



RTCNPG Response to the Examiner's initial queries.

Question 1

Section 3 Consultation talks about the comprehensive efforts undertaken by the RTCNPG to engage the local community in producing the neighbourhood plan (plan making.) The RTCNPG agrees that plan making should be informed by consultation and section 3 explains this.

Section 9 is a proposed way of working with developers at pre application stage on planning applications. For completeness wording could be added in section 9 to emphasise that this way of working is in addition to the community engagement that has already taken place to produce the neighbourhood plan.

Question 2

In relation to the location of the listed buildings and positive buildings map 2 is a repeat of map 37 in the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA). Map 2 does have additional updated information on it as well, particularly the location of significant boundaries which are shown on map 27 of the CAA but that were updated by a planning officer for BDC as part of this neighbourhood plan process. It would be a good idea to reference the CAA map 37 and to add a reference to map 27 but to clarify that the information on map 2 is updated and combined from Map 27 and 37.

Question 3

The RTCNPG agree the reference to 7 character areas is an error and it should be 6 character areas on page 18/19.

Question 4

The RTCNPG confirm 'Cannon' is the correct spelling.

Question 5

The RTCNPG agree 'to places' should be added after 'safe access' and delete 'and'

Question 6

The suggestion to move criterion 1 of policy 3 and 1 of policy 8 is accepted.

Question 7

Para 117 text should have said there is 'not a loss of tree canopy' and where possible a net gain'. The 'where possible' provides the flexibility usually required but the aspiration to see an increase in tree canopy is important to the community. It is unclear but is Ms Kingaby's proposed amended wording intended to remove the reference to tree canopy? The focus on tree canopy reflects the important contribution trees make in the Town Centre for shade, especially where they are located in the pedestrian areas where there is otherwise limited shade, so retaining the reference to tree canopy would be preferred.



Question 8

The intent of criterion 3 was to ensure that where development was adjacent to the river or canal, the layout should ensure it does not impede any existing walk way or contribute to the creation of one where it does not exist. The RTCNPG are aware what an asset a waterside location is and want the benefit of this maximised in any development proposal. (Historically development has sometimes turned its back on or ignored the canal and river.) Where development is located next to but does not front the water ways, existing walking routes can feel isolated due to a lack of natural surveillance. It is hoped that the examiner is able to amend criterion 3 if required and still reflect this intent.

Question 9

It is agreed that the use of NA was due to this being the reference in the Housing Needs Assessment, but use of the abbreviation RTCNPA would also mean the same thing and is explained in the list of abbreviations.

Question 10

Agree that the reference to M34(3) was a typo and should read M4(3).

Question 11

The housing mix in Policy 10a is that proposed based on the HNA assessment – it is the need that has been identified currently but it is not the current housing mix. It is not clear from the suggested wording in Ms Kingaby's letter how 'currently' is intended to be used. It is agreed that the reference to 'topography and proximity of everyday services' can be removed from the policy as it is referenced in para 175.

Question 12

The RTCNPG agree that 'which' should be added to the last sentence of para 179. The RTCNPG are keen to ensure development in Retford sees a step change in reducing the use of carbon in its construction and operation.

The RTCNPG consider that all new development should incorporate sustainable design features and adding 'where appropriate' may signal that this is a 'nice to have' not a requirement. It is accepted that the planning system may not be able to be this prescriptive when it comes to householder extensions for example. If 'where appropriate' would provide the balance in this approach it is accepted.

Regulation 16 responses

Question 1

The RTCNPG did seek to engage with other landowners in the Town Centre who were occupying sites that seemed to be underutilised or in an inappropriate location (for example the Jewson Depot between new Street, Carolgate and the Canal and the BT Open Reach building between Saville Street, West Street, Coronation Street and Carolgate,) but at the time of plan preparation the companies had no plans for relocation and disposal of these sites. However, these sites could come forward as windfall residential sites for major development, so the RTCNPG consider it appropriate to include a housing mix from the HNA.



Question 2

The RTCNPG have reviewed the proposed BDC wording amendment and accept that developers have provided evidence previously to indicate that affordable housing was not viable. The RTCNPG suggest that the second sentence of Policy 10b starts with ‘Subject to viability and feasibility and in addition to providing First Homes’

Question 3

Para 239 yes, the reference to Council at the end of the sentence is an error.

Question 4

This analysis was done by a local resident and cyclist. A written cycling plan was also provided to the RTCNPG by another cyclist who is the Group Coordinator for Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers. This is attached for information.

The evidence base for a neighbourhood plan has to be proportionate, and the use of local, well informed people who cycle in Retford is appropriate. That said, the observations detailed in Map 10b align with the findings of [Grey to Green - Retford and Cycling Audit June 2021](#), produced by WYG as part of the evidence base for the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan. The following paragraphs are of particular relevance:

4.5.8: The comfort and feel of the cycle network in Retford has significant room for improvement. Where there are potentially extremely attractive routes, which could entice many cyclists of all abilities, particularly along the Chesterfield Canal and River Idle, they are fundamentally undermined by no or poor-quality surfacing and the narrowness of the paths.

