Main Modifications do not include reference to a foot/cycle path between the new development and Westerdale. As such, this has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process so does not form part of the consultation.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM7.14c	MODREF-008 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Refers to the inclusion of sensitive planting to protect Peaks Hill Wood from Carlton and create a soft landscaping on the development. It is equally important that a buffer is in place between the new houses and existing housing on Westerdale. The existing hedges behind houses on Westerdale should also be retained. Do not want a foot path/cycle path to join the new Housing estate to Westerdale as this will only increase anti-social behaviour to this street (e.g. increased littering, and dog fouling etc).		The buffer between the new development and Westerdale is covered by MM7.14f. The Main Modifications do not include reference to a foot/cycle path between the new development and Westerdale. As such, this has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process so does not form part of the consultation.
MM7.14c	MODREF-009 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Refers to the inclusion of sensitive planting to protect Peaks Hill Wood from Carlton and create a soft landscaping on the development. It is equally important that a buffer is in place between the new houses and existing housing on Westerdale. The existing hedges behind houses on Westerdale should also be retained. Do not want a foot path/cycle path to join the new Housing estate to Westerdale as this will only increase anti-social behaviour to this street (e.g. increased littering, and dog fouling etc).		The buffer between the new development and Westerdale is covered by MM7.14f. The Main Modifications do not include reference to a foot/cycle path between the new development and Westerdale. As such, this has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process so does not form part of the consultation.
MM7.14c	MOD-REF016 Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	They claim to include sensitive planting for this development but are going to destroy a huge tree plantation and destroy acres and acres of farming land that can never be replaced. This is never sound. There are huge amounts of buildings and brownfield sites that need regenerating before destroying good farming land that is used all year round.	Do not destroy the natural landscape for housing that is not needed when there are so many underdeveloped and regeneration areas that need using first which will also build the town centre backup and also utilise old business land	There is insufficient suitable, deliverable brownfield land available in Worksop and the District to meet housing needs over the plan period so some greenfield land has been identified. The Local Plan does not say that the tree plantation will be lost and requires new green infrastructure to connect to the existing woodland.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				rather than being left derelict	
MM7.14c	MODREF-017  Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	There is already in place its own plant, trees and associated biodiversity sustaining wildlife including deer birds insects etc. You can't come close to replicating what nature has done decades and possibly centuries	Things should be left as they are especially when it comes to destroying valuable farmland	Noted.
MM7.14m & MM7.14q  MM7.12	MOD-NRF011  Nottinghamshire County Council	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Refers to modified Policy ST16 2.I) and modified Policy ST16 2.I)vii. It removes reference to the Infrastructure Plan and the strategic junctions identified in the Bassetlaw Transport Study but modification 7.12 inserts reference to the Infrastructure Plan 2023 in the text. When consulted on a planning application for the Peaks Hill site, the Highway Authority is likely to recommend the securing of highway infrastructure improvements by way of planning condition where directly related to the development. Given the likely reduced level of CIL funding if the Councils proposal to zero rate larger local plan allocations is adopted, NCC will make the case for development to contribute to strategic highway improvements which address the cumulative impacts of major Local Plan developments as referenced in the Bassetlaw Transport Study. Whilst Infrastructure improvements that cannot be attributed to any individual site(s) should normally be funded through CIL, NCC will continue to work with the District Council to seek a mechanism to apportion appropriate costs and seek developer contributions through S106. Note that the Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a living document and as set out in para 12.3.9 of the Plan will be reviewed annually and guided by the advice of infrastructure partners. MM 7.12 should reflect the fact that the IP2023 will be updated. Wish to		Part 1 of Policy 16 refers to supporting infrastructure identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023. MM13.10 in the Glossary Plan 2023 confirms that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023 is no longer considered to be live. The IDP 2023 represents the position as of May 2023. The Council does not intend to continuously review the IDP. The deletion of the reference to a living IDP in para 12.3.9 is addressed through an Additional Modification AM12.3.9. However, as stated at the CIL hearing the Council fully intends to monitor and review the Infrastructure Funding Statement annually. This would include identification of appropriate mechanisms to deliver necessary transport infrastructure projects to support the Local Plan identified by the County Council. The County Council would also have the opportunity through the planning application process to ensure the scope of the site-specific Transport Assessment is appropriate and to engage on appropriate delivery mechanisms. Should large

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			work with the Council as an infrastructure partner to ensure that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is kept up to date and clarified further as necessary to help support the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure generated by the Local Plan. Wish to continue to work with the Council and other relevant authorities on an Improvement Plan for the A57.		allocations be CIL exempt it is worth noting that CIL would still exist in the District, so could be an appropriate mechanism to contribute towards strategic infrastructure. The Council intends to continue to work with the County Council to ensure infrastructure improvements required as a consequence of new development are secured via an appropriate mechanism. Additionally, the Council would welcome further discussions with the County Council as the Highways Authority and partners about progressing the A57 Improvement Plan.
<b>Policy 21: Site HS7: Trinity Farm, Retford</b>					
<b>MM7.32</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	Land immediately south of HS7 (buff shading on Figure 1 below) is covered by Outline planning application for 196 dwellings (15/00493/OUT) and 11 hectares of employment land. The residential scheme is now being built out by Avant Homes (20/01477/RES), and the employment land to the east of North Road (EM006) will shortly be brought forward. Support the proposed allocations and remain committed to delivery, as high quality housing in a sustainable location to the north of Retford, one of the most sustainable settlements in Bassetlaw. This should be read alongside the Statement of Common Ground, our Regulation 19 submissions and Hearing Statements		Noted.
<b>MM7.32</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the	Not stated	MM7.32 provides for the inclusion of approximately within the Policy. This is an improvement and is supported, as it provides greater clarity to interested parties that the figure in the Local Plan is indicative. The final quantum of housing which can be delivered on the allocated sites is		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Holy and Undivided Trinity		best informed by site specific evidence and masterplanning undertaken to support a planning application. It is clearly not acceptable to withhold a permission for example because the number of units delivered is in excess of the indicative figure within the Local Plan, if there is no evidence of any harm of such an increase. Such an approach would conflict with the NPPF in respect of boosting significantly the supply of housing and making efficient use of land		
<b>MM7.33</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	No objection to proposed deletion and agree with rationale provided.		Noted.
<b>MM7.34</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	No objection to proposed inclusions.		Noted.
<b>MM7.34</b>	MOD-NRF012  Historic England	Not stated	Supportive of confirming what archaeological assessment is required		Noted.
<b>MM7.35</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the	Not stated	Support the proposed deletion.		Noted.



<b>MM Number:</b>	<b>Representation Reference: Name:</b>	<b>Legal compliance and soundness:</b>	<b>Summary of Comments made:</b>	<b>Suggested changes by consultee:</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
	Holy and Undivided Trinity				
<b>MM7.36</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	No objection to proposed inclusions		Noted.
<b>MM7.37</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	As the Council will be aware the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a 'live' document and can be continuously reviewed as the situation develops. In this context, the addition of 2023 is not considered beneficial as it now links the Policy to the IDP as delivered today.		MM13.10 in the Glossary confirms that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023 is no longer considered to be live. The IDP 2023 represents the position as of May 2023. The Council does not intend to continuously review the IDP. The deletion of the reference to a living IDP in para 12.3.9 is addressed through an Additional Modification AM12.3.9.
<b>MM7.38</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	The Tracked Changes Plan shows the full deletion of criterion d, however it does not appear within the Main Modifications matrix as it appears on the Plan. Fully support the proposed deletion - given it does not form part of the schedule, which is the changes formally being consulted upon, it will not be deleted. The status of this criterion should be clarified to ensure it can be deleted, which is eminently justified.		This proposed change is covered by MM0.11.
<b>MM7.38a</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the	Not stated	A comprehensive masterplan is already a requirement of Policy ST58 which essentially means that the proposed revision MM7.38a duplicates existing policy text and does not substantially alter the expectations of development forthcoming on the site.		The submitted Policy 21 made reference to a masterplan, MM7.38a seeks to improve the effectiveness of Policy 21 by moving the requirement from the end of the policy to Part 1. No duplication is proposed.


<b>MM Number:</b>	<b>Representation Reference: Name:</b>	<b>Legal compliance and soundness:</b>	<b>Summary of Comments made:</b>	<b>Suggested changes by consultee:</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
	Holy and Undivided Trinity				
<b>MM7.38a</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	The addition of the word 'reflects' is considered to be beneficial, as it clarifies the expectations of development.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38b</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	No objection to proposed amendments to policy.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38c</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	No objection to proposed amendments to policy. The requirement for intrusive site investigations was not justified in evidence supporting the Plan. The modification provides a more logical and consistent approach to heritage assets which allows for necessary desk-based and non-intrusive works prior to determining whether intrusive investigations are necessary.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38c</b>	MOD-NRF012  Historic England	Not stated	Re-worded modification around archaeological assessment is supported		Noted.
<b>MM7.38d</b>	MOD-NRF003	Not stated	No objection to proposed amendments to policy		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity				
<b>MM7.38e</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	No objection to proposed amendments to policy.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38f</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	The removal of reference to 1.5ha, in respect of multifunctional publicly accessible open space is supported. This requirement was not justified.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38g</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	Support proposed amendment to policy.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38h</b>	MOD-NRF003	Not stated	Support the proposed deletion. As previously worded the requirement may not have been CIL test compliant as the issue of capacity of service is to be fluid and thus whilst a		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity		contribution may be applicable at time of writing of the policy, it may not be at the time an application is submitted. If it is necessary to make the development acceptable at the time of submission, such a payment would be CIL compliant and thus payment would be justified		
<b>MM7.38i</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	Consider the amended wording better relates to the CIL tests and thus is considered sound, when compared with the wording it replaces.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38j</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	Support the proposed amendments. Whilst the Plan is supported by highways evidence, it is site specific detailed highways evidence as demonstrated through a detailed Transport Assessment which best sets out the impacts of the development and any necessary mitigation required. County highways input will be valuable, the removal of the reference in the policy is considered sensible.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38k</b>	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	Support the proposed amendments. Agree that it was not necessary to include a cycle track between the two phases if appropriate cycle infrastructure is provided for on North Road as is the intention through the amendment below.		Noted.
<b>MM7.38l</b>	MOD-NRF003	Not stated	No objection to amendments in accordance with the above. Understood that the existing shared use path link on North Road to serve Phase 2 of the development.		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity				
MM7.38m	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	No objection albeit not considered that the amendment is particularly beneficial.		Noted.
MM7.38n	MOD-NRF003  Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity	Not stated	Support the proposed amendment, particularly the removal of the specific junctions referenced in the policy. This Plan and the current iteration of the IDP are snapshots in time. It may be that when an application is submitted, supported by detailed modelling, that improvements are not required to the junctions to make the development acceptable. In this context, the policy presumption that improvements are required would not satisfy the CIL tests. Now represented in policy that the extent of highways mitigation and improvements can only be established at the time of submission, as identified through an appropriate Transport Assessment, reflecting the housing mix and the capacity of junctions at that time, in agreement with the LHA		MM13.10 in the Glossary confirms that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023 is no longer considered to be live. The IDP 2023 represents the position as of May 2023. The Council does not intend to continuously review the IDP. The deletion of the reference to a living IDP in para 12.3.9 is addressed through an Additional Modification AM12.3.9.
MM7.38n	MOD-NRF011  Nottinghamshire County Council	Not stated	Modifications to Policy ST21 repeats the approach taken to Policy ST16 with transport and connectivity provisions set out at ST21 2.k, and k)viii. The Highway Authority's response is the same in terms of the future approach to		Noted.

