

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
CC: [REDACTED]
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: LDF Core Strategy Consultation responseSOUNDNESS and EVIDENCE

Dear Planning Policy Team,

As respondent would like to acknowledge that rural diversification policies are improved from previous drafts. However, table at 4.10 still identifies 0% employment growth in rural service centres, Carlton, Langold, Misterton and Tuxford - despite earlier notification of this oversight in an earlier consultation response.

It should be entirely necessary from a sustainability and soundness point of view, that at the very least, a windfall employment site column is added to table 4.10. This is because, the existence of such a column indicates to the reader/landowner/developer, that rural diversification/development in the countryside policies, will have a recognised outcome in terms of land use. And that these outcomes will be tracked as part of LDF delivery.

It is especially important to heighten the importance of rural employment within this table when the issue of affordable housing is considered. At present, the Bassetlaw LDF proposes an East West divide with the majority of the rural east providing affordable housing and a narrow western band providing minimal affordable housing. Policy CS7 (Misterton) and CS6 (Tuxford) ask for 35% affordable housing because they are in the East. Policy CS8 (Rural Service Centres) request 35% - 25% affordable housing and they too, are mainly in the East - yet looking at table 4.10, all employment land will be in the west where only 15% affordable housing will be requested.

Bassetlaw state at 4.9 that the rationale behind this is that viability will not allow for any higher provision in the west however, I do not believe this to be the case. The area around Cuckney is demonstrated as very high value in the North Derbs and Bassetlaw HMA Housing Strategy. Bassetlaw know that the reason for such low incomes in that area, is the result of Welbeck Estate ownership, low agricultural incomes with housing mostly tied and used to bolster low wages, yet the authority has persisted in maintaining the 15% affordable housing provision in that area because it concurs with their East/West spatial strategy (at fig 4.1). Were new developments to be enabled around the village of Cuckney, their ability to deliver affordable housing at beyond 15% would be easily demonstrated and the soundness of the evidence base is therefore challenged.

I live close to the village of Mattersy Thorpe and I am extremely concerned that the nil employment/high affordable housing provision proposal for the East of the district will result in more of that kind of settlement. Known locally as bandit island and referred by Bassetlaw District Council officers as a model of bad planning for the CRESR report into Housing Needs for Young People, I am convinced that the building of affordable housing in rural areas with no employment provision has not been sufficiently modelled by Bassetlaw Policy Officers. The Inspector needs to read the face to face interviews transcribed in the CRESR report to understand what it is like to be marooned in a rural location without work - in Mattersy Thorpe.

In November 2010, the Council formally approved the Local Investment Plan for the Housing Market Area - containing Bassetlaw specific sections. In their own section, Bassetlaw state that their primary investment priority for the district is rural affordable housing to help maintain the rural economy yet the LDF does not quantify the rural economy - nor does it show any intention of bolstering the rural economy in terms of table 4.10.

There is an assertion therefore that Bassetlaw are seeking to make their Western edge regeneration settlements more attractive to developers by loading affordable housing onto the Eastern side of the district (fig 4.1) in a bid to deliver their spatial strategy at pg16.

Neighbouring authorities have not taken the approach of not delivering employment land in rural locations. The Inspector is urged to examine the Soundness of the approach, to examine the way that viability assessments have been used, to consider the ease with which households in affordable housing will access employment in rural areas and to consider recommending to Bassetlaw that table 4.10 includes windfall employment sites.



This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>
