

Mattersey Parish Council

Response to Local Development Framework Consultation – December 2010

We responded to the initial Consultation on the Local Development Framework in October 2009 and at that time we expressed a very strong opinion that we felt that Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe should be treated as one entity for Planning purposes and not as two different centres with different criteria applied to them in CS8 and CS9. Our reasoning for this as follows

1. They are linked by Thorpe Road and are only separated ~~a~~-by just over a hundred metres
2. Both locations use the common facilities of the school, Post Office, Shop etc., and it would be fair to say that proportionately those facilities are used more by the residents of Thorpe than of Mattersey itself, although they are based in Mattersey. These facilities are also closer to the Thorpe residents than many residents of Retford and Worksop experience.
3. Both locations are covered by the same Parish Council and we certainly work on the basis that we have a single community.

We would therefore ask you to re-consider the classification of Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe as a single Rural Service Centre in Policy CS1. We would argue that the identification of areas should be on the basis of what actually happens on the ground rather than what appears neat in the District Council's Policy document. We have no objections to the Development criteria which have been established for the Parish in total.

On Page 13 we are disappointed to note that there is no reference to the rail link from Retford which provides direct access to London, Leeds and the North East. This should be seen a critical element of the economic potential of the area.

Under the Settlement Specific Policies we are concerned to note that Rural Service Centres will be targeted to provide 10% of Housing Growth but 0% of Employment Growth. Surely this will make these Centres even more dormitory villages than they already are. We would suggest that some employment should be targeted outside the three core areas of Worksop, Retford and Harworth for reasons of CO2 Reductions as per DM4 as a minimum.

In Policy CS8, it is proposed that Mattersey (and we would argue combined with Mattersey Thorpe) should contribute along with ~~other~~-7 other locations to provide 35% of the Affordable Housing Target. Yet in the Proposal Maps no land has been identified for such development. We would seek the District Council to identify which parcels of land it would favour for such development., otherwise we would not be in favour of Mattersey parish being included within this target. Currently the district and county councils are unable to supply all the appropriate services for the existing occupants of low cost housing

in the Parish. It is unlikely that any additional affordable housing would be sufficient to attract the resources required to service these occupants properly.

We would support the proposal in DM6 to extend the existing site at Daneshill for Travelling People but to no more than double its current size.

We would ask that DM6 is strengthened to state that the Policy will be pre-disposed against any change of use of existing employment land to residential development land rather than the rather soft tests which are being suggested.

Policy DM13 relating to Sustainable Transport should be more specific about the number of parking spaces in residential developments in rural areas since public transport is almost non-existent there should be at least one parking space provided for each bedroom in the property, i.e. 3 bedrooms, would require spaces/garaging for 3 vehicles.

The Parish Council would be happy to express these views at the Examination in Public.