<b>MM Number:</b>	<b>Representation Reference: Name:</b>	<b>Legal compliance and soundness:</b>	<b>Summary of Comments made:</b>	<b>Suggested changes by consultee:</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
			securing appropriate transport mitigations and contribution to strategic highway improvements.		
<b>Policy 27: HS13: Ordsall South</b>					
<b>MM7.57</b>	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	Ordsall South has the capacity for 1,250 dwellings and an allowance should be made for the Site to be delivered in its entirety during the plan period where there is demand. Construction could begin earlier than anticipated by the Council. An outline planning application has been submitted and is pending determination (22/01633/OUT). It is anticipated that construction will commence in early 2025 and this should be reflected in the Council's housing trajectory.		It is considered that a pragmatic approach to housing delivery at Ordsall South has been taken informed by evidence supplied by the site promoters in previous representations and at the hearings and taking into account the content of the Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010. No changes to the site capacity are considered necessary.
<b>MM7.58</b>	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	Do not object to the Main Modification, should be clear that all landowners within the allocation boundary will be obliged to contribute towards funding the alternative sports provision on site, correlating to the scale of development coming forward at their portion of the Site. At present, the Retford Golf Course land is not within the application 22/01633/OUT boundary; it would not be appropriate for the Applicants of site 22/01633/OUT to solely fund the alternative sports provision triggered by the loss of Retford Golf Club land.		The provisions of national legislation will ensure that all landowners involved with the site make an appropriate contribution to infrastructure proportionate to the number and type of development associated with their part of the site.
<b>MM7.61</b>	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	Support this Main Modification.		Noted.
<b>MM7.62a</b>	MOD-NRF010	Not stated	An allowance should be made for the residual capacity of the site to be delivered within the plan period where there is demand. Confident that all 1,250 residential units can be		The Local Plan policies should be read collectively. Policy ST58 criterion 4 sets out the different mechanisms that could be

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.		delivered within the plan period which would further enhance the housing supply available. Content of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023 is noted, the policy or supporting text should state that the funding of the supporting infrastructure required to accommodate development at the Site will be secured via a Section 106 Agreement which will be negotiated with the Applicant(s) during the determination of associated planning application(s).		used to secure infrastructure. It is not considered necessary to amend the supporting text; paragraph 7.1.12 clarifies that this site would be CIL exempt and also lists the different mechanisms that could be used to secure infrastructure.
<b>MM7.62c</b>	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	<p>Supportive of MM7.62c. As a result of modifications to the proposals map, the green gap designation GG7 lies to the south of the Ordsall South allocation, as denoted at figure 1.1 below. It is not clear how development at the Site could protect and enhance 'the permanent openness with GG7: Retford South-East Green Gap'. As such, this line should be omitted to avoid confusion.</p>  <p>The map shows a central orange-shaded area labeled 'HS13'. To its south and east are two green-shaded areas with a cross-hatch pattern, labeled 'Proposed GG7' and 'Proposed GG8' respectively. A third 'Proposed GG8' label points to a green area to the west of HS13. A grey-shaded urban area is visible to the north of HS13. A small note at the bottom left of the map reads: 'Should be read in conjunction with the Interactive Policies Map. Not regarding Neighbourhood Plan allocations.'</p>		MM7.62c ensures that a landscape statement submitted with a planning application would inform a landscape-led masterplan which would reinforce the landscape qualities in the locality, including the openness of the Green Gap through a variety of design techniques. As per MM7.62c the use of design techniques should be locally specific and agreed at planning application stage. As the site promoters figure 1.1 shows Ordsall South is adjoined by two green gaps – GG7 and GG8. For consistency and to ensure the effective implementation of the policy a change is proposed to MM7.62c ( <b>bold underlined</b> ): a <u>landscape-led scheme of an appropriate scale, layout, form and materials</u> , with a design that responds visually to topography, aspect and local context, informed by a landscape statement and density plan, which protects and enhances the permanent openness within GG7: Retford South-Eaton Green Gap <b>and GG8: Retford West Green Gap</b>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
					in accordance with Policy ST38 and maintains sightlines and long open views across the Idle Valley and to Eaton. This should include:
<b>MM7.62f</b>	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	Support this Main Modification		Noted.
<b>MM7.62m</b>	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	Object to this Main Modification as it fails to take account of previous representations and Hearing contributions. The costs involved with providing land for a new school and its construction are substantial. It would not be reasonable or appropriate to also require a 'financial contribution towards enabling primary school education to address pupil growth.'		The Local Education Authority state that a primary school is needed to support the new development of Ordsall South. As such, the cost should be borne by the developer. See response to Infrastructure Delivery Plan comments below.
<b>MM7.62n</b>	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	Support this Main Modification		Noted.
<b>MM7.62n</b> <b>MM7.62q</b>	MOD-NRF011  Nottinghamshire County Council	Not stated	Refers to the content of Policy ST27 2.m) and the final paragraph of Policy ST27. In response to a planning consultation, the Highway Authority is likely to recommend planning conditions to secure; demand management measures during construction, traffic management schemes through Eaton and Ordsall Village, and improved pedestrian and cycle links. Infrastructure improvements that cannot be attributed to any individual site(s) should be		MM13.10 in the Glossary confirms that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023 is no longer considered to be live. The IDP 2023 represents the position as of May 2023. The Council does not intend to continuously review the IDP. The deletion of the reference to a living IDP in para 12.3.9 is addressed through an Additional



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>funded through CIL unless there is a strong case to pool financial contributions from other nearby sites to address the cumulative impacts of the developments at a specific location. The County Council notes the reference to Ordsall South in para 12.3.17 and associated references to pooling contributions to deliver strategic infrastructure made necessary by multiple developments. It notes that the Bassetlaw Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a living document and as set out in para 12.3.9 will be reviewed annually and guided by the advice of infrastructure partners. Wish to work with the District Council to ensure that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is kept up to date and clarified further as necessary to support the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure. Given the likely reduced level of CIL funding if the proposal to zero rate larger local plan allocations is adopted, the County Council will make a case for the development to contribute to strategic highway improvements which address the cumulative impacts of major Local Plan developments as referenced in the Bassetlaw Transport Study. Whilst Infrastructure improvements that cannot be attributed to any individual site(s) should normally be funded through CIL, will continue to work with the District Council to seek a mechanism to apportion appropriate costs and justify developer contributions through S106 planning obligations</p>		<p>Modification AM12.3.9. However, as stated at the CIL hearing the Council fully intends to monitor and review the Infrastructure Funding Statement annually. This would include identification of appropriate mechanisms to deliver necessary transport infrastructure projects to support the Local Plan identified by the County Council. The County Council would also have the opportunity through a planning application to ensure the scope of the site-specific Transport Assessment is appropriate and to engage on appropriate delivery mechanisms. Should large allocations be CIL exempt it is worth noting that CIL would still exist in the District, so could be an appropriate mechanism to contribute towards strategic infrastructure.</p>
<b>MM7.62p</b>	<p>MOD-NRF010</p> <p>Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.</p>	Not stated	<p>Support this Main Modification. Highways work required to mitigate any adverse impact of development at Ordsall South should be identified and informed by a Transport Assessment.</p>		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM7.62q	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	Support this Main Modification.		Noted.
MM7.62s	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited.	Not stated	Support this Main Modification.		Noted.
Not stated	MOD-NRF010  Stantec on behalf of Howard (Retford) Limited	Not stated	Appendix 2 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023 details the infrastructure which is required to deliver Site HS13 Ordsall South. Of the view that a number of requirements are not justified and has provided a comment next to each Infrastructure Item identified by the Council at Table B.1 below.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Education:</b> The IDP 2023 paragraph 3.9 maintains the County Council's position at the hearings that 'a development of the size of Ordsall South would be expected to generate sufficient demand to sustain its own primary school, plus associated pre-school. Based on the total number of pupils generated and taking into account forecast capacity in the Retford primary planning area, the development would need to provide land and contributions to deliver a 1FE (210 places) primary school with the ability to expand to 1.5FE (315 places). The land and costs below would need to be secured via a planning obligation and are based on the cost per pupil data contained in the current NCC</li> </ul>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response																																										
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="680 344 1189 357">Site HS13: Ordsall South, Retford</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="680 357 748 370">Infrastructure Type</th> <th data-bbox="754 357 887 370">Infrastructure Item</th> <th data-bbox="893 357 1189 370">Our Client's Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="680 375 1189 387"><b>Education</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 392 748 469">Education, primary</td> <td data-bbox="754 392 887 485">1.5ha of serviced land to accommodate a 1.0 Form Entry primary school and early years facility and associated supporting infrastructure; and an appropriate financial contribution towards enabling primary school education</td> <td data-bbox="893 392 1189 571"> <p>In the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Baseline Assessment (document reference: TI-007), the Council identify that there is projected to be a surplus of 263 primary places in the Retford Primary Planning Area in the five-year projection period 2019-2024, and that there is sufficient primary school places in Retford to accommodate the needs of the proposed development in the Local Plan (paragraph 4.17).</p> <p>As part of the scheme at Ordsall South, as required by Policy 27, our Client has identified 1.5ha of land sufficient to accommodate a 1.0 Form primary school.</p> <p>As the existing capacity of primary schools in Retford is sufficient to meet demand over the plan period, and a new primary school is to be delivered at Ordsall South, it is considered that a financial contribution towards enabling primary school education to address pupil growth associated with the development is not justified.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="680 571 1189 584"><b>Social Infrastructure</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 584 748 619">Healthcare, primary</td> <td data-bbox="754 584 887 619">New GP branch surgery - approx. 218 sqm GIA - and community healthcare facilities on-site</td> <td data-bbox="893 584 1189 619">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 624 748 643">Local Centre</td> <td data-bbox="754 624 887 643">A Local Centre on site</td> <td data-bbox="893 624 1189 643">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 647 748 692">A community hub</td> <td data-bbox="754 647 887 692">A community hub on site to include indoor and outdoor sports facilities and ancillary accommodation</td> <td data-bbox="893 647 1189 692">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="680 692 1189 705"><b>Green Infrastructure</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 705 748 734">Community Park</td> <td data-bbox="754 705 887 734">A 23ha country park and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace on site</td> <td data-bbox="893 705 1189 734">Our client is of the view that it would be more appropriate to describe this provision as a 'community park'.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 738 748 758">Open space</td> <td data-bbox="754 738 887 758">Provision of multifunctional open space on-site</td> <td data-bbox="893 738 1189 758">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 762 748 782">Food production</td> <td data-bbox="754 762 887 782">Provision of space for food production on site</td> <td data-bbox="893 762 1189 782">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 786 748 805">Green Infrastructure</td> <td data-bbox="754 786 887 805">Provision of trees to contribute to climate change mitigation</td> <td data-bbox="893 786 1189 805">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="680 810 1189 823"><b>Transport</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Site HS13: Ordsall South, Retford			Infrastructure Type	Infrastructure Item	Our Client's Response	<b>Education</b>			Education, primary	1.5ha of serviced land to accommodate a 1.0 Form Entry primary school and early years facility and associated supporting infrastructure; and an appropriate financial contribution towards enabling primary school education	<p>In the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Baseline Assessment (document reference: TI-007), the Council identify that there is projected to be a surplus of 263 primary places in the Retford Primary Planning Area in the five-year projection period 2019-2024, and that there is sufficient primary school places in Retford to accommodate the needs of the proposed development in the Local Plan (paragraph 4.17).</p> <p>As part of the scheme at Ordsall South, as required by Policy 27, our Client has identified 1.5ha of land sufficient to accommodate a 1.0 Form primary school.</p> <p>As the existing capacity of primary schools in Retford is sufficient to meet demand over the plan period, and a new primary school is to be delivered at Ordsall South, it is considered that a financial contribution towards enabling primary school education to address pupil growth associated with the development is not justified.</p>	<b>Social Infrastructure</b>			Healthcare, primary	New GP branch surgery - approx. 218 sqm GIA - and community healthcare facilities on-site	No Comment.	Local Centre	A Local Centre on site	No Comment.	A community hub	A community hub on site to include indoor and outdoor sports facilities and ancillary accommodation	No Comment.	<b>Green Infrastructure</b>			Community Park	A 23ha country park and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace on site	Our client is of the view that it would be more appropriate to describe this provision as a 'community park'.	Open space	Provision of multifunctional open space on-site	No Comment.	Food production	Provision of space for food production on site	No Comment.	Green Infrastructure	Provision of trees to contribute to climate change mitigation	No Comment.	<b>Transport</b>				<p>Developer Contributions document.' No change required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Infrastructure:</b> Based on previous representations and discussions at the hearing it is considered that reference to country park is appropriate.</li> <li>• <b>Transport:</b> The content of the Transport Assessment accompanying the planning application is not a matter for the Main Modifications. However, it is considered that the policy requirement proposed by MM7.62p is justified and is better able to reflect the scope for highway impacts to be resolved through mitigation measures and to better reflect the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>• <b>Utilities:</b> The IDP 2023 paragraph 3.76 states 'utility providers are private companies that charge for their services, so their upfront provision costs are off-set by what developers pay in terms of initial charges and by future revenues from billing new customers. The utilities companies have not identified any need for strategic infrastructure over the plan period. Therefore, utilities infrastructure, in terms of waste water, water, electricity, gas and digital infrastructure will require local connections to the existing network</li> </ul>
Site HS13: Ordsall South, Retford																																															
Infrastructure Type	Infrastructure Item	Our Client's Response																																													
<b>Education</b>																																															
Education, primary	1.5ha of serviced land to accommodate a 1.0 Form Entry primary school and early years facility and associated supporting infrastructure; and an appropriate financial contribution towards enabling primary school education	<p>In the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Baseline Assessment (document reference: TI-007), the Council identify that there is projected to be a surplus of 263 primary places in the Retford Primary Planning Area in the five-year projection period 2019-2024, and that there is sufficient primary school places in Retford to accommodate the needs of the proposed development in the Local Plan (paragraph 4.17).</p> <p>As part of the scheme at Ordsall South, as required by Policy 27, our Client has identified 1.5ha of land sufficient to accommodate a 1.0 Form primary school.</p> <p>As the existing capacity of primary schools in Retford is sufficient to meet demand over the plan period, and a new primary school is to be delivered at Ordsall South, it is considered that a financial contribution towards enabling primary school education to address pupil growth associated with the development is not justified.</p>																																													
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>																																															
Healthcare, primary	New GP branch surgery - approx. 218 sqm GIA - and community healthcare facilities on-site	No Comment.																																													
Local Centre	A Local Centre on site	No Comment.																																													
A community hub	A community hub on site to include indoor and outdoor sports facilities and ancillary accommodation	No Comment.																																													
<b>Green Infrastructure</b>																																															
Community Park	A 23ha country park and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace on site	Our client is of the view that it would be more appropriate to describe this provision as a 'community park'.																																													
Open space	Provision of multifunctional open space on-site	No Comment.																																													
Food production	Provision of space for food production on site	No Comment.																																													
Green Infrastructure	Provision of trees to contribute to climate change mitigation	No Comment.																																													
<b>Transport</b>																																															

