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Section 1-4 Introduction and Methodology
1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Local Development Framework (LDF) is the development plan system by which the council will guide the development of the borough up to 2031. It will replace the 2006 Replacement Chesterfield Borough Local Plan.

1.2 The LDF is made up of a number of statutory and non-statutory documents, which deal with different planning issues.

1.3 The LDF is made up of the following documents:
   - Core Strategy DPD
   - Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor Area Action Plan
   - Statement of Community Involvement
   - Annual Monitoring Report
   - Local Development Scheme
   - Proposals Map
   - Supplementary Planning Documents

1.4 The first part of the LDF process is the Core Strategy that has been submitted to the Secretary of State. The Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor Area Action Plan is at public consultation on a preferred option alongside this Sites and Boundaries Issues and Options DPD. The area of coverage of the Area Action Plan is shown on Map 30.

1.5 The Core Strategy sets out the broad picture of where, when and how development will take place. The key elements of the Spatial Strategy set out in the Core Strategy are:
   - Concentrate development in accessible locations and in areas that need regeneration
   - Protect the Green Belt and other greenfield land as much as possible by concentrating new development on brownfield sites
   - Reduce pollution and congestion by locating new development close to existing centres
   - Make it easier for people to choose healthy and environmentally friendly forms of transport
   - Address deprivation
   - Regenerate vacant, underused and contaminated land especially in the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor
   - Locate the majority of new homes on brownfield sites at Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor and Waterside, concentrated around existing town, district and local service centres, and at areas in need of regeneration
   - Allow for some greenfield housing development in areas in need of regeneration when brownfield land is not available
• Locate new employment development for manufacturing and distribution on brownfield or already-committed sites in areas already regarded as industrial in character, with light industry and offices

1.6 The Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor AAP is a more detailed plan that sets out how the Staveley and Rother Valley will be developed over the next 15 years. Although the boundary of the Area Action Plan is shown within this plan, any detailed proposals are contained within the SRVCAAP.

1.7 The next important stage in the LDF process is the production of the Sites and Boundaries DPD.
2.0 Sites and Boundaries DPD

What is it?
2.1 This plan allocate sites for different types of development and / or protection, and it will be used to take forward elements of the Core Strategy at the more detailed site specific level.

What area will the Site and Boundaries DPD cover?
2.2 It will cover the whole of Chesterfield borough, the only exception being the proposals covered by the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor Area Action Plan.

What will it show?
2.3 The Plan will show in detail where development will take place and which policies apply to specific areas. The Sites and Boundaries DPD will identify the following sites and boundaries:

- Specific site allocations for housing (including affordable housing)
- Regeneration Priority Areas
- The designation of Employment Areas.
- The amendment, where necessary, of the Green Belt boundary and the definition of proposed Green Wedges, Strategic Gaps, areas of open space and other green infrastructure assets.
- The identification of boundaries for Town, District, Local Service and Local Centres, as well as establishing Primary and Secondary Frontages within Town and District Centres and the identification of existing ‘edge of centre' Retail Parks and Supermarkets
- The identification of sites for new community and infrastructure facilities.
- The safeguarding of land for identified new transport routes
- Areas of search for renewable energy opportunities
- Areas for the ‘place shaping policy’ contained within the Core Strategy

2.4 This Issues and Options document sets out the range of potential sites that could be allocated for future development up to 2031, along with some of the issues for consideration in the decision making process. The settlements specified as development locations are established in the publication version of the Core Strategy and are not, therefore, subject to further consultation now.

How have these potential sites been identified?
2.5 The sites and boundaries set out in this Issues & Options document have been collected either through the use of documents contained within the Local Development Framework evidence base or have been initially based upon some of the boundaries contained within the
The Council is seeking your views on the criteria that will be used to select the final sites to be allocated for development. These can be found in Chapter 3 – Site allocations and screening methodology and we welcome any comments you may have on our proposals.