4.5.9: The reliance on cyclists travelling within the main carriageway alongside general traffic also fundamentally undermines the comfort of the network with those less confident or novice cyclists dissuaded due to safety concerns.

4.7.1: Whilst elements of the provision form attractive, relatively safe, direct and comfortable routes, too often it is punctuated by poor quality infrastructure or no provision at all, particularly at vital locations, such as major junctions approaching the town centre. This undermines the overall user experience and will result in many novice or occasional cyclists being dissuaded to cycle around the town.

On the basis of the above, the RTCNPG would welcome the addition of a link to the Grey to Green Retford Walking & Cycling Audit as a footnote in this section of the RTCNP if this is acceptable to the examiner. The link is here <https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/6319/retford-walking-and-cycling-audit-r-infrastructure.pdf>

Question 5

The RTCNPG do not object to the reference to Arlington Way as a trunk road in paragraph 149 being amended to “busy road”.



The east-west improved pedestrian route referred to at para 151 follows Spa Road turning left onto Carolgate and first right onto West Street. It is possible to walk this route but improved signage and street design and if possible, more street trees as part of the wider approach 'Greening the streets' (Policy 6a), would make it an attractive route to Kings Park. Map 10d does not show this very clearly, that is something that could be rectified. Map 10d is from the Masterplan but a clearer map could be provided.

The RTCNPG agree that reference to the D2N2 [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan](#) would be a sensible addition. The RTCNPG are pleased that NCC indicate that a north-south route through Retford Town Centre has been identified but disappointed that they say this is a long term potential route. The RTCNPG note that in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan page 50 a NW route through Retford is a short term priority.

Further references to Retford are included in the accompanying [Technical Note](#) (page 2), including projects on Bridgegate and Carolgate (the north-south route referenced in the NCC representation). The RTCNPG are supportive of these proposals, but disappointed that these are identified as a long term potential route, rather than a firm proposal.

The RTCNPG would be pleased to work with NCC to assist in bringing forward improved cycling and walking infrastructure. The ideas in the NP are intended to start discussion about opportunities in Retford and remain useful to identify the issues and the potential local opportunities to make cycling and walking easier into and across the town given the increase in population in the wider area.

Question 6

The RTCNPG did not consider it necessary to say any more in the RTCNP about the use of taxi services.

There is nothing in the RTCNP that would restrict the access to the bus station or bus stops within the RTCNPA. The expansion of the on-demand bus service to the whole of Bassetlaw would be a positive move towards modal shift from individual car use in the area and ease pressure on taxi services.

Whilst the RTCNPG recognise the important contribution buses make to the movement of people into the Town Centre, they did not consider there to be a particular additional planning policy response.

Community consultation did raise the issue of the lack of bus services in an evening and a reference to this in the narrative would be relevant.

Helen Metcalfe BA Hons MA, MRTPI
on behalf of Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan Group

17.4.24

A Cycling Plan for Retford

1. Introduction

The opportunity for Retford and its surrounding area to enjoy the national resurgence in cycling, with paths and infrastructure also available for use by pedestrians and mobility scooter users, remains largely unfulfilled. This is despite the town centre and suburbs being compact in size and the area relatively flat, which form a positive encouragement to more active travel.

The principal obstacle is the lack of adequate joined-up cycling infrastructure and dedicated routes. Many people are deterred from making the modal shift from motorised travel, even for short distances, by the perceived risks of using busy roads. This can be overcome only by the incremental development of new cycle infrastructure, both complementing existing provision and extending elsewhere to form a cohesive network within the town and linking to neighbouring communities.

Therefore, this Plan identifies existing cycling facilities and provides as a basis for discussion an initial list of suggested improvements to deliver a network which will link the town's residential, shopping, educational and employment sites. Potential links to surrounding towns and villages are also mentioned.

Successful delivery of this Plan's elements will depend on the involvement and support of the town's decision-makers: Councillors and Officers of Bassetlaw District Council [BDC] and those of Nottinghamshire County Council [NCC] - the highways authority for the area. Other partnership relationships, such as with the Retford Town Centre Neighbourhood Planning Group and Sustrans, the national charity making it easier for people to walk and cycle, should be explored.

A brighter future, with a wider choice of travel modes available to all the town's population and visitors, awaits.

First issued - June 2020

Updated – May 2022

Footnote

The *Highway Code* identifies cyclists and pedestrians as being amongst the most vulnerable road users, all of whom must be considerate towards each other. Sadly, that is not always the case in reality, particularly where the confines of existing road layouts cause delay and frustration to all road users. Implementation of this Plan and, where possible, segregating cyclists and pedestrians onto dedicated paths, could reduce negative interactions between different groups of road users, to the benefit of all.