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response																																							
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 346 741 416">Transport, highways</td> <td data-bbox="748 346 871 416">Two-point distributor standard access to the west part of the site and a single point distributor road access to the east part of the site from Ollerton Road for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</td> <td data-bbox="878 346 1144 416">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 421 741 480">Transport, highways</td> <td data-bbox="748 421 871 480">Any appropriate proportionate financial contribution towards improving highways infrastructure in the locality of the site.</td> <td data-bbox="878 421 1144 480">The Transport Assessment submitted in support of application 22/01633/OUT identifies that only junctions Ordsall Road/A620 Babworth Road and London Road / Whitehouses Road require mitigation measures, with other junctions either operating with spare capacity or not relevant to the proposed development by virtue of being in the vicinity of Worksop.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 485 741 544">Transport, highways</td> <td data-bbox="748 485 871 544">Any appropriate proportionate financial contribution towards the provision of off-site traffic management schemes along Main Road, Galton and at Ordsall Old Village.</td> <td data-bbox="878 485 1144 544">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 549 741 576">Transport, highways</td> <td data-bbox="748 549 871 576">New and improved pedestrian and cycle links from the site to neighbouring areas.</td> <td data-bbox="878 549 1144 576">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 580 741 620">Transport, highways</td> <td data-bbox="748 580 871 620">New footway and marked cycle path along the Ollerton Road frontage (east and west) to connect to the existing network at Ordsall.</td> <td data-bbox="878 580 1144 620">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 625 741 665">Transport, highways</td> <td data-bbox="748 625 871 665">Improvements to the existing public rights of way that cross the site and run along its boundaries.</td> <td data-bbox="878 625 1144 665">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 670 741 710">Transport, highways</td> <td data-bbox="748 670 871 710">Provision of a new footpath and marked cycle path along the Ollerton Road frontage – on-site.</td> <td data-bbox="878 670 1144 710">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 715 741 774">Transport, highways</td> <td data-bbox="748 715 871 774">Any appropriate financial contribution towards a high frequency bus services from the site to Retford town centre and the wider area supported by appropriate public transport infrastructure within the site.</td> <td data-bbox="878 715 1144 774">No Comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="680 778 741 786"><b>Utilities</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 791 741 815">Utilities</td> <td data-bbox="748 791 871 815">Waste water management infrastructure upgrades</td> <td data-bbox="878 791 1144 815">It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to waste water management infrastructure of treatment upgrades.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 820 741 844">Utilities</td> <td data-bbox="748 820 871 844">Water management infrastructure upgrades</td> <td data-bbox="878 820 1144 844">It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to water management infrastructure of treatment upgrades.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 849 741 873">Utilities</td> <td data-bbox="748 849 871 873">Necessary improvements to enable connection to the electricity transmission network</td> <td data-bbox="878 849 1144 873">It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to improvements to the electricity transmission network.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="680 877 741 901">Utilities</td> <td data-bbox="748 877 871 901">Necessary improvements to enable connection to the digital infrastructure network</td> <td data-bbox="878 877 1144 901">It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to improvement to the digital infrastructure network.</td> </tr> </table>	Transport, highways	Two-point distributor standard access to the west part of the site and a single point distributor road access to the east part of the site from Ollerton Road for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.	No Comment.	Transport, highways	Any appropriate proportionate financial contribution towards improving highways infrastructure in the locality of the site.	The Transport Assessment submitted in support of application 22/01633/OUT identifies that only junctions Ordsall Road/A620 Babworth Road and London Road / Whitehouses Road require mitigation measures, with other junctions either operating with spare capacity or not relevant to the proposed development by virtue of being in the vicinity of Worksop.	Transport, highways	Any appropriate proportionate financial contribution towards the provision of off-site traffic management schemes along Main Road, Galton and at Ordsall Old Village.	No Comment.	Transport, highways	New and improved pedestrian and cycle links from the site to neighbouring areas.	No Comment.	Transport, highways	New footway and marked cycle path along the Ollerton Road frontage (east and west) to connect to the existing network at Ordsall.	No Comment.	Transport, highways	Improvements to the existing public rights of way that cross the site and run along its boundaries.	No Comment.	Transport, highways	Provision of a new footpath and marked cycle path along the Ollerton Road frontage – on-site.	No Comment.	Transport, highways	Any appropriate financial contribution towards a high frequency bus services from the site to Retford town centre and the wider area supported by appropriate public transport infrastructure within the site.	No Comment.	<b>Utilities</b>			Utilities	Waste water management infrastructure upgrades	It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to waste water management infrastructure of treatment upgrades.	Utilities	Water management infrastructure upgrades	It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to water management infrastructure of treatment upgrades.	Utilities	Necessary improvements to enable connection to the electricity transmission network	It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to improvements to the electricity transmission network.	Utilities	Necessary improvements to enable connection to the digital infrastructure network	It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to improvement to the digital infrastructure network.		and/or reinforcements to that network. It is usual that such costs are borne directly by the developer.’ No change required.
Transport, highways	Two-point distributor standard access to the west part of the site and a single point distributor road access to the east part of the site from Ollerton Road for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.	No Comment.																																										
Transport, highways	Any appropriate proportionate financial contribution towards improving highways infrastructure in the locality of the site.	The Transport Assessment submitted in support of application 22/01633/OUT identifies that only junctions Ordsall Road/A620 Babworth Road and London Road / Whitehouses Road require mitigation measures, with other junctions either operating with spare capacity or not relevant to the proposed development by virtue of being in the vicinity of Worksop.																																										
Transport, highways	Any appropriate proportionate financial contribution towards the provision of off-site traffic management schemes along Main Road, Galton and at Ordsall Old Village.	No Comment.																																										
Transport, highways	New and improved pedestrian and cycle links from the site to neighbouring areas.	No Comment.																																										
Transport, highways	New footway and marked cycle path along the Ollerton Road frontage (east and west) to connect to the existing network at Ordsall.	No Comment.																																										
Transport, highways	Improvements to the existing public rights of way that cross the site and run along its boundaries.	No Comment.																																										
Transport, highways	Provision of a new footpath and marked cycle path along the Ollerton Road frontage – on-site.	No Comment.																																										
Transport, highways	Any appropriate financial contribution towards a high frequency bus services from the site to Retford town centre and the wider area supported by appropriate public transport infrastructure within the site.	No Comment.																																										
<b>Utilities</b>																																												
Utilities	Waste water management infrastructure upgrades	It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to waste water management infrastructure of treatment upgrades.																																										
Utilities	Water management infrastructure upgrades	It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to water management infrastructure of treatment upgrades.																																										
Utilities	Necessary improvements to enable connection to the electricity transmission network	It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to improvements to the electricity transmission network.																																										
Utilities	Necessary improvements to enable connection to the digital infrastructure network	It is not considered justified for the Applicant at Ordsall South to cover all the costs relating to improvement to the digital infrastructure network.																																										
<b>Policy 28: Site HS14: Ollerton Road, Tuxford</b>																																												
Not stated	MOD-REF019 Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes Soundness - No	HS14 is the one site outside the three Main Towns. Under the header of Social and community facilities, all words have been struck and replaced with a bland statement “new and/or improved social, community and green infrastructure to meet the needs of the development”. Unclear why this change took place, does not support fact and do NOT support it. Both schools are full, and Tuxford Medical Centre is busy, it seemed reasonable to assess that this sort of contribution is a necessary part of ensuring that HS14 is sustainable. Absent funds for these purposes as BDC has stated will be the case, that HS14 is not	Remove the text under Policy 28 and all references to HS14 in the text of the plan. Remove the developer obligation related to the S106 on HS14 from the financial analysis	Following on from the Council’s MIQ response, the Council had further discussions at the Hearings with the Inspectors and other interested parties on matters the Inspectors considered relevant, including the proposed change to social and community facilities criterion. This resulted in BDC-44 and BDC-44a, following which the Inspectors requested through their Post Hearing Note (INS-10) that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan would																																							