Questions for Consideration

Q1. Are the evidence base documents that have been used to identify the potential sites and boundaries appropriate?

Q2. Is there any topic that you feel would require further evidence or investigation?

Duty to Cooperate

The National Planning Policy Framework (para. 179) states that local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. During the process of developing the Sites and Boundaries there will be a need to work closely with partners including Derbyshire County Council, North East Derbyshire District Council and Bolsover District Council on a variety of allocations and boundaries that will be of strategic importance.

Derbyshire County Council have had involvement in identifying land and sites for safeguarding that are required for transport and education schemes. Both North East Derbyshire District Council and Bolsover District Council will be encouraged to work with the council on the proposed growth highlighted around Duckmanton, Hasland, Mastin Moor and Holme Hall due to the close proximity to the borough boundary. The impact of potential renewable energy developments, particularly the areas of potential for wind in the north of the borough will also require collaborative working to ensure that any renewable development will have positive impact for all neighbouring authorities.

How do I use this document?

The document is divided into theme specific sections, such as residential, employment and environment. Specific questions are asked in relation to each theme, allowing you to express your views on the relative suitability of potential development sites and boundaries.
2.10 Within this consultation document there are a number of tables and maps, which illustrate all of the potential housing, employment, retail, open space, environmental and renewable energy sites and boundaries for consideration. Each site and boundary shown has a unique reference number. The numbers given to potential sites and boundaries have been specifically assigned by the council for this consultation paper and do not correspond with any other background study.

**When and how do I respond with comments?**

2.11 We want our plans to be shaped by input and evidence from everyone interested in the borough of Chesterfield and its future development. We need your local knowledge to help us to understand the relevant local issues and we welcome your ideas for the allocation of land in the Borough. Please let us know whether you think we are on the right track. A guide to the types of issues that can and cannot be taken into account in relation to your answers can be found at Appendix C.

2.12 The deadline for responses for this consultation stage is Friday 8th February 2013. Please be aware that representations made about this document (including your name and address) cannot be treated as confidential and will be made available for public inspection.

2.13 In order to respond to this document please return your comments on the questionnaire provided. If you are reading this in hard copy, a questionnaire is attached (you may wish to make additional copies) or you can download a questionnaire from our website.

2.14 You can send your response to us in the following ways:

Post to:
Forward Planning Team
Chesterfield Borough Council
Town Hall
Rose Hill
Chesterfield
S40 1LP

Email: forward.planning@chesterfield.gov.uk

Fax: 01246 345809

In person: please hand at Planning Reception at the Town Hall in Chesterfield marked for the attention of Forward Planning.
What will happen next?

2.15 We will compile all responses to this consultation document and use them to help us come to a decision about which sites we consider to be the most suitable for the borough; the so called ‘Preferred Options’. More detail on how these preferred options will be reached can be found in Section 3. We will consult on them in a ‘Preferred Options’ document.

2.16 If you have any further queries please get in touch with the Forward Planning team.
3.0 Site Allocations Screening Methodology

Residential

3.1 A number of sites put forward to the Council have already been screened out as a result of the assessment used for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). These sites were not considered to be either suitable or available for development when considered in relation to the criteria set out in the agreed methodology.

3.2 With the exception of certain brownfield sites that have been identified away from settlements, only sites that are within or next to a settlement or area named in the Core Strategy Policy CS1 have been considered as having potential for development, to ensure that development is focused in the most sustainable locations.

Suitability of the Site

3.3 Sites considered in the SHLAA were assessed against the following potential constraints, the effects of which might impact on their suitability for development:

- Heritage assets (including Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings)
- Local Wildlife Sites
- Access to the site and local road network capacity
- Levels of access to key services and facilities
- Protected trees
- Protected species
- Ancient woodlands
- Local Nature Reserves
- Agricultural land quality
- Biodiversity
- Open space with statutory protection
- Protected employment land
- Highways access
- Ground conditions/topography
- Flood risk
- Pollution or contamination
- Land stability
- Access to utility infrastructure

3.4 In many cases, such constraints can be overcome, in which case the site has been assessed as 'may be suitable'. Where this is not felt to be possible, or goes against Core Strategy policies (such as flood risk), the sites have been considered as being unsuitable for
development and have not been brought forward for consideration in this Issues & Options consultation report.

