Meeting of Steering group for Neighbourhood plan for Cuckney Norton Holbeck and Welbeck November 27th 2014 at Cuckney Cricket Club

Present: Helen Metcalfe, Natalie Cockrell, Jo Davies, David Collins, Darren Ridout, Mike Smith, Claire Barlow, Keith Barlow, Richard Bower, Sheila Brailsford, Caroline Chambers, Georgina Smith, Judy Oxley, Sharna Bunting.

Apologies : David Wall

DC: Welcome to everyone. Thank you to Jo Davies from Bassetlaw DC Planning dept for coming to the meeting. Welcome to Judy and Sharna, for their first attendance at the Steering group.

The meeting was run by H M. It was intended to go through the first draft of the Neighbourhood plan document.

Certain items were flagged up that required our input

Consultations : HM: These need to be all pulled together in one place

DC: This doesn’t mean they need to be re-written

NC: James has already started on this

Local Context : HM: this needs statistics such as age profile to back up why future development is needed. HM can do this.

Helen then went through the draft document and some minor adjustments were made.

There was a discussion about the use of the words “affordable housing”

MS: Do we need to use the label “Affordable Housing”

HM: Yes, otherwise it won’t meet the guidelines and the core plan policy.

DR: Welbeck are in the process of setting up a separate company to become a Registered Social Landlord. This will have procedures to include community involvement. There will be five board members – 2 Welbeck, 2 Community, 1 independent.

NC: Please keep us informed of the progress of the RSL

Policy 2 – Pre application consultation

HM: Transparency is needed

DR: We would have to consult on the design and layout

Policy 3 – Housing mix and type

MS If Welbeck only develop one site, there still has to be a mix of housing

Policy 5 – Design Principles for new development

DR: Mr Parente wants to develop a Welbeck Style of housing to blend with the character of the villages.

RB: What is the character? Brick or Stone? Both are prevalent in the community apart from Welbeck.

Policy 9: rural buildings and land in commercial use outside the settlements

NC: What about a field that is not yet in commercial use

DR: We need to have a mechanism in place for this

NC: You can have a threshold if you wish

CB: What about the Hazel Gap area as it is near the Welbeck pit site

DR: Various business ideas have come forward for that site

KB: What do you define as a settlement?

HM: A cluster of houses, like High Hatfield for example.

Policy 13: Conservation and enhancement of non- vehicular routes

Here we referred to the draft documents provided by Cliff Andrews, and maps on which he had made suggested changes to create circular walks around the Neighbourhood.

Policy 14 Designating local green spaces

Here we discussed the draft report from Cliff Andrews, and agreed that the following should aim to be adopted as local green spaces.

In Cuckney

1. Mill Hill
2. Community garden
3. The Dam and Dam meadow
4. Remise on Donkey (Sandy)Lane
5. Area north of the River Poulter from the A60 to the back of Riverside Close
6. Church meadow to the A60

In Holbeck

1. Millenium garden in Holbeck Woodhouse
2. Little remise and Hill Top remise

In Norton

1. The Lady Margaret Crescent Lawn
2. Bunkers Hill plantation (site of PoW camp)

We did not have time to discuss additional green spaces suggested in the report.

Cliff had also produced a potential circular route for walking and cycling, demonstrated on maps. But we didn’t have time to discuss these at the meeting.

Policy 15: Enhancing and increasing the provision of community facilities

Again due to time constraints, this was mentioned briefly by HM; with the possibility of a project to replace the “tin hut” with a new build community centre, and the possibility of moving it to another site.

Jo Davies from Bassetlaw planning department then described the stage they were at with the proposed allocation of housing sites in the four villages.

So far, each site had been viewed by consultants in conservation, drainage, highways, trees, and environment.

The report was still not completed, so JD was only able to give us a verbal report until the written report had been completed and approved.

She described what is possible now and what could in principle happen if the Neighbourhood Plan goes ahead.

The following sites have been agreed in principle:

1. Cuckney depot - main issues to address are access to the site and density of houses to be built. DR asked how many houses. JD said it depended on the design mix
2. Eddisons Cottage, Norton – Main house must be kept and repaired – DR said it could be a future smallholding. JD: the NP must give further justification for other houses to be built in Norton. HM: recommended we study the Lynton in Lynmouth NP for cross subsidy and Viability/ deliverability
3. Hatfield Plantation – main issues here are the trees/ecology. Justification is needed why development is needed in this location
4. Lady Margaret Hall – further community development is ok. Main issues are highway concerns and design of extensions
5. Lady Margaret Crescent, Norton – development is acceptable subject to sustainability issues and design and intensity of development. HM: if this is worked through the NP and there is justification for this development, it can be brought forward
6. Budby Road, Cuckney – main issues are access to the site and impact on views approaching Cuckney
7. Creswell Road site – acceptable – main issue is design of houses
8. Woodhouse Hall Farm – the principle of using the existing buildings on the site is acceptable subject to sustainability, and whether there is a justifiable need for new buildings on the site. DR: the NP needs to be able to justify this site as a retirement complex. The development of the site depends entirely on the development of ten new build houses on the site.
9. Hazel gap farm – the principle of developing the site is acceptable depending on the intended use of the site

The two sites found unacceptable for consideration for development are:

1. Cuckney House – a proposal to build new houses in the grounds was considered unacceptable due to the impact on the setting of Cuckney House.
2. The allotments site on Creswell Rd in Cuckney – the main objections are the site is not big enough for the proposed houses; a public car park at the back of the houses would be a security issue for the houses; and highways were concerned about the entry and exit to the car park if it was behind the houses.

At the end of Jo Davies’s presentation, some expressed disappointment at the refusal of the allotment site as it leaves us without a proposal for an adequate car park that is desperately needed for the school and play area. The old allotment site is an eyesore in what is an otherwise attractive part of the village.

The Cuckney house site proposal came as a surprise to most of the group as it hadn’t been considered in previous meetings. The general consensus was in agreement with the refusal, but suggestions for other possible uses for Cuckney House were mentioned, namely, apartments, offices, hotel/restaurant.

Before the meeting drew to a close, views were expressed about the length of time we were having to wait for these reports in writing, and that it was holding up the NP process, particularly with funding time limits.

NC: We must arrange another major consultation event in February at the latest.

MS: the problem we have is that there is still nothing to consult the community on and until we have that, we cannot arrange a consultation event. Helen is limited in writing the NP.

NC: I will carry out a scoping report. This is a set way of writing up the sustainability aspect of the NP

Next Meeting will be in January to plan a consultation event in February.

Meeting closed at 10.15pm