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>sustainable, and fails the sustainability test under NPPF and should be refused development. Text has been changed by BDC in response to the MIQ from the Inspector equally, text that has not been changed, despite questions from the Inspector having been raised as Matters, are suitable for comment. Question 14.3 in Matter 14 contained six questions. BDC responded with Action 95 (BDC 44 and BDC44a) - comments are derived from this document. BDC reviews the total costs for infrastructure linked to delivery of the employment and housing identified in Worksop and Retford. Para 4 states: "The tables focus on the infrastructure considered by the Council to be necessary to mitigate the impact of new development as defined by the IDP [BG-041] as: infrastructure that must happen so that development does not have a significant adverse impact on existing infrastructure." Then "They are usually identified... as necessary to make a proposed development acceptable in planning terms." In other words, absent the infrastructure the development would NOT be acceptable in planning terms. Then concludes "In the first instance, these are considered to be a S106 contribution cost. But for CIL liable sites, CIL may be used." The LPMM 12.3.19 "it confirms... with the planning obligations sought in this Local Plan... can be achievable for sites of less than 50 dwellings with the proposed CIL rate..." It then says "Site allocations delivering 50 or more dwellings are expected to provide for significant infrastructure onsite and/or through developer contributions, will be exempt from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)." This last section is unchanged; it was the topic of a specific question in the MIQ, 14.3 b), but has not been answered in Action 95, and therefore live. BDC prefer S106; the primary legislation for S106 is broad</p>		<p>benefit from further clarity. It stated that the Council had confirmed that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Baseline Assessment 2021 would be revised to identify the specific provision or contributions to improvements that would be necessary to accommodate Local Plan growth on a site-by-site basis. This is now known as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023 (MOD-007). The information contained therein provided by the relevant infrastructure partners is considered appropriate to justify the change in policy criteria and to better align with the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 12.3.11 of the Local Plan sets out the national legal tests that apply for S106 agreements. They must be necessary, directly related to the development and reasonably related in scale and kind. Any future S106 agreement for a site in Tuxford must mitigate identified impacts upon relevant infrastructure in the locality. The IDP 2023 states that S106 contributions will be sought for social, community, transport and green infrastructure which would as per the legislation be spent in Tuxford. The Local Plan and the Council have not stated that secondary education S106 contributions would be spent in Worksop. As Tuxford has a made neighbourhood plan 25% of CIL receipts generated in the Parish will be made</p>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>and gives no limits to purpose entered into between a person interested in land and the local planning authority. Refers to the definition of Planning Obligations on the Council's website. The purpose is for S106 funds to be spent in providing improvements to the infrastructure in <i>the impacted area</i> in the categories mentioned in order to ensure no strain is put upon them. This is consistent with the reference to "on site" above. The tables in Action 95 include a set of Policy sites; all are either in Worksop or Retford, except one – HS14. The tables state the total sums which, it states, have been "secured via Section 106 agreement". A total of £713,557 will come from a S106 agreement for HS14 – the only site outside Worksop or Retford. When the contributions per site and the categories of contribution are plotted <i>only two sites are hit with a demand for contributions to every category</i>: The largest site, Peaks Hill Farm requires transport infrastructure from scratch and Peaks Hill Secondary School and HS14 in Tuxford, which will benefit from nothing. BDC considered it was unreasonable to burden Retford sites with a contribution to the Secondary school (which is a reasonable indication that BDC recognise there will be no spaces for Retford students in Peaks Hill); likewise – apart from Peaks Hill, no other sites in Worksop were burdened with transport contributions, with Worksop's transport contribution being taken by employment sites. Yet Tuxford is burdened with every category. The narrative explains what the funds will be used for. Education will be used for a Secondary Education facility at Peaks Hill Farm 34 miles from Tuxford. The document explains that the Peaks Hill development (930 houses) will take around half of the school's capacity but with 2560 within Worksop, it will be full with residents</p>		<p>available to the Parish Council to spend on infrastructure identified as necessary to help deliver the vision of the neighbourhood plan so would also be spent in the locality. Requirements for education and transport are informed by the County Council as Local Education Authority/Highways Authority not by the District Council.</p>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>of Worksop. Recognise there are challenges with expanding schools in Tuxford, no provision is not a viable plan. Transport money will be used on transport infrastructure between Worksop and Retford; nothing to help alleviate the HS14. No specific comments related to health but there will be a need for new primary care facilities associated with each of the two major sites in Worksop/Retford. For Green infrastructure there are clear plans in Greening Bassetlaw for this to be spent in Worksop. There will be no financial contributions from HS14 available to enable TTC to allocate – or recommend – any of the necessary infrastructure. HS14 would represent around 50% of the remaining minimum allocation during the Plan period. It is not going to be possible to “catch up”, even if BDC didn’t pull the same trick again, having set this as a precedent, to fund the further infrastructure in Worksop which it has not yet costed. BDC has lumped a single site in Tuxford with a set of sites in Worksop and Retford. Both of these Towns will see significant infrastructure; new schools, road and transport infrastructure built from scratch, new major parks and green spaces. Tuxford will get nothing. Have checked with the two Tuxford schools and they confirm their intake is full. Unaware of any offers of funding to expand or any request to do so.</p>		
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	S106 funding should be used for infrastructure necessary to enable that development to go ahead, without it, the development is unsustainable. Yet HS14, which will not benefit from any of the infrastructure for which its S106 funds have been agreed (with the exception of the unknown proportion of health for Acute Care – Worksop Hospital), is assessed to be a contributor in every category. Given that HS14 is assessed for S106	The S106 text be limited to the three Towns, where such large-scale new infrastructure will clearly be needed “on-site”, or: The S106 text be updated such that	There is no planning application for HS14 and no signed S106 agreement. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is setting out the types of infrastructure that the Council would expect to be delivered via a s106 agreement in the future. It is for the infrastructure partners e.g. County Council to identify appropriate

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>payments, which proves there is a need for those facilities, no facilities will be forthcoming within Tuxford. There is no space in the schools; increased traffic along Ollerton Road once construction is complete, and the Ollerton Road/Eldon Street junction is already at or near capacity, implying some improvements would be required; HS14 when it comes forward with its current S106 signed agreement as part of the Planning Application – <i>must be considered unsustainable as there will be no money for any of the necessary infrastructure within Tuxford so will therefore be obliged to refuse permission. There is no reasonable likelihood of the site being developed within the plan and must be removed from the Plan to be considered sound.</i></p>	<p>S106 funds should be spent on new infrastructure within the Settlement where the development took place;</p>	<p>mitigation/infrastructure, such as improving provision at local schools. Paragraph 12.3.11 of the Local Plan sets out the national legal tests that apply for S106 agreements. They must be necessary, directly related to the development and reasonably related in scale and kind. Any future S106 agreement for a site in Tuxford must mitigate identified impacts upon relevant infrastructure in the locality. The IDP 2023 states that S106 contributions will be sought for social, community, transport and green infrastructure which would as per the legislation be spent in Tuxford.</p>
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	<p>Legally Compliant – Yes</p> <p>Soundness - No</p>	<p>In reference to Matter 14, MIQ 6.5 asks whether the housing allocation in Tuxford is sound. BDC has not effectively answered this. In the context of BDC’s response to Matter 14: a) Policies are clear; they are not justified, they would probably be very effective b) Site yield has been looked at; site HS14 is NOT viable; c) There is evidence from BDC’s own documents to confirm <i>HS14 is NOT viable</i>; it cannot be developed during the Plan period so should be removed from the plan until either a new S106 agreement (contributing to Tuxford directly) or a CIL agreement is in place. d) Policies are complete but not sufficiently flexible for developments outside the Main Towns; if this approach is accepted, it is likely to become a template for future updates to the Plan and this would set a precedent e) The modifications are not necessary; they lead to HS14 at least being unsustainable and serve to make the plan unsound.</p>		<p>See responses above in relation to infrastructure. The MM’s are considered to make the policy sufficiently flexible to manage appropriate development on site HS14.</p>



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	The policy provides an effective framework to achieve sustainable transport for the main Towns. It does NOT provide a framework for sustainable transport for Tuxford. Refers to attached draft Community Priorities Statement – people do not use sustainable transport, primarily because the level of HGV traffic through Tuxford makes cycling unsafe and walking less than pleasant. It is not surprising that 0% of the Students who live in Tuxford stated they cycled to school. Tuxford is a small town (or a large village) and it is worrying. The plan does NOT do enough to promote sustainable travel.		MM7.68f states that necessary transport improvements for the development will need to be evidenced through a Transport Statement for the application. This would cover sustainable transport.
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Do not support HS14 being used as a cash cow for transport infrastructure miles away which is of no benefit to Tuxford residents - the biggest issue residents complain about is HGV traffic through the small Georgian town centre; the plan to force the two smaller employment sites into the B2/B8 category will exacerbate this for no good purpose. The issue of HGV traffic through the middle of Tuxford is the biggest issue facing residents. This has been an issue for decades; it was an issue in the last NP and is the biggest issue for the next. Know that NPs are not permitted to address traffic volumes directly, but there are ways to address this. Would rather work with BDC to address this.		See responses above in relation to infrastructure. S106 agreement cannot be used to address existing infrastructure issues. The County Council as Highways Authority have not objected to the allocation of site HS14. The Council would welcome the opportunity to continue engagement with Tuxford Town Council in relation to their neighbourhood plan and other strategic planning matters.
<b>Policy ST29: Affordable Housing</b>					
<b>MM7.72a-c</b>	MOD-REF024  Planning Issues Town Planning and Architecture on behalf of Churchill	Legally Compliant – Not stated  Soundness - No	Policy ST29 sets a policy requirement for 20% affordable housing provision on brownfield land. Representations at the Regulation 19 and a Hearing Statement demonstrate that it was not viable for specialist older persons' housing to meet the affordable housing requirement. The inability of retirement living housing to meet the policy requirements appears to have been addressed through		MM7.72c addresses those exceptional cases where the provision of specialist housing, such as sheltered or extra care, may make on site affordable housing provision difficult. This is considered to align with national policy/national planning practice guidance and does not mean that

