1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To brief Councillors on the progress being made in preparing the Local Development Framework (LDF) Evidence Base since the last briefing on 22nd February 2011.
2.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That the report be noted,
2.2 That the Local Centres Survey be approved for inclusion as part of the LDF Evidence Base;
2.3 That the draft Local Strategy Statement be approved for consultation with stakeholders;
2.4 That the recommended changes to the Employment Study arising from the consultation be approved and the study as amended be added to the LDF evidence base.

3.0 **BACKGROUND**

3.1 LDF Evidence Base progress was reported to Councillors at Lead Member and LDF Steering Group meetings on 22\textsuperscript{nd} February 2011. The previous report focussed on evidence base work concerning Potential Strategic Sites, Retail Capacity Study Update and the Employment Land Discussion Paper.

3.2 The current report will provide an update on progress on the LDF Evidence Base and will cover the following documents.

- Retail Capacity Study Update
- Local Centres Study
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 3
- Joint Transport Study
- Local Strategy Statement
- Employment Study

3.3 A summary of the progress and projected timetables (where necessary) on each of the evidence base documents now follows.

4.0 **RETAILCAPACITY STUDY**

4.1 The LDF system places great emphasis on the importance of good evidence as the basis for policies. The material must be made generally available and must be kept up to date. Paragraphs 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 that follow provide a recap on the situation reported on 22\textsuperscript{nd} February. Paragraph 4.5
4.2 A Retail Capacity Study for Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire was prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) in 2008. Although recent, this work was carried out before the current economic downturn. A further update was therefore requested from NLP in late 2009, to provide up-to-date evidence for an appeal into the council’s refusal of an application to extend the Sainsbury’s store on Rother Way. The study has now been further updated to take account of the Inspector’s decision to allow the appeal and criticisms of the methodology and assumptions used in the study. The revised study will provide evidence on retail capacity to inform the LDF.

4.3 The study identifies that there is scope for further comparison and convenience retail development during the plan period of the Core Strategy (2011-2026). There is potential for approximately 2,800 sqm of new net convenience floorspace by 2016, including a single new large foodstore. If such a foodstore is secured within Chesterfield Town Centre (on the Northern Gateway site), there will be no need to identify further opportunities for large food store development up to 2021.

4.4 Projections of new comparison floorspace have declined since previous studies, due to the implementation of new floorspace at Tesco and Sainsbury stores, as well as significant restructuring in the bulky goods and DIY sectors, which have left a number of large units vacant. The NLP study indicates that there could be scope for a further 19,143 sqm net comparison floorspace up to 2016, although there is also scope for restructuring the large format provision in particular to provide improved quality. It is also likely that, with changing retail formats, more of the comparison floorspace will be delivered in larger formats, creating increased demand for larger units.

4.5 Earlier this year the council commissioned NLP to prepare an update of the 2008 study. The consultants draft report has been received and work to finalise it is almost complete. The document will be reported to councilors for signing off and addition to LDF evidence base.

5.0 LOCAL CENTRES SURVEY
5.1 The purpose of the Local Centres Survey is to identify and map facilities and services currently available in each local centre within Chesterfield Borough.

5.2 The survey identifies the current provision and range of facilities in each of the borough’s local centres. It does not provide detailed information about facilities such as capacity or condition of building.

5.3 Analysis of the survey shows that the borough’s local centres fall into three main groups. Typically, the three groups have differing functions and characteristics. They can be described as follows:

- **‘Local Service Centre’** – has a strong provision of services and facilities, strong sustainable transport links. These give the existing centre the capacity to support growth and potentially to serve an even wider catchment population. The term ‘Local Service Centre’ is used in PPS4 in relation to rural areas (EC6.2) but it is also considered an appropriate term to describe the largest and best-served local centres in the borough.

- **‘Local Centre’** – provides a variety of services and facilities. It also has a larger catchment population than its immediate neighbourhood, but may not have the capacity and range of services for supporting further local growth.

- **‘Neighbourhood Centre’** – a local centre that provides small scale local convenience shops, services and amenities for its immediate area.

5.4 Table 1 shows how the 15 Local Centres in the borough are distributed across the three categories according to the type and variety of facilities on offer, the size of the centre and the number of vacant units within the centre.

### Table 1: Hierarchy of Local Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Local Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Service Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brimington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abercrombie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlemoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Whittington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Whittington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birdholme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkins/Derby Road (Trevor Cr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grangewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkersall Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loundsley Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 The survey work carried out is a snapshot of the ‘on the ground’ situation of the Local Centres within Chesterfield borough as of June 2011. The picture is likely to be ever-changing with different circumstances having differing effects across the borough.