Although the *Highway Code* doesn't define "a cyclist", this term is taken to mean a person riding a wheeled device propelled by pedals, including with electrical assistance (an e-bike) and/or towing a trailer. When a cyclist dismounts and pushes their cycle by walking alongside, they are a pedestrian – in the same way as a person with, for example, a pram or pushchair.

The following distinctions between types of cyclist are suggested:-

Road – likely to use a 'road' (racing) bike with dropped handlebars, wear team or club jerseys and prefer riding quickly on roads over longer distances.

Tourer – may use either a road bike or a touring or hybrid bike (including trikes and tandems) with straight handlebars over medium distances on roads and some unsealed surface trails and could wear either cycling apparel or casual clothing.

Utility/Commuter – may use any kind of bike (including folding and disability adapted bikes) over shorter distances, especially around town, in any clothing.

Mountain biker – riding a bike with knobbly tyres for off-road terrain, wearing appropriate protective clothing.

Whilst this Plan is intended to cater for all cyclists, given its mainly urban context, utility/commuter and tourer cyclists are likely to be the most numerous.

2 Existing Situation

A National Cycle Network (Sustrans)

There are no NCN signed on/off-road routes in the immediate area of Retford area, the nearest being:-
Route 6 (London – Cumbria) running through Clumber Park, Worksop and Shireoaks
Route 647 connecting Route 6 at Clumber Park, via Bothamsall, Bevercotes, East Markham and Tuxford to
Route 64 (Market Harborough – Newark – Lincoln) at Harby

B National Byway

This signed route on minor roads was designated at the Millennium, planned to form a circuit of England with a connection into Scotland. In the Midlands, it runs from the Humber Bridge to Oundle. Retford is connected to its Tuxford to Gainsborough section by a link via Eaton from Upton.

C Retford

Signed shared-use paths and/or on-road cycle lanes are at:-

North Road (A638): from Randall Way to Hallcroft roundabout
Babworth Road (A620) railway bridge
West Carr Road (east side): from Babworth Road to Ordsall Park Road
Alma Road – Lidget Lane
Chesterfield Canal towpath: Carolgate – Welham Road, with a link to New Street #
London Road (A638): from South Street to Grove Road (both sides); (west side only) from Grove Road to Eaton

D Public Rights of Way

Although cycling is legally permitted on Bridleways [BW], Restricted Byways [RB] and Byways Open to All Traffic [BOAT], few of these are in good enough condition. Of those that are, the following are useful:-

East Retford BW30: Grove Street – Pennington Walk
East Retford BW34: Whinney Moor Lane – Goosemoor Lane #
East Retford BW56: Dominie Cross Road – Holly Road
East Retford BW63: Westfield Road #
East Retford RB75: Pelham Road #

E Other Paths

Retford railway station – Thrumpton Lane (possibly private path: Network Rail?) #

F Nearby Popular Routes on Minor Roads

Need identification with signage:-

Retford to Fledborough (for NCN Route 647 east) via Eaton, Upton, East Drayton, and Darlton
Retford to Bothamsall (for NCN Route 647 west) via Ollerton Road, Brick Yard Road, Jockey Lane, bridge over A1 at Elkesley, Coalpit Lane, Cross Lane, Bothamsall BW2 and Redhill Lane #

need improvement

3 Improvement Projects

3.1 Additional cycling routes, to form a comprehensive network capable of realistically achieving the promotion of cycling as a viable alternative to motorised travel, are suggested below.

3.2 The Town Centre

1 North-south link: the absence of this is the single most significant obstacle to cycling in the town, as the pedestrianisation of Carolgate, lack of cycle paths along Arlington Way (A638) and prohibition of cycling across the Market Square and through Kings Park leave potential cyclists between opposite sides of the town with no alternative but to use Arlington Way, congested by vehicular traffic through all its traffic-lights junctions, or to dismount and walk.

A new segregated shared-use [SU] or LTN 1/20 route on this axis is essential. The preferred route would be from Bridgegate to Chancery Lane, via the Bridgegate Centre car park and a new path along the eastern fringe of Kings Park to the Sir Stuart Goodwin Hall.