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Retirement Living		sub-clause 9, which adds increased flexibility on development viability. This moves development viability from Plan-making to development management, which is a deviation from Paragraph 58 of the NPPF. There remains no specific reference to the viability difficulties associated with specialist older persons' housing or apartments in the policy or supporting text. These difficulties are made clear in the Council's evidence base. Burdening specialist accommodation with an unrealistic affordable housing requirement on the presumption that viability will be considered on a site-specific basis, but not making this clear in the policy creates uncertainty and opportunity for conflict. It will be assumed that applications for sheltered or extra care housing will be able to support a policy compliant level of affordable housing. This makes the development management process more challenging for specialist accommodation and increases the prospect of applications being taken to Appeal. The PPG advises that <i>'Different (affordable housing) requirements may be set for different types or location of site or types of development'</i> (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 10-001-20190509). It would be appropriate to set a nil affordable housing target for apartments, including sheltered and extra care apartments, in urban areas.		viability will need to be considered on a site by site basis. Criteria 9 is not identified as a Main Modification so has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process.
<b>Policy ST31: Specialist Housing</b>					
<b>MM7.77e</b>	MODNRF-007  Home Builders Federation	Not stated	MM 7.77e seeks to amend criterion 3 of this Policy. This results in a confusing criterion that drops a flood zone policy into a requirement for adaptable dwellings. The result is a confusing policy that needs revising and/or reformatting for it to be more easily understood by plan-users. Policy wording should provide clarity on what the policy intends and should not require re-reading. At the	If it is to be retained suggest that this section be amended: "Proposals for residential market housing should be designed to meet the	Whilst flooding is not the only example highlighted by the PPG it is considered that reference to Flood Zone 1 better aligns with other policies in the Plan and the Plan's Vision and Objectives. Criterion 3 is still considered necessary and justified in that whilst the Government may have

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>Examination, HBF made reference to the caveats set out in the PPG on Optional Technical Standards for Housing Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 56-008-20160519 Revision date: 19 05 2016 and it seems that this is the issue that Council are seeking to address. The PPG caveats for when it would be unreasonable to require M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings are not limited to just flooding, because topography and other circumstances are listed. Flexibility is needed to reflect site specific characteristics. The attempt to address the point by adding a specific reference to Flood Zone 1 in the policy is confusing and potentially misleading and the reference for “alternative measures to enhance accessibility and adaptability” is in direct conflict with the PPG. Question whether reference to M4(2) of the Building Regulations is needed. The requirements to meet Part M4(2) will be superseded by changes to residential Building Regulations. The Government response to ‘Raising accessibility standards for new homes’ states that the Government proposes to mandate the current M4(2) requirement in Building Regulations as a minimum for all new homes, with M4(1) applying in exceptional circumstances. This will be subject to further consultation and will be implemented in due course through the Building Regulations. This criterion could be unnecessary as all new development, including older person’s housing in C3 Use Class is required by Building Regulations.</p>	<p>requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings under Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. Flexibility will be applied where it can be demonstrated that the requirements will not be feasible or viable.’ A consequential amendment to the Target in the Table on page 233 will also be needed so the reference to within Flood Zone 1 is removed.</p>	<p>indicated forthcoming changes to the Building Regulations these are not currently in place. As such, the policy provisions are considered appropriate. To ensure the effective implementation of the policy a change to criterion 3 is proposed (bold underlined/strikethrough): Proposals for residential market housing in Class C3 in <u>Flood Zone 1</u> should be designed to meet the requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings under Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. <b><u>Exceptions circumstances, will be where it can be demonstrated that the requirements will not be feasible or viable or where the proposal is outside Flood Zone 1, proposals should incorporate alternative measures to enhance accessibility and adaptability. Such proposals will be determined on a case by case basis.</u></b></p>
Not stated	MODNRF-007  Home Builders Federation	Not stated	Lack of clarification in relation to Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations. Part M4(3) differentiates between wheelchair adaptable housing and wheelchair accessible housing. Part a) and Part b) are different. M43a sets out standards for wheelchair adaptable housing, M43b relates to wheelchair accessible housing. M43b can only be required	Suggest clarification/factual update is needed in the Local Plan to reflect this distinction, namely:	Although not identified as a proposed Main Modification for clarity and to ensure the effective implementation of the Local Plan the following proposed changes are considered necessary to align with the

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>on affordable housing where the Council has nomination rights. Paragraph 7.19.7 of the Local Plan states that the whole plan viability assessment found the delivery of wheelchair accessible housing would be unviable in combination with the other requirements of the Plan. Would be helpful to clarify whether M4(3)a or the M4(3)b was used. As the paragraph refers to the provision of market dwellings, which the Council would not have nomination rights to, assume it was M4(3)a that was considered. Must take care in looking to require wheelchair adaptable and/or accessible housing. Delivery of the M4(3)b standard is more expensive than M4(3)a which has been found unviable. Wheelchair accessible housing will have a significant impact on site specific viability requiring external funding and/or a reduction in other Section 106 requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criterion e of Policy 27: Site HS13: Ordsall South, Retford which should refer to M4(3)a not just M4(3)</li> <li>• Paragraph 7.19.7 which should refer to M4(3)a</li> <li>• The Target in the Table on page 231 should refer to M4(3)a</li> </ul>	<p>national legislation (bold underlined/strikethrough): 7.19.7: As a starting point, 40 48 <b>wheelchair adaptable</b> market dwellings <b>(designed to Part M4(3)a of the Building Regulations)</b> will be provided at HS13: Ordsall South in this plan period. 7.14.7: On that basis, in addition to the requirements of Policy ST27 5% of market housing will be designed to the higher Building Regulation wheelchair standard (M4 (3)<b>a</b>), and provision will be made for extra care accommodation. Monitoring Framework, Policy 27, Target: • The construction of a range of housing types, sizes and tenures including: 5% of dwellings to be designed to Building Regulations standard M4(3)<b>a</b> to be accessible to those in wheelchairs; extra care accommodation; and where appropriate serviced plots for self-build and custom homes.</p>
<b>Policy ST38: Green Gaps</b>					
<b>MM8.6b</b>	MOD-NRF012  Historic England	Not stated	Support the reference to heritage within this new paragraph but note the deletion in earlier paragraphs relating to the role of heritage and local landscape value in these areas. Keen to ensure that the significance of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting are protected.		Noted. Policy ST42 and Policy 43 provide a positive framework to address proposals that may have an implication for the historic environment. These policies should be read alongside Policy ST38 and other policies in the Plan to help minimise duplication.
<b>MM8.12a</b>	MOD-NRF008	Not stated	Site at Blackstope Lane comprises previously developed, derelict, brownfield land which offers little visual amenity		No comment - this part of the Plan is not identified as a Main Modification and has

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	Knights PLC for Park Broom Homes (Spofforth) Limited.		benefit. Despite this, the site remains identified as falling within 'Green Gap 6' and as such any future proposals for that site will need to demonstrate compliance with Policy ST38. Maintain the objection to this site being considered within a 'Green Gap' on the basis that the site makes little to no positive contribution to the wider surrounding natural environment given its status as a formerly developed brownfield site.		already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process.
MM8.12b	MOD-NRF008  Knights PLC for Park Broom Homes (Spofforth) Limited.	Not stated	Support the shift within the Main Modifications from the criteria previously set out at 2(a) – 2(c) of the policy.		Noted.
<b>Policy ST39: Green and Blue Infrastructure</b>					
MM8.15	MOD-NRF013  R Troop & Son	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Concerned that Policy ST39 needs to provide a better link with Policy ST12 The Visitor Economy and not fetter visitor attraction developments linked to Green/Blue infrastructure.	After “ <i>The Green Infrastructure Study</i> ” please add.....” <i>which recognises the importance of the Visitor Economy and Cultural Assets embedded within Bassetlaw’s rich green and blue infrastructure....</i> ”  At 2c of Policy ST39 delete “ <b>and minimise the environmental</b>	MM8.15 provides a reference to the Green Infrastructure Study to identify the evidence that will inform the approach to be taken to green infrastructure. In that context, it is not considered appropriate to make the change proposed. The evidence used to identify the minimum buffer zones for the green corridors identifies the importance of development minimising environmental effects. The MM is considered appropriate.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				effects upon the green corridor” replacing with “for the purpose of highlighting the cultural asset in benefit to Bassetlaw’s Visitor Economy.”	
MM8.16b	MOD-NRF009  Severn Trent Water	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	The incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) into blue green corridors can help to improve biodiversity, assisting with the wider benefits of utilising SuDS.		Noted.
<b>Policy ST40: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</b>					
MM8.19	MOD-REF015  Natural England	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Consider that paragraph 8.6.11 needs clarification to differentiate between the Clumber Park SSSI and other SSSIs within the District. Natural England amended the 10km Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for Clumber Park SSSI to include a particular requirement for housing developments of 50 dwellings or above to include a Recreational Impact Assessment. This IRZ amendment has now been included on MAGIC maps and Webmap. The amendment was based on the evidence from the Recreational Disturbance Assessment (Footprint Ecology) for Clumber Park SSSI which was carried out as part of Local Plan preparation. For other SSSIs within the District there is no particular requirement for a recreational assessment, but development proposals should ensure that the proposal will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the SSSI has been notified.	Suggest the following changes to paragraph 8.6.11: On that basis, <b>to reduce the impact of potential recreational pressure resulting from additional housing development, Policy ST40 requires that planning applications for residential development of 50 or more dwellings falling within 10km of Clumber Park SSSI</b>	To clarify the approach to be taken within the 10km Impact Risk Zone for Clumber Park SSSI and to ensure the effective implementation of Policy ST40 the following amendments to paragraph 8.6.11 are proposed: On that basis, Policy ST40 identifies that all housing sites <u>of 50 or more dwellings</u> that fall within <del>an</del> <b>the ‘10km Impact Risk Zone’ of a the Clumber Park SSSI</b> will be required to give appropriate consideration, <u>in particular in relation to the potential recreational impact from the proposal upon to the</u> <del>that the</del> <b>Clumber Park SSSI</b> in <del>developing proposals for the site.</del> Where relevant, appropriate mitigation measures will be sought, which may include an appropriate design and layout to protect the <u>integrity of</u>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>are requested to include an assessment of recreational pressure. Where relevant appropriate measures will be sought to mitigate identified adverse impacts such as the provision of natural greenspace within the development site or other appropriate design, layout or management measures to divert visitor pressure away from the SSSI and be a step towards reducing the impacts of recreational disturbance.</p>	<p>the <u>Clumber Park</u> SSSI. Measures will take into account acceptable mitigation identified for a proposal to off-set recreational impact associated with the development. Schemes that propose a lower site threshold to circumvent the policy requirement will be resisted.</p>
<b>MM8.22 and MM8.24c</b>	MOD-REF015 Natural England	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Advise that to reflect the latest information on Biodiversity Net Gain and for clarification paragraphs 8.6.22, 8.6.23 and 8.6.24, and policy ST40 (points 3 and 4) should be amended.	8.6.22 In the last sentence “ <i>Use of the latest Natural England metric ...</i> ” should be replaced by <b>Statutory Biodiversity Metric</b>	To ensure the principles of national legislation can be implemented effectively the following amendments are proposed: Paragraph 8.6.22 last sentence: Use of the latest <del>Natural England</del> <b>Statutory biodiversity</b> metric will be supported to evidence applications. MM8.22:

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>8.6.23 In the first sentence the date for mandatory net gain will be <b>January 2024</b>.</p> <p>8.6.24 Rather than use the term "commuted sum" suggest the following wording (or similar) should be included in this paragraph – "Reflecting legislation <b>net gains should be managed for a minimum of 30 years in accordance with an agreed maintenance scheme, with monitoring and reporting requirements to be agreed as part of the approved scheme.</b> Further guidance will be set out in the Greening Bassetlaw SPD."</p>	<p>The requirement for 40% biodiversity net gain is not expected to be a legal requirement until <del>2023</del> <b>January 2024</b>.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6.24: Reflecting emerging legislation <del>a commuted sum equivalent to net gains</del> <b>should be managed for a minimum of 30 years in accordance with an agreed maintenance scheme will be sought and should be accompanied by a management plan</b> to ensure the continued protection of features. Further guidance will be set out in the Greening Bassetlaw SPD.</p> <p>MM8.24c Policy ST40 Part 3: 3. <del>In line with national legislation, All</del> new development should make provision for <del>at least 10% net biodiversity gain on site, or</del> where it can be demonstrated <b>after following the mitigation hierarchy</b> that <del>for design reasons</del> this is not practicable, off site <b>provision will be considered through an equivalent financial contribution.</b></p> <p>Policy ST40 Part 4: 4. <del>A commuted sum equivalent to</del> <b>Management for a minimum of 30 years in accordance with a maintenance scheme</b> will be sought to manage the biodiversity assets in the long term.</p>



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>Points 3&amp;4 of Policy ST40 suggest the following:</p> <p>In line with national legislation, <b>all new development should make provision for at least 10% biodiversity net gain on-site wherever possible. Off-site provision will only be considered where it can be demonstrated, after following the mitigation hierarchy, that all reasonable opportunities to provide measurable net gains on-site are not achievable. Net gains should be managed for a minimum of 30 years in accordance with an agreed maintenance scheme, with monitoring and reporting requirements to be</b></p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				agreed as part of the approved scheme	
MM8.24a	MOD-REF015 Natural England	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Paragraph 1c of Policy ST40 needs clarification to differentiate between the Clumber Park SSSI and other SSSIs within the District. Natural England amended the 10km Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for Clumber Park SSSI to include a particular requirement for housing developments of 50 dwellings or above to include a Recreational Impact Assessment. This IRZ amendment has now been included on MAGIC maps and WebMap. The amendment was based on the evidence from the Recreational Disturbance Assessment (Footprint Ecology) for Clumber Park SSSI which was carried out as part of Local Plan preparation. For other SSSIs within the District there is no particular requirement for a recreational assessment, but development proposals should ensure that the proposal will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the SSSI has been notified.	Suggest the following changes to 1c of Policy ST40: ... proposals of 50 dwellings or more (which includes piecemeal planning applications for less than 50 dwellings within a wider site) that fall within the 10km 'Impact Risk Zone' of Clumber Park SSSI will be required to demonstrate that appropriate consideration has been given to the development's impact upon the integrity of that SSSI, including recreational impact. Where relevant, appropriate mitigation measures will be sought, which may include the provision of natural greenspace within the development site or	To clarify the approach to be taken within the 10km Impact Risk Zone for Clumber Park SSSI and the IRZ for other SSSIs in the District and to ensure the effective implementation of Policy ST40 the following amendments are proposed to MM8.24a: <u>Proposals of 50 dwellings or more (which includes piecemeal planning applications for less than 50 dwellings within a wider site) that fall within the '10km Impact Risk Zone' of the Clumber Park SSSI will be required to demonstrate that appropriate consideration has been given to the development's impact upon the integrity of the SSSI, including recreational impact. Where relevant, appropriate mitigation measures will be sought, which may include the provision of natural greenspace within the development site or other appropriate design, layout or management measures and/or a financial contribution to help mitigate identified impacts at the Clumber Park SSSI.</u>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				other appropriate design, layout or management measures and/or a financial contribution to help mitigate identified impacts at Clumber Park SSSI.	
<b>MM8.24c</b>	MOD-NRF007  Home Builders Federation	Not stated	MM8.24c does not reflect the Environment Act which requires 10% Biodiversity Net Gain, or the emerging national policy, guidance and Best Practice on how Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain will be implemented in practice. Guidance is still emerging as preparation for the introduction of Biodiversity Net Gain in Nov 2023 continues. The policy wording says 'off site through an equivalent financial contribution' is incorrect. The national BNG 4.0 Metric considers not only the type of the biodiversity asset, but also its condition and rarity. The metric requires any lost biodiversity to be replaced with either a like-for-like asset(s) or one of a better quality. It is not possible to 'trade down'. The metric also incentivises the implementation of BNG closest to the site, through the multipliers applied to off-site provision and the high cost of statutory credits. It is inaccurate for the policy to refer to an equivalent financial contribution as reliance on the statutory credits is deliberately more expensive than providing on-site BNG or delivering BNG units off-site. BNG can be delivered via either a Section 106 agreement or through a Conservation Covenant. It may well be that a developer delivers BNG through BNG off-site unit payments to a Responsible Body who is not the LPA. This arrangement would not comply with a policy requiring "a commuted sum equivalent to 30 years maintenance" being	Suggest that the policy should be amended to say: Biodiversity Net Gain 3. In line with national legislation, all new development should make provision for 10% biodiversity net gain. This should be provided on site where possible and practicable unless there are clearly demonstrated reasons why off-site BNG units or statutory credits should be used. 4. BNG should be secured for 30 years using either a Conservation Covenant with a Responsible Body, or through a Section 106 agreement.	Deletion of reference to '10%' biodiversity net gain was discussed in detail at the hearing with the Inspectors and the HBF. The HBF supported the removal of the reference to ensure the criterion was consistent with national legislation. The Council acknowledges that since the Hearings the Government position relating to BNG has moved on, and that national guidance continues to emerge. As such, and to ensure the principles of national legislation can be implemented effectively amendments are proposed as above.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			paid to the Council, as the monitoring and maintenance arrangement would be agreed with the Responsible Body. Similarly, the situation where the onsite BNG was managed through a conservation covenant, would not comply with the proposed policy wording. The policy should instead seek to secure BNG for the period of 30 years without specifying how this will be achieved.	Suggest that Conservation Covenant, Responsible Body, on-site BNG, off-site BNG and BNG statutory credits be defined in the Glossary.	
<b>Policy ST42: The Historic Environment</b>					
<b>MM8.27</b>	MOD-NRF012 Historic England	Not stated	Should be re-phrased to ensure that it is the contribution the setting makes to an asset's significance that is protected and enhanced.	The modification should state 'protect and enhance' in line with the NPPF rather than refer to 'preserve'.	To ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework the amendment is agreed as. <del>Proposals that harm an assets'</del> <b>preserve protect</b> or enhance those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset will not normally be supported.
<b>MM8.28</b>	MOD-NRF012 Historic England	Not stated	Support the inclusion of text relating to the need for archaeological investigation and re-assert National Planning Policy Framework footnote 68.		Noted.
<b>MM8.29</b>	MOD-NRF012 Historic England	Not stated	Unclear on the amendment		Part A1 previously referred to designated and non designated assets. To provide consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework MM8.29 deletes reference to non-designated assets.
<b>MM8.30d</b>	MOD-NRF012 Historic England	Not stated	Support this inclusion		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
<b>Policy ST45: Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities</b>					
<b>MM9.3a – MM9.3c</b>	MOD-REF025 NHS Property Services (NHSPS).	Legally Compliant - Not stated Soundness - No	Stipulates that as part of requirements which will allow for the loss of a community facility, a robust evidence base would have to be provided for such requirements to be satisfied. This includes the premises being marketed for its current lawful use for a minimum period of 12 months. Support the provision and enhancement of sufficient, quality community facilities but object to specific wording within this policy pertaining to the loss of a community facility. Following previous representations (Preferred Options, 2019; Issues and Options, 2020 and Submission, 2021), it is important for policies to address the need for flexibility within the NHS estate. Work with local NHS Commissioners in ensuring that the necessary services are provided in the best possible locations and to better facilitate and promptly adapt to changing models of care. Policies should respond to the fact that some public service providers, such as the NHS, routinely undertake strategic reviews of their estates. Reviews of the NHS estate are aimed at improving the provision of healthcare services by increasing efficiencies, including through the disposal of unneeded and unsuitable properties. This means that capital receipts from disposals, as well as revenue spending that is saved, can be used to improve facilities and services. The timely disposal of surplus sites that are no longer needed for healthcare purposes are an important component in acquiring funding of new and improved health provision in the locality, which can potentially be restricted through imposed marketing requirements. In order to ensure the right facilities are delivered at the right place at the right time, NHS employs their own separate, rigorous testing and approval	Recommend that the wording of Policy ST45 are amended to include as follows (underlined): “3. <i>Proposals that result in the loss <u>or change of use</u> of a community facility, through change of use or redevelopment, will be resisted unless: it would lead to the significant improvement of an existing facility or the replacement of an existing facility equally convenient to the local community it serves and with equivalent or improved facilities; <u>or</u> it has been demonstrated that the community facility is no longer required in its current use and it is not suitable for any other community use; or</i>	Part 3 of Policy ST45 has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process so does not form part of the consultation. However, it should be noted that the reference to change of use is already in Part 3 of Policy ST45 so the proposed change would be duplication. Health facilities in their various forms are important community facilities. The Council has had extensive engagement with the NHS throughout the plan-making process resulting in a statement of common ground which did not object to this policy. The Council will continue to work with the NHS to identify and help to bring forward land that may be suitable for meeting development needs in their ownership as per the NPPF paragraph 121. It is considered that this can be achieved through the provisions of the Local Plan.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>processes. An NHSPS property can only be released for disposal or alternative use once NHS Commissioners have confirmed that it is no longer required for the delivery of NHS services. NHSPS estate code requires that any property to be disposed of is first listed on “e-PIMS”, the central database of Government Central Civil Estate properties and land, which allows other public sector bodies to consider their potential use for it. Advise the that policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets, where healthcare is included within this definition, can potentially have a harmful impact on the NHS’s ability to ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community. Where such policies are overly restrictive, the disposal of surplus and unsuitable healthcare facilities for best value can be prevented or delayed, which in turn delays vital re-investment in the NHS estate. In line with NPPF Paragraph 121, where NHS Commissioners can demonstrate that sites are no longer required for the provision of services, there should be a presumption that such sites are suitable for housing (or other appropriate uses) and should not be subject to restrictive policies or periods of marketing. Policy ST45 cannot be said to be positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with National Policy as it is currently drafted. The strategy put forward will essentially inhibit health estate transformation in addressing and providing for changing clinical requirements and health needs in as and when it is required and should be amended. The NPPF is clear in stating that Local Plans should adopt policies that “take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community” (Paragraph 93b). The strategic reviews that are separately</p>	<p>in the case of commercial services it is not economically viable.</p> <p><i>4. Appropriate detailed and robust evidence will be required to satisfy Part 3 above. This should include: evidence which demonstrates that the premises has been marketed for the lawful use at a reasonable market value for a sustained minimum period of 12 months; or evidence which demonstrates the loss of change of use of an existing built community facility is part of a wider public service estate reorganisation programme.”</i></p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			undertaken by the NHS exist to ensure the identified health needs of communities are being addressed in a suitable and timely manner. Further, Paragraph 121 of the NPPF sets out the need for Local Planning Authorities to take a proactive role in helping to bring forward development on suitable sites in public ownership, where there is an identified need. As such, the policy should be amended to allow suitable NHS sites to come forward, providing that the project has undergone the rigorous internal process.		
<b>Policy ST46: Delivering Quality, Accessible Open Spaces</b>					
<b>MM9.5b</b>	MOD-NRF009  Severn Trent Water	Not stated	Understand the need for protecting Green Spaces, however open spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes such as flood alleviation schemes to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation schemes can result in additional benefits to the local green space through biodiversity and amenity benefits.		Noted.
<b>Policy ST50: Reducing Carbon Emissions, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</b>					
<b>MM10.4a;</b> <b>MM10.4b;</b> <b>MM10.4c;</b> <b>MM10.4d;</b> <b>MM10.7f</b>	MOD-NRF007  Home Builders Federation	Not stated	Concerned that the issues raised have not been fully addressed by the Council's response to the Inspectors Action 70. The HBF are concerned by the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the Council arrived at the requirement for 5 trees per dwelling, or how assumptions were made in relation to the size and standard of trees.</li> <li>• The provision of 5 trees per dwellings has potential to have a significant impact on the land uptake for any development and may have significant implications for the density of developments, which has the potential to have an impact on the viability of developments.</li> </ul>	Suggest revising the policy and the supporting text to be explicit about how site-specific viability will be considered, and what a developer would need to do to justify making a financial contribution to tree planting rather than on site provision.	BDC-33 and BDC-42 provide the Council's detailed response to the Inspectors queries and to the matters raised at the hearings by the HBF. It is considered these cover points raised with the exception of point 3 which is a new issue. Should tree planting be proposed in the highway that will be a matter for discussion with the Highways Authority. However, the Council consider this is a detailed matter which can be addressed through the policies in the Plan and guidance in an SPD. It is considered that modifications MM10.4a-4f

