

Ref: 1/1-1/7

29/11/2010) Luke Brown - Core Strategy and Development Management Policies

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 11/11/2010 15:22  
**Subject:** Core Strategy and Development Management Policies

Thank you for consulting the NFU on the latest stage of Bassetlaw's Idf. Our comments are set out below with page numbers referring to the draft document.

- 1/1 ✓ Page 44, policy CS 9. We support B on economic development in rural areas.
- 2/1 ✓ Page 47. We generally support policy DM 1 but wonder if this goes far enough to meet the Coalition Government policy set out in paragraph 3.7 of the new White Paper "Local growth: realizing every place's potential", which states that there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development in all planning applications. We are concerned that the final paragraph of policy DM 1 will prevent diversification happening. How can you prove beforehand that the diversification is needed to support the continued viability of the farm? It strikes me that every application could fall foul of such a potentially onerous requirement.
- 3/1 ✓ Page 48, policy DM 2. We would like to see the words, "as a minimum" removed the first line of A General principles. If the words are retained who knows what other criteria could be foisted on developers.
- 4/1 ✓ Page 50, policy DM 3. We support section C on farm buildings and domestic equine facilities.
- 5/1 ✓ Page 63, policy DM 9. We support this policy provided that the Council can explain satisfactorily what Green Infrastructure is and the term is not so widely drawn as to be used as a restraint on farm and rural diversification.
- 6/1 ✓ Page 67, policy DM 10. We feel the Council must be much more supportive of renewable energy development, especially on farms. Paragraph 3.42 of the White Paper referred to above indicates the Coalition Government's support for renewable energy projects. Every farm has the capacity to be self sufficient in energy generation from renewables. Local plan policies need to be supportive of projects to ensure the legally binding eye-watering treaty targets we have for renewables have a chance of being met. In this connection why is there a bullet point about the loss of high grade agricultural land? We feel that requirement should be removed.
- 7/1 ✓ Page 74, policy DM 13. In A general principles, surely not all development proposals need to be accompanied by a transport statement, only those above a certain size. It seems a needless requirement to make all applications have a transport assessment. We feel these should only be needed for the largest of development proposals.

Paul Tame