5.6 The intention is to update the study on a regular basis to understand the changing nature and health of these centres. Local centre boundaries are to be reviewed as part of the Sites and Boundaries DPD process, which could lead to the boundaries of these centres being expanded, reduced or left as they are in order to reflect the variety, offer and size of the centres.

5.7 As requested by councillors, the draft of the document was made available for information and comment. No corrections or comments were requested as a result of this process. The version now attached as Appendix 1 is the document recommended to be approved for inclusion within the LDF Evidence Base.

6.0 **STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT 3 (SHLAA 3)**

6.1 The aim of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is to identify future land for housing which is deliverable and developable up to 2026. The assessment forms part of the evidence base for work on the Local Development Framework which will eventually replace the existing Local Plan.
6.1 Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing June 2010 (PPS3) requires all local planning authorities to prepare SHLAAs. ‘Practice Guidance’ was produced in 2007 telling them how it must be done. The SHLAA assesses potential housing land supply but does not seek to make policy decisions about which sites should be developed. Sites are only assessed for suitability, deliverability and developability.

6.2 The first SHLAA for Chesterfield (SHLAA1) was approved in 2009 and the council committed itself to yearly updates. Following the approval of SHLAA 2 in February 2011 as part of the LDF Evidence Base, work has commenced on the production of a third version of the SHLAA (SHLAA 3). A call for sites to identify new sites was carried out with stakeholders over 29th June – 20th July 2011, a total of 16 new sites were identified by stakeholders and council officers.

6.3 The new sites are currently in the process of being analysed. As before, the assessment of their potential for housing will be based on the ‘suitability’, ‘availability’, ‘developability’ and ‘deliverability’ of each site. The analysis of the sites should be completed by the end of September, with a draft of the SHLAA being available by the end of October. It will then be reported to the Deputy Leader and the Executive Member for Planning before consultation with stakeholders.

6.4 It is expected that a final draft version of SHLAA 3 will be reported to the Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Planning in December 2011 for final approval for inclusion within the LDF Evidence Base.

7.0 JOINT TRANSPORT STUDY

7.1 The Joint Transport Study is being prepared by the county council, using its retained consultants, in collaboration with the Highways Agency, the borough council, North East Derbyshire District Council and Bolsover District Council. The purpose is to report on the likely cumulative effects of the proposed broad areas for development in the draft Core Strategies of Chesterfield, Bolsover and North East Derbyshire. A draft of this was supplied by the county council’s consultants in December 2010.
7.2 The draft reported on the likely cumulative effects of traffic predicted to flow from both existing developments and from proposed broad areas of development within the three districts in north east Derbyshire. This was produced using a simple model (DIAMOND) with a base date of 2008 which allocates predicted flows of traffic onto the various links on the Principal Road Network. The main points were as follows:

7.3 The focus of the cumulative report is to quantify the likely traffic impacts of the proposed LDF developments and to give a broad indication of the mitigation strategy likely to be required to deliver the growth envisioned.

7.4 Since many roads within the north eastern part of Derbyshire are expected to experience a high percentage change in traffic flow with the introduction of the cumulative LDF developments, a process has been adopted to identify where there are currently high base flows onto which it is expected there would be a large additions of flow related to the LDF developments.

7.5 The draft report identifies the critical roads where high increases in traffic are forecast on roads already carrying high base traffic flows. Hence, these locations are likely to see the greatest impacts in future years. The critical roads within the borough are:

- **A61 (North of Hornsbridge)** 1552 extra trips (75%)
- **A617 Chesterfield to Mansfield** *Chesterfield to Temple Normanton* 1,274 extra trips (75%)
- **A61 (South of Hornsbridge)** *Hornsbridge to Clay Cross* 876 extra trips (39%)
- **A619 (Chatsworth Road)** 3,515 extra trips (250%)
- **A619 (Chesterfield Road)** *Staveley to Mastin Moor* 1,954 extra trips (155%), *Mastin Moor Barlborough* 1,542 extra trips (122%)
- **A617 Chesterfield to Mansfield** *Chesterfield to Temple Normanton* 1,274 extra trips (37%)

7.6 Many of the increases in flow predicted by the DIAMOND network assignment tool are very large. However, the capacity of the road network, particularly in urban centres, is largely governed by junction, and not road, capacity. Whilst a signalised junction could be expected to accommodate additional flows when allowances
made for red signals and signal changes this capacity is reduced. Hence, such large increases in flow are likely to be accompanied by associated increases in queuing along the roads identified in the above table.

