**From:** Darren Ridout <[Darren.Ridout@welbeck.co.uk](mailto:Darren.Ridout@welbeck.co.uk)>

**To:** Cuckney PC Clerk <[cuckney@ymail.com](mailto:cuckney@ymail.com)>

**Cc:** "[Natalie.cockrell@bassetlaw.gov.uk](mailto:Natalie.cockrell@bassetlaw.gov.uk)" <[Natalie.cockrell@bassetlaw.gov.uk](mailto:Natalie.cockrell@bassetlaw.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** Friday, 31 July 2015, 9:54

**Subject:** FW: Cuckney Neighbourhood Plan

Cuckney Parish Council

As the receiving representative for the Draft Neighbourhood Plan please find below the comments of the Welbeck Estate to the formal draft Neighbourhood Plan.  While extensive these comments may not be exhaustive with a further meeting with the Board planned for wc 10th August to discuss their further feedback.  I hope that any further comments while submitted after the formal consultation deadline will be equally considered.

Policy 14 – The Limitation of the Barn Conversions to use as ‘Community Housing Only’ will further impact the viability of the scheme and thus threaten its deliverability given further new build will be required to ‘enable’ the delivery of the barn conversions in community house form.  Therefore, while we agree to the designation of new enabling housing as community housing the barn conversions should remain without financial qualification even if the community housing selection criteria is applied to their occupancy.

Policy 16 – The limitation of the Eddison’s Cottage conversion being Community Housing will impact on the viability of the refurbishment, especially if it is retained as a single dwelling.  As with Policy 14 above, we can agree to the designation of any new enabling housing as community housing but the main property should remain free of the financial implications of the designation even if, as above, the selection criteria is applied in the first instance.

Policy 18.1 Requires rewording and we suggest the replacement of the words ‘and does’ with the words ‘that does’.

Policy 19.1 e) The maintenance and protection of trees in perpetuity may not be achievable given their natural ageing and therefore degrading over time which will introduce the obvious need to protect property and health and safety interests.  Is there a conflict here that will impact on deliverability of the business scheme and the usual and normal Estate commercial woodland management practices?

Policy 22.1 and 22.2  Who is liable for the safety of users of the non-vehicular routes in particular those shared with private vehicular traffic?

Policy 23 – How much weight and timescale does the Local Green Space designation carry?  i.e. does it extend beyond the time of the plan and are we in danger of putting a ‘mill stone’ round the necks of future generations?  Would Welbeck to Parish Leases suffice to protect these spaces thus removing the need for the designation?

In particular the Estate resists and therefore does not support the following Local Green Space designations:

number 21 (this could conflict with expansion plans following the Harley Gallery extension development),

number 20 (this may conflict with plans to expand the campsite offer or other recreational facilities that may be in the pipeline),

number 6 (this could be considered suitable for future development land in 15+years, will the designation prevent this, and therefore could its immediate protection be achieved by Lease until its future can be assessed at the appropriate time),

number 12 (This conflicts with Policy 19 and as such its relevance and inclusion is challenged),

number 31 (this location hasn’t been identified or consulted previously as a LGS – what is the designation seeking to protect or prevent here?),

number 14 (we need to make sure such a designation doesn’t conflict with the school car park which will be within the LGS boundary),

number 24 (this is farmland),

numbers 27, 28,29 and 30 (what these protecting/designating?)

Overall I need to be able to explain and further brief the family on Policy 23 Local Green Space and its meaning and implications before I will get sanction to the designation of such land as LGS.  This is not intended as being controversial but further explanation and consultation is necessary to understand the reasons and concerns and the meaning of the process, a process which may be beneficial to us all.

We look forward to hearing from you further and being further involved in the development of the Neighbourhood Plan document.

On behalf of the Welbeck Estate

Kind Regards

Darren