Cuckney Holbeck Welbeck and Norton Neighbourhood planning meeting

19th November 2015 at Cuckney Cricket Club

Present

Natalie Cockrell, Helen Metcalfe, David Collins, David Wall, Mike Smith,

Georgina Smith, Sheila Brailsford, Darren Ridout, Caroline Chambers, Claire Barlow, Richard Bower

Apologies from K. Barlow, J Green

Views on the latest version of the NP

DC: We need to remember about the NP, without it there would be no development. It has to reflect our views, and has to be adopted by Bassetlaw Council planners. We do not work in a vacuum, so it has to comply with the NPPF. Let’s not lose sight of what we have achieved! I think the latest version is a clever design. It is all in the Heritage at risk policy. The previous version didn’t distinguish between new build and/or renovation. The tourism/ Car parking has been given more flexibility. Apart from the LGS, there are no changes that affect our wishes. This version gives us more flexibility.

RB: I have found some of the criteria difficult to follow

Many of the group agreed.

MS: The original plan was in “human speech”. This plan is bureaucratic speak. When it goes to referendum it needs to be understood. Heritage England is a quango. HM was always working with the NPPF. Why did it have to change?

CC: It is difficult to understand the jargon. Keep the wording simple. The agenda is so negative

GS: When we first started this process, we were encouraged to think outside the box, and have a vision of what we would like to see happen in our villages. Little by little this has been eroded. I feel we were deceived. The plan is ending up as Bassetlaw’s plan not ours. Why wasn’t Heritage England considered at an earlier stage?

NC: This process was very new when your group first started, and we have had to learn as we have gone along by seeing how other NPs have been received by the examiners. This particular plan is very ambitious, more than any other so far.

It is unusual for a village to want development, most are wanting to limit development. This is also an unusual situation due to the amount of historic buildings. Heritage England have so far never had to consult on a Neighbourhood Plan so you have to understand how new all this is.

HM: Since our meeting with Simon Britt and HE, I have worked with them to produce the Historic buildings at risk policy.

Heritage England is a statutory consultee. The plan would fail the statutory conditions without the at risk policy.

We have lost policy 18, but the at risk register is more flexible

RB: HE said a Welbeck design would have helped.

DR: Re the At Risk policy – How do we define “fair or poor” ?

Although the plan is technical, it is doing what we want.

I have been to a meeting, where it appears Heritage England are getting stronger, and there have been a lot of appeals. So it is important that we have a Neighbourhood Plan that addresses heritage issues.

Local green spaces

HM: Elkesley had an LGS, that was thrown out and Harworth also had a problem due to access issues. So I removed those that I think would not be accepted. But you can change that if you wish.

DC: Would it be detrimental to the plan being accepted if we put them in?

DR: Sports facilities are already protected. Dam meadow is protected

HM: ok, add in Church meadow

DR: I suggest we put in the area of Church meadow where the existing footpath is and leave the rest out.

Local connection policy

HM: there are changes re percentage for affordable housing to 15%. The definition of affordable housing is changing and starter homes will be classified as affordable homes

NC- the housing needs survey needs updating

HM: the Community Housing Policy has to come out because it is not a land use policy. It has to be a legal agreement between Welbeck and the parish council.

DR: the policy on Community housing cannot be a planning obligation.

DC: But we have no power to enforce this.

HM: at the planning application stage the parish council will be able to make this a condition

DR: The group want 15% of the total development to be “affordable” housing.”

Car Parking

DC: Are we to go against BDC and HE

CC: the Consultation said that we want them

DR: We need to be able to demonstrate the need for more off road parking.

HM/ NC It has to be consistent with the basic conditions

Policy 20

DR: Lady Margaret Crescent – can it state “ in the region of 4” properties.

North of Budby Road site – can it state in the region of 5 properties – that is if we can keep it in the plan

Summing up

DC: Where do we go from here?

CC: Once it is done and tidied up, what next?

NC: I am completing the sustainability report

HM: this version of the NP is not different in principle so it doesn’t have to go out to consultation

MS I’m still not convinced about the language

NC: This is where an executive summary is required. Most people will not want to read the entire document, and the executive summary can be provided in “layman’s” language.

MS: the website is still getting about 100 hits a month, though I am unable to know where they are from.

NC: Who will write the executive summary? There is no rush for this as the process of the sustainability report and the plan has to have another 5 week consultation and go before the BDC. So we are thinking that it will be ready for the examiner in mid February.

HM: I also have to prepare a basic condition statement

In conclusion, by the end of the meeting, the Steering group was able to agree to the latest draft, with a few reservations being expressed.