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the provision of five trees per dwelling may have implications in relation to highway provision and highway maintenance;</li> <li>does this requirement form part of BNG provision?</li> <li>the use of small saplings with a low purchase cost is likely to have implications in terms of the maintenance of the plant, and may lead to a significant number of the saplings not making it to mature trees</li> <li>unclear as whether the Council are looking for these trees to be provided in public or private parts of the site.</li> <li>unclear as to the mechanism on how any financial contribution or offsite trees will be managed.</li> </ul> <p>Unclear how effective the proposed SPD will be as this will only provide guidance and not policy.</p>	<p>Clarify the relationship between this policy with the new 10% mandatory BNG requirements. If on-site or off-site tree planting is one of the ways the development is contributing to its 10% BNG requirements would this need to be in addition to the 5 trees per dwelling? And if so, is this reasonable and deliverable?</p>	<p>and MM10.7f are justified and provide for the effective implementation of Policy ST50.</p>
<b>MM10.4b</b>	<p>MODNRF-002</p> <p>Fisher German/The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity</p>	Not stated	<p>Concerned that the requirement to deliver 5 trees per dwellings has not been sufficiently justified and how the planting of trees with help mitigate the impact of carbon emissions from new development. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no guidance as to where new trees should be planted or provided as part of a landscape strategy.</li> <li>A lack of such evidence means the policy requirement is simply not been established as necessary and not justified in evidence.</li> <li>No calculation on what any financial contribution should be and how this impacts viability.</li> <li>Does this requirement form part of the BNG provision.</li> </ul>		<p>BDC-33 and BDC-42 provide the Council's detailed response to the matters raised by the Inspectors on this matter. It is considered that modifications MM10.4a-4f and MM10.7f are justified and provide for the effective implementation of Policy ST50.</p>



MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
<b>Not stated</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Consider the lack of requirement that new houses be equipped with vehicle charging points, both at each property and in visitor spaces, is not a viable situation given the reluctance of the public to purchase EVs (rightly or wrongly) in part because of charge anxiety.		Electric vehicle charging points are covered by the Building Regulations so do not need to be considered by the Local Plan.
<b>MM10.7e</b>	MOD-NRF009  Severn Trent Water	Not stated	Supportive of the use of water efficient design of new developments fittings and appliances and encourage the optional higher water efficiency target of 110 litres per person per day within part G of building regulations. Delivering against the optional higher target or better provides wider benefits to the water cycle and environment as a whole. This approach is not only the most sustainable but the most appropriate direction to deliver water efficiency.	Recommend that the following wording is included for the optional higher water efficiency standard: New developments should demonstrate that they are water efficient, incorporating water efficiency and re-use measures and that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, not exceeding 110 litres/person/day.	MM10.7e requires new housing to promote water efficiency by meeting the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres/person/day. This is considered to help the effective implementation of the policy. Other matters are covered by the Building Regulations so do not need to be covered by the Local Plan.
<b>Policy ST51: Renewable Energy Generation</b>					
<b>MM10.8c</b>	MOD-REF027  Framptons Town Planning	Legally Compliant – Yes	Paragraph 10.2.7 acknowledges that large scale ground mounted proposals for solar farms are capable of contributing substantially to total solar power generation nationally, and the District is currently experiencing an increase in interest for such schemes. It goes on to state:	Paragraph 10.2.13 refers to the requirement for applicants to provide details of the removal	Paragraph 10.2.7 is not identified as a Main Modification so has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process. However, the Plan does refer to the UK Solar Photovoltaics

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
	on behalf of JG Pears	Soundness - No	<p>'This has the potential for adverse impacts, so in accordance with the UK Solar Photovoltaics Strategy, the preference is for future expansion of solar photovoltaics to be on commercial and industrial roof-space.' This 'preference' is inconsistent with the Strategy. There is no reference to where solar PVs are to be sited other than ensuring proposals are appropriately sited, giving proper weight to environmental considerations. This is consistent with PPG in determining applications for renewable and low carbon energy projects. The PPG advises that 'the need for renewable or low carbon energy does not automatically override environmental protection and that cumulative impacts require particular attention, especially the increasing impact that such developments can have on landscape and local amenity as the number of turbines and solar arrays in an area increases'. PPG sets out that particular factors a local planning authority will need to consider Solar farms are normally temporary structures and planning conditions can be used to ensure that the installations are removed when no longer in use and the land is restored to its previous use (Paragraph 013 Ref ID: 5-013-20150327). The UK Solar PV Strategy Part 2: focuses on the Government's ambition for key market segments and is not seeking to prioritise one sector of solar deployment over another. The ambition is to increase solar deployment for the mid-size commercial rooftop sector, recognising this sector has untapped potential in terms of emissions reduction and in terms of innovation, jobs and investment. Refers to statement by former Minister of State for Energy and Climate Change, Gregory Barker MP. This sector (mid-size commercial rooftops) falls into the wider strategy for increasing solar deployment nationally, which also includes small-scale domestic roof-</p>	<p>of associated infrastructure for renewable energy projects and returning the site to an acceptable state 'details of site restoration are to be agreed with the Council prior to the development proposal being approved.' A requirement is too restrictive as it may unnecessarily affect an applicant's ability to bring a development into use if full details of site restoration/decommissioning are to be agreed prior to determination. These details and methodologies for site restoration may not be known if contractors have not been appointed. It is more appropriate for applicants to be required to prepare a <i>strategy</i> for site</p>	<p>Strategy 2 which makes reference to increasing solar deployment on commercial roofspace. It is considered that the last sentence of Paragraph 10.2.7 'Nevertheless, large scale ground mounted proposals may be acceptable subject to meeting the criteria in Policy ST51' provides sufficient confidence to developers that all solar energy applications will be considered appropriately.</p> <p>For clarity and to aid the effective implementation of the policy an amendment to paragraph 10.2.13 is agreed as:  <u>The details of A strategy for site restoration are is to be agreed with the Council prior to the development proposal being approved.</u></p> <p>The Council will address policy numbers/names on adoption of the Plan as Additional Modifications.</p> <p>It is considered that the introduction to Policy ST51 within MM10.16d is justified, consistent with national policy and will provide for the effective implementation of the policy.</p>