7.7 The first step in identifying a suitable mitigation package is to prepare a strategy for accommodating as many trips as practical by sustainable modes. As far as land-use planning is concerned this means that techniques that maximise the likelihood of using alternative modes; such as providing higher density, mixed-use development. These sorts of measures would have most impact on short-distance trips (i.e. within walking and cycling range) and those along public transport corridors and near to public transport nodes. Potential reductions in trips could be within the range of up to 15%.

7.8 Notwithstanding this, since the proposed LDF developments are predicted to result in additional traffic using the highway network, there are two generalised strategies which could be adopted to accommodate this traffic growth. The first is to acquire areas of land in order to construct additional highway capacity. This would also require additional urban core car parking to be provided.

7.9 If further highway expansion is viewed as being unsustainable and/or unaffordable, however, and if there is agreement about the congested network being the likely future scenario for the local road network, then an alternative strategy would be to focus on the securing of the good operation of central urban centres (e.g. Chesterfield). Measures for this purpose could include:

- Use land-use planning strategies to minimise the need to travel (i.e. Smart Growth);
- Identify key walking and continuous cycling routes with cycle parking at key destination points;
- Identify the likely public transport network requirements with good bus and rail interchanges;
- Identify schemes to prioritise public transport traffic (i.e. buses) along the public transport network;
- Critically review town centre parking locations, and intercept car traffic from radial routes;
- Increase parking at the rail station;
• Employ Smarter Choices transport planning techniques (such as Personalised Travel Planning etc.) to reduce single occupancy trips;
• Hold traffic on the inbound radial routes to ensure the good operation of town centre junctions;
• Identify and improve bottleneck locations and,
• Provide new highway infrastructure only where it provides access to development land, or if it contributes to the above strategy.

7.10 The last point means that some new highway infrastructure is still likely to be required. However, the strategy suggested above provides a good fit with current government policy and guidance.

7.11 The LPAs have sent detailed comments back on the draft. These relate to

• the prevalence of jargon
• The need to consider Junction 29A (constructed after the base date of the study)
• The need to give advice on the severity of the impacts of developments on the network and the likely impact of mitigation measures

8.0 LOCAL STRATEGY STATEMENT

8.1 The government has proposed the revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) through the Localism and Decentralisation Bill. The effect of the revocation of the RSS for the East Midlands will be to remove a raft of policies that set the sub-regional context for all districts, including Chesterfield between 2006 and 2026.

8.2 In response the Planning Officer’s Society (POS) has recommended that local planning authorities should draw up a local strategy statement (LSS). The purpose of the LSS is to set out the strategic context within which the LPA intends to take forward its plan making and decision making in anticipation of the revocation of the regional strategy. The POS has published an advice note about how to prepare such a statement, which has been followed in the draft document for Chesterfield reported here.
8.3 The POS notes that an LSS, because it will be based upon or refer to relevant evidence, may be a material consideration in development management decisions.

8.4 A draft LSS based on the POS advice has been drawn up, which is attached at Appendix 2. It is recommended that it would be prudent to publish this draft LSS and undertake public consultation so that stakeholders get a chance to make their views known before it is finalised. Paragraphs 4.37 – 4.xx provides a summary of the LSS.

8.5 The draft LLS is attached at Appendix 2. It deals with:

- The relevance of RSS policies approved in 2009
- The Economic Strategy
- Transport
- Scale of Housing
- Cross Boundary Issues

**Relevance of RSS Policies**

8.6 The policies of the RSS which concentrate development in and around a hierarchy of retail and service centres and regeneration of former coalfield areas and the evidence on which that strategy was based are still considered to be relevant for Chesterfield.

**Economic Strategy**

8.7 The regional economic strategy prioritises:

- Enterprise, learning and skills
- Sustainability through transport, energy and environment
- Equality through cohesiveness, renewal and inclusion

8.8 The borough is a member of two Local Enterprise Partnerships. The Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership aims to ensure the growth of a rebalanced local economy, led by the private sector.

**Transport**
8.9 The borough is included within two transport studies. One is assessing the potential impact of currently proposed broad areas of growth on the principal road network in north eastern Derbyshire. Progress on this has been reported above. The second is constructing a traffic model for Chesterfield. This will enable a more detailed assessment of the impact of development proposals on the highway network. In addition to this the DCC has adopted a strategic cycle network for Chesterfield. The borough council also supports the restoration of the Chesterfield Canal to full navigation.