2 Spa Common: connect Kirke Street to the Chesterfield Canal towpath with an SU path **outside the NP area**

3 Cannon Square: reassign space and repave to permit cycling between Churchgate and the Market Place

3.3 The wider town area

4 Moorgate (A620): adapt existing pavement to SU path along eastern side between Arlington Way and Tiln Lane ^

5 Moorgate/Welham Road (A620): create SU path along southern side between Tiln Lane and Lidget Lane^

6 Welham Road (A620): improve existing footway on north side to SU path between Longholme Road and Chesterfield Canal (Welham Bridge)

7 Tiln Lane: upgrade pavement to SU path along western side to Carr Hill Primary School ^

8 Bolham Lane - Camborne Crescent: improve existing footpath (East Retford FP20/42) to SU path **

9 Randall Way: construct planned segregated cycle and foot paths (to DfT LTN 1/20 specification) on south side between North Road and Hallcroft Road

10 Grove Road: improve existing footway on north side to SU path between London Road and Allison Avenue

11 Five Fields Lane: improve existing footpath (East Retford FP36) to SU path – to connect The Brambles housing development with Grove Coach Road

^ in conjunction with the proposed traffic-lights junction improvement at Moorgate/Tiln Lane to be provided as a condition of the Tiln Lane housing development (Linden Homes) when 110 dwellings are occupied.

** in conjunction with the proposed SU path from Tiln Lane to Bolham Lane to be provided as a condition of the Tiln Lane housing development (Linden Homes).

3.4 Links to the surrounding areas

12 Babworth Road (A620): improve existing footway on north side to SU path between Retford Oaks Academy and Babworth

13 Sutton-cum-Lound to Sutton cross-roads (A638): create SU path (or LTN 1/20 route) on east side

14 A638 Sutton cross-roads to Randall Way: needs designated route between projects 9 and 13 above to provide continuity – could be achieved by reassigning road space on existing carriageway, upgrading existing footway and/or via new construction through the North Road development site (Trinity Farm)

15 A638 to Markham Moor: create on-road cycle lanes on both sides by reassigning road space on existing carriageway – narrowing at Gamston may be problematic.

3.5 Link to Worksop Also to Clumber Park and NCN Route 6

16 from town via West Street, The Carr (giving access to the skate park), Pelham Road, railway bridge over ECML (pedestrianised; consider redesignation), Ordsall Park Road +, Ordsall Road +, Cheyne Walk/East Retford FP9 (between the Worksop railway line and the golf course), Babworth FP6A, Old London Road to Little Morton, Babworth BW7A to Mansfield Road (B6420) and Babworth BOAT7B to Apleyhead.

+ development of the Sandhills area could enable this section to take Devonshire Road, Manvers Road, and a new SU path across the Sandhills to the garage parade on Northumbria Drive.

Continuing across the A1 intersection bridge on existing SU paths, then Babworth BW14, old Mansfield Road, Lime Tree Avenue and Clumber Park perimeter cycle trail to Manton Lodge. Then Old Coach Road to Windmill Hill and NCN Route 6, or via a link to existing SU paths along the B6040 and A57 near Wilkinsons and DHL sites. Alternatively, via new LTN 1/20 route along improved (dual carriageway) A57.

4 Delivery

4.1 Construction of new and improved infrastructure will be dependent on the availability of funding, so may tend to be patchy and potentially uncoordinated. Some initial monies have been provided to NCC from the Government's active travel fund. Beyond that, it may be appropriate to carry out a local consultation process to determine a scheme priority list.

4.2 Key to effective delivery of the components of this Plan will be BDC's Development Control function. All applications for planning permission for new developments will need to be assessed, in conjunction with NCC Highways (as statutory consultee) and Active Travel England, against not only requirements for walking and cycling provision within the development site but also how the development can contribute to the projects identified in this Plan. This may be either by direct construction as part of the development or by the application of condition(s) requiring financial contribution(s) or both.

4.3 BDC will need to apply a clear process for obtaining developer funding for off-site cycle network improvement; for example, compiling a prioritised cycling infrastructure list for delivery via such funding (similar to CIL for highways). Currently, cycling provision appears to be the lowest priority in this respect, which must change if progress is to be achieved.

4.4 Every 'windfall' opportunity, eg. national infrastructure schemes, highway improvements, Network Rail level crossing removal proposals, etc. must be pursued to contribute to and harmonise with the delivery of this Plan's projects. Parking on cycle lanes and paths must be discouraged or prohibited.

4.5 The implementation of Travel Plans for new developments must be improved in conjunction with NCC. These are currently largely ineffective, owing mainly to the County/District division of responsibilities. The process needs review and replacement by a clear, consistent and effective policy which cannot be ignored by developers and premises occupants. Also, the potential role of partner organisations in facilitating local on-going delivery and support should be considered, to increase take-up.

Glossary

BDC	Bassetlaw District Council
BOAT	byway open to all traffic)
BW	bridleway) public rights of way
FP	footpath)
NCC	Nottinghamshire County Council
NCN	National Cycle Network – constructed and maintained by Sustrans
RB	restricted byway - public right of way
SU path	shared-use path – for use by pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooter users
Sustrans	the national charity making it easier for people to walk and cycle; responsible for the NCN