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			<p>top projects and large-scale ground mounted solar farms. Refers to Paragraph 155a of the NPPF that seeks to increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat. Paragraph 10.2.7 will not provide sufficient confidence to developers that large scale ground mounted proposals for solar farms will be supported. The reference to preferring one sector of solar deployment over another should be omitted. The future expansion of solar photovoltaics on commercial and industrial roof-space should be encouraged in addition to large scale ground mounted solar farms, as part of the Council's ambition to help transition Bassetlaw from a net carbon producer to a net contributor of zero carbon and low carbon renewable energy (Paragraph 10.2.4).</p>	<p>restoration/decommissioning to be submitted to and agreed by the Council prior to determination.</p> <p>A condition could be imposed requiring submission and approval of further details. This condition would meet the tests of reasonableness for planning conditions as set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework and PPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 21a-005-20190723.</p> <p>Replace the words <i>'the new strategic policy'</i> to clearly state <i>'the new strategy policy on development on large brownfield sites in the countryside'</i> or include a policy number if one is assigned to this strategic policy.</p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p>Reference is made in Paragraph 10.2.5 to <i>'the new strategic policy'</i> which should be updated to clearly state <i>'the new strategy policy on development on large brownfield sites in the countryside'</i></p> <p>Replace the words: <b>The wording of Part 3 of Policy ST51</b> 'subject to the satisfactory resolution of relevant site specific and cumulative impacts upon:' with <i>'subject to demonstrating that there are no unacceptable impacts (including cumulative impacts) arising from:'</i></p>	
<b>MM10.9</b>	MOD-NRF005  Gerald Eve LLP/EDF	Not stated	The proposed wording adds greater clarification as to the Council's encouragement of green and low carbon energy uses across the district's three power station sites including Cottam. EDF supports the Main Modifications to and consider that the changes align with the tests of		Noted.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			soundness as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.		
<b>MM10.13d</b>	MOD-NRF012  Historic England	Not stated	Welcome a reference to the need to consider the impact on the significance of heritage assets and their setting, including the need for appropriate assessment being undertaken to inform proposals. MM10.8c deletes this need and consider the Plan would benefit from a reference about appropriate assessment being undertaken to inform suitable locations.		Part 3 of MM10.13d is clear that proposals will be supported subject to the satisfactory resolution of site specific and cumulative impacts upon a range of matters including heritage assets and their settings. It is considered this is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Policies ST42 and Policy 43 provide a positive policy framework within which impacts upon the historic environment can be considered. To minimise duplication it is important that policies and their supporting text are read together.
<b>MM10.14</b>	MOD-NRF012  Historic England	Not stated	Welcome clarification on an 'acceptable state' and would welcome an appropriate restoration policy that seeks to protect and where possible enhance landscapes/ setting etc		An 'acceptable state' will depend on the site location, use and condition of the site at application and the type of technology proposed. It is considered that 'acceptable state' provides sufficient flexibility to enable developers to respond to site context and submit a positive strategy to enable effective site restoration.
<b>Not specified</b>	MOD-REF019  Tuxford Town Council	Legally Compliant – Yes  Soundness - No	Do not understand why this has changed so much, and why there is a focus on wind, to the exclusion of all else, compared with the previous version which was more general. Do not feel it is wrong, nor do we feel it is comprehensive. Solar farms are widely used along the A1 corridor, and this eastern part of the country has good sunshine and should be at least considered for expansion of solar; it is far from clear that onshore wind turbines will be approved for widespread use; they may fall off the preferred options after the next election, for example.		The changes to Policy ST51 are in response to the Inspectors Post Hearing Note INS-010. It is considered that the policy provides a positive framework for renewable energy proposals to be considered. The addition of wind energy is to reflect the National Planning Policy Framework.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
			Regarding a) do not see the changes are justified, nor do we see they are necessary. Regarding c) TTC does not understand the reasons for the change to focus on wind and do not see that this is responsive to any question from the Inspector.		
<b>MM10.16b</b>	MOD-NRF012  Historic England	Not stated	The clause would benefit from being specific to the requirements of the historic environment to ensure the protection of the significance of heritage assets and their setting. The needs of the natural and historic environment are not always the same.		It is acknowledged that the needs of the natural and historic environment are not always the same. To provide clarity and ensure the effective implementation of the policy a change is proposed by separating the criterion into two separate criteria: <u>natural and heritage assets, and their impact zones and buffer zones</u> heritage_assets <u>and their</u> settings
<b>Policy ST53: Protecting Water Quality and Management</b>					
<b>MM10.20b/c</b>	MOD-NRF009  Severn Trent Water	Not stated	Provide information regarding drainage and surface water drainage according to internal and national guidance and policy.		Noted.
<b>MM10.21d</b>	MOD-NRF011  Nottinghamshire County Council	Not stated	The Highway Authority is not a statutory sewerage undertaker and has no legal powers to accept third party surface water whether it was by means of a pre-existing situation or as a new connection or indeed on a temporary basis. Water authorities are the statutory sewerage undertakers who have both the legal obligation to supply a sewerage connection when requested as set out in Section 98 of the Water Industry Act 1991 and they have the legal powers as a utility company to place, maintain and adjust their apparatus in connection with their legal responsibilities as a utility provider.	The modification to policy ST53 3.a) should not include highway drainage in the drainage hierarchy.	Proposed MM10.21d is consistent with the drainage hierarchy in the Flood Risk Planning Practice Guidance.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM10.21d	MOD-NRF009  Severn Trent Water	Not stated	Management of surface water is an important feature of new development as the increased coverage of impermeable area on a site can increase the rainwater flowing off the site. The introduction of these flows to the public sewerage system can increase the risk of flooding for existing residents. It is therefore vital that surface water flows are managed sustainably, avoiding connections into the foul or combined sewerage system and where possible directed back into the natural water systems.	Recommend that the following policy wording is included to ensure that surface water discharges are connected in accordance with the drainage hierarchy: <i>New developments shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, whereby a discharge to the public sewerage system is avoided where possible.</i>	It is considered that MM10.21d is consistent with national planning policy and guidance so is considered an appropriate basis for the policy.
<b>Policy ST54: Transport Infrastructure</b>					
MM11.3d	MOD-REF006  Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Residents are concerned about the capacity of the existing highway/transport network and the increase in traffic movements from new developments in Worksop. It is expected that the majority of people will be commuting in and out of the developments to other areas and therefore will lead to further impacts on the existing transport networks over the plan period.	The plan should clearly state which commuter roads outside of Worksop will be improved, what improvements will be proposed for these roads, and crucially, an indication of the approximate	The scale and location of proposed development has been assessed through the Council's Transport Assessments, which has identified mitigation where appropriate. The scale and type of infrastructure necessary to support the proposed Local Plan growth is identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023. It is considered that MM11.3d will aid the effective implementation of the Plan

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				timescale for any improvements being fully completed.	and ensure that new development will not prejudice the safe operation of the existing highway network.
<b>MM11.3d</b>	MODREF-007  Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Residents are concerned about the capacity of the existing highway/transport network and the increase in traffic movements from new developments in Worksop. It is expected that the majority of people will be commuting in and out of the developments to other areas and therefore will lead to further impacts on the existing transport networks over the plan period.	The plan should clearly state which commuter roads outside of Worksop will be improved, what improvements will be proposed for these roads, and crucially, an indication of the approximate timescale for any improvements being fully completed.	The scale and location of proposed development has been assessed through the Council's Transport Assessments, which has identified mitigation where appropriate. The scale and type of infrastructure necessary to support the proposed Local Plan growth is identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023. It is considered that MM11.3d will aid the effective implementation of the Plan and ensure that new development will not prejudice the safe operation of the existing highway network.
<b>MM11.3d</b>	MOD-REF008  Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Residents are concerned about the capacity of the existing highway/transport network and the increase in traffic movements from new developments in Worksop. It is expected that the majority of people will be commuting in and out of the developments to other areas and therefore will lead to further impacts on the existing transport networks over the plan period.	The plan should clearly state which commuter roads outside of Worksop will be improved, what improvements will be proposed for these roads, and crucially, an indication of the approximate timescale for any improvements being fully completed.	The scale and location of proposed development has been assessed through the Council's Transport Assessments, which has identified mitigation where appropriate. The scale and type of infrastructure necessary to support the proposed Local Plan growth is identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023. It is considered that MM11.3d will aid the effective implementation of the Plan and ensure that new development will not prejudice the safe operation of the existing highway network.



<b>MM Number:</b>	<b>Representation Reference: Name:</b>	<b>Legal compliance and soundness:</b>	<b>Summary of Comments made:</b>	<b>Suggested changes by consultee:</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
<b>MM11.3d</b>	MOD-REF009  Resident	Legally Compliant – No  Soundness - No	Residents are concerned about the capacity of the existing highway/transport network and the increase in traffic movements from new developments in Worksop. It is expected that the majority of people will be commuting in and out of the developments to other areas and therefore will lead to further impacts on the existing transport networks over the plan period.	The plan should clearly state which commuter roads outside of Worksop will be improved, what improvements will be proposed for these roads, and crucially, an indication of the approximate timescale for any improvements being fully completed.	The scale and location of proposed development has been assessed through the Council's Transport Assessments, which has identified mitigation where appropriate. The scale and type of infrastructure necessary to support the proposed Local Plan growth is identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2023. It is considered that MM11.3d will aid the effective implementation of the Plan and ensure that new development will not prejudice the safe operation of the existing highway network.
<b>Policy ST55: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Active Travel</b>					
<b>MM11.4a – MM11.4c</b>	MOD-NRF014  The British Horse Society	Not stated	Concerned that equestrian activity and infrastructure is overlooked within the Local Plan, whilst it forms an important part of sustainable travel. Believe that existing infrastructure for horse riding should not be compromised and that new infrastructure should be supported to improve facilities and connections for horse riding across the District.		No comment - this part of the Plan is not identified as a Main Modification so has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process.
<b>Policy ST58: Provision and Delivery of Infrastructure</b>					
<b>MM12.6 – MM12.11c</b>	MOD-REF025  NHS Property Services (NHSPS).	Legally Compliant – Did not state  Soundness - no	Policy ST58 and its supporting paragraphs cannot be viewed as being positively prepared, justified, or consistent with National Policy in its current form, and therefore put forward specific wording to address this.	Recommend that Policy ST58 is amended as follows (underlined)  <i>“12.3.3 The Council will work with partners such as the Local Highways Authority, Highways England,</i>	No comment - this part of the Plan is not identified as a Main Modification so has already been considered by the Inspectors during the examination process. However 12.3.3 is covered by AM12.3. This is considered appropriate to address the subsequent points raised.

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p><i>the Local Education Authority, the utility companies, local NHS Integrated Care Board (ICB), and neighbouring local authorities to anticipate and bring forward the necessary infrastructure that is required in order to deliver the spatial strategy.</i></p> <p><i>12.3.17 Regarding healthcare, S106 agreements and CIL (where introduced) will be used to secure developer contributions towards healthcare infrastructure. Where on-site infrastructure will be provided, this will be secured in a S106 agreement. Healthcare infrastructure will be identified in the IDP or by the NHS Integrated Care Board (ICB) to support the delivery of</i></p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
				<p><i>development. <u>Free land/property transfers may be required to facilitate provision as necessary.</u></i></p> <p><i>12.3.18 Policy ST58 requires developers to consider all the infrastructure requirements of a scheme. This may include improvements to roads <u>and</u> healthcare facilities in neighbouring Districts as a result of growth in Bassetlaw. The Council will continue to work closely with the Local Highways Authority, Highways England, the NHS Integrated Care Board and neighbouring planning authorities, to ensure a coordinated approach to delivering such road <u>and</u> healthcare <u>facility</u> improvements.”</i></p>	

MM Number:	Representation Reference: Name:	Legal compliance and soundness:	Summary of Comments made:	Suggested changes by consultee:	Officer Response
MM13.16  Appendix 3	MOD-NRF009  Severn Trent Water	Not stated	Reviewing the completion numbers / trajectories through pages 264-272, it is noted that some of the completion / trajectory numbers are incorrect – the grand totals are correct, but some of the individual yearly numbers have been entered incorrectly. Given these tables show a reduction in housing supply in this plan period, foresee no water supply issues, as the WRMP utilised the larger housing supply numbers that were published in an earlier version of this plan		It is acknowledged that some of the annual delivery assumptions in the MM schedule for Land off Essex Road; West of High Street; Yew Tree Farm are incorrect. However, the total dwellings for each site and the yearly total is correct. Additionally, one of the monitoring period entries and the total number for Fox Covert Lane is incorrect. This affects the total number of dwellings for that annual monitoring period, the overall number for neighbourhood plan allocations without permission, the annual total and total housing land supply. An amendment to the housing trajectory is proposed. For clarity this is attached separately as Appendix 3.