Scale of Housing

8.10 The RSS required a provision for an average of 380 additional dwellings each year between 2006 and 2026. The borough council is currently consulting on a strategic housing requirement which aims to continue providing housing delivery at the same rate. This rate is adequate to meet the 2008 based household projections up to 2031 whilst supporting the same levels of economic growth and regeneration that were proposed by the RSS.

8.11 Elsewhere in the housing market area, districts are set to produce local housing targets which will deliver new homes at a rate that will meet all of the policy scenarios that have been tested to 2031 except for the one which seeks to maintain the proportion of economically active residents in the face of an ageing population.

Cross Boundary Issues

8.12 Chesterfield is a sub regional centre. It provides education, employment and retail opportunities for residents of Bolsover, Derbyshire Dales and North East Derbyshire Districts. This creates a net inflow of commuters into the borough. Chesterfield and Sheffield exchange commuters which are relatively in balance. The Markham Vale development straddles the borough boundary and will serve all the districts.

8.13 Flooding issues are significant. Action to restrain flood water e.g. tree planting in North East Derbyshire and within the borough can have significant beneficial impacts.

Conclusion
8.14 It is considered that the general thrust of the RSS strategy of supporting concentration of development in centres and areas requiring regeneration is still relevant. The main change is the economic recession which has slowed the pace of development. The evidence underlying that strategy is still generally sound.

8.15 The latest 2008-based household projections have been considered and a draft local housing target of 380 is being consulted upon. This target will generally support all policy scenarios that have been tested. Whilst the targets of the other districts have not yet been confirmed, current proposals, if approved, are likely to be sufficient to meet the needs of the local housing market area.

9.0 EMPLOYMENT STUDY

9.1 In February an Employment Land Discussion paper was approved for public consultation. The document can be viewed on the council’s website at:

9.2 The consultation with stakeholders was carried out by e-mail and letter between 15th April and 13th May. Members of the Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber were included and the Head of Regeneration attended a meeting of the Chamber’s board to give notice of the opportunity to comment.

9.3 Six representations were received. They are summarised in Appendix 3, with an officer comment about each point raised and a recommended council response. It is recommended that these responses be approved and the document be amended accordingly and incorporated into the evidence base as a topic paper. It is recommended that the spatial strategy for employment in the draft Core Strategy be amended to provide 79 hectares of employment land by 2031, rather than 84 hectares by 2026.

10.0 FINANCIAL & OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

10.1 In writing this report the following corporate issues have been considered:
• **Financial Considerations** - the matters described all fall within existing budgets and the work that has and is to be undertaken among the core duties of current staff.

• **Consultation with the public and with stakeholder groups** - it is necessary to carry out public and stakeholder consultation for some evidence base work. Consultation, although not statutory, will be carried out to a strict timeframe and follow council procedures.

• **Public relations/media** - corporate and statutory requirements are being followed regarding public relations and media.

• **Sustainability and biodiversity** - the proposed consultation document is a statement of sub regional context. This does not raise sustainability and biodiversity issues.

## 11.0 RISK MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the Risk</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Mitigating Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The failure to maintain an adequate, robust and up to date evidence base leading to the Development Plan Document being found unsound by a government inspector</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Ensure that appropriate evidence is collected and analysed on a regular basis in line with government guidance and best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The failure to adequately engage with stakeholders in relation to documents included as part of the LDF evidence base</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Ensure that consultation is undertaken in line with the council’s Statement of Community Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 12.0 EQUALITIES
12.1 As no new policies or programmes are being proposed it is considered there is no requirement for an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA). Once the preferred options of the plans are finalised, a full EIA will be undertaken.

13.0 RECOMMENDATION

13.1 Recommended that:

1) The report be noted,
2) The Local Centres Survey be approved for inclusion as part of the LDF Evidence Base,
3) The draft Local Strategy Statement be approved for consultation with stakeholders,
4) The recommended changes to the Employment Discussion Paper arising from the consultation be approved and the study be revised in ‘topic paper’ format and be added to the LDF evidence base.

14.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

14.1 1) To keep members informed about work on the Local Development Framework.

2) To keep the LDF Evidence Base up to date.

3) To undertake consultations for the LDF.

You can get more information about this report from Alan Siviter on 01246-345954, C Mark Shewring on 01246-345792 or Richard Bryant on 01246-345790.
Officer recommendation supported/not supported/modified as below or Executive Member’s recommendation/comments if no officer recommendation.

Signed
Date

Consultee Executive Member/Support Member comments (if applicable)/declaration of interests