Employment

3.5 Potential employment sites and areas were considered in the Employment Land Topic Paper, which looked at the employment land requirement of the Core Strategy and amount of land available to deliver this requirement. This supplemented and updated the work of the Northern Sub-Region Employment Land Review which also appraised existing employment areas in terms of criteria that focused on market, policy and sustainability attributes.

3.6 No new employment sites have been identified for allocation, but existing employment areas have been identified as being capable of providing available and suitable land to meet the requirement set out in the Core Strategy. A number of areas that were previously identified as employment areas within the 2006 Replacement Chesterfield Borough Local Plan have been removed from this designation because they no longer cater for any significant B employment uses.

Identifying Sites for Preferred Options

3.7 Following the consultation on the Issues & Options paper, further more detailed site assessment will be undertaken in order to reach a preferred set of sites for consideration in the second formal round of consultation: the Preferred Options report.

3.8 This further site assessment will be based on the criteria set out below. These criteria will allow the Council to assess the potential impacts of developing particular sites, as well as giving consideration to the benefits that development may deliver to the wider community.

3.9 Sites will be scored against each criterion using a traffic light system, with green indicating no conflicts, amber indicating some or minor issues (that can be overcome) and red indicating direct conflict. A summary of key observations or concerns in relation to each site will also be provided.

3.10 It is not our intention to rank the sites, although the sites with the highest number of ‘green lights’ will be regarded as more desirable (with the least amount of mitigation required) and more likely to be carried forward into the Preferred Options report. It is important to note, however, that ‘red lights’ do not necessarily mean that a site cannot be considered. These show that the site has issues that require greater mitigation or has impacts that need to be balanced against other factors in the assessment (e.g. its ability to deliver significant local benefits). As such, there will be situations where a site may score more ‘amber’ or ‘red lights’ but, in addressing or mitigating
these issues or impacts, a greater range of benefits could be achieved for the wider community. In these situations these sites may also be carried forward to the Preferred Options.

3.11 There may well be several sites in a settlement with the same ‘score’, in which case it will come down to a matter of judgement as to which are the most suitable, taking note of local opinion.

3.12 Following the site assessments, the Council will present the combination of sites it considers to be the best option (the Preferred Option), in terms of delivering the right range and type of development in the best locations, while achieving the right balance between impact on, and benefits to, local communities.

Site Assessment Criteria

Criterion 1: Will development of the site be compatible with existing and/or proposed neighbouring land uses?

3.13 From the point of view both of existing public amenity and amenity of the occupiers of new development sites, it will be essential to ensure that new development is compatible with its surroundings, taking into consideration, for example, issues of noise, odour, light or privacy. For example, new housing is unlikely to be compatible with an existing heavy industrial site and vice versa.

3.14 Sites will be classified as one of the following:

| Development is compatible with existing and proposed uses | GREEN |
| Development is likely to be compatible with existing and proposed uses providing mitigation measure incorporated. | AMBER |
| Development is incompatible with existing and proposed uses | RED |

Criterion 2: Will the site result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land?

3.15 Some new development in the borough will be on greenfield land. It is important to ensure, therefore, that its impact on the land most valuable for agricultural purposes is minimised.

3.16 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 112 states that “Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a high quality”.
3.17 Natural England’s Agricultural Land Classification is a helpful tool which can be used when considering the development of Greenfield land. This classification separates land into five grades (and further subdivides grade 3 into 3a and 3b).

3.18 In line with the NPPF development of the