Cuckney, Norton Holbeck and Welbeck NP meeting with Bassetlaw District Council, Planning and Conservation team. 15.09 15

Present: Helen Metcalfe James Green David Collins Darren Ridout Caroline Chambers David Wall Richard Bower Sheila Brailsford

Georgina Smith Simon Britt (conservation officer) Tom Bannister (Planning officer) Jo

The first part of the meeting was a general discussion about the NP. TB and SB were pleased that the enabling aspects had been removed and that it was now restoration only.

The discussion on the pattern guide was that it would be beneficial to have one in the NP and it could be used for information but not be adopted and this would reduce the amount of time it would take for it to be included in the plan.

TB: there are two drivers – 2 goals. Historic restoration and housing growth.

I suggest you separate them out.

We are still learning about NPs. We can’t use previous models. NP is a different way of working. For example, be careful not to identify type of properties.

JG. We need to clarify the numbers from the core strategy- 5

TB: It is no longer a relevant document

JD: In terms of increase, 5 was extra to the depot site which is considered a brownfield site

HM and TB discussed the terminology of

Policy 3 Paragraph 8.8

Policy 4 Community housing cannot be a policy as it carries no weight from BDC. It cannot be referenced in the NP

Policy 6 – Parking. TB says the group would have to bring forward evidence that there are parking issues.

Policy 10 – “in the region of”

Sites

Land north of Budby Road

DR: It’s a view issue. HE is against it

SB: It would be flagged up in planning. It will be a huge hurdle. It’s your choice if you want to include it, but ‘setting’ is in law.

Woodhouse Barns

SB: this is now a restoration project which is not a problem

DR: we would want to allocate the rest of the site ie old dutch barns at the back for new build in the future

JG: perhaps separate them as conversions and new build

SB: I suggest you keep this site as one

Eddisons Cottage

There was a debate about the historic status of this building and that policy 16 should have only one purpose outlined

Policy 18

TB: The NP can’t have consideration of cross boundary considerations. This is a very open ended policy with possible unknown consequences.

SB: Limit these outlying barns to historic risk

There was a discussion about what consitiuted “historic”. SB said it was pre 1919.

DR: so we need to identify which sites

Policy 19

Local Green spaces – this needs to be justified by public benefit

Meeting continues for a while with general discussion. When the meeting with BDC ended, the steering group stayed to talk over the events of the day.

It was agreed that HM should continue with the plan. Issues around continued funding were discussed and DC agreed to check it.

DR said he would try to make some progress on the pattern book

GS to review the LGS policy re public benefit.

All agreed to keep in all sites as these are what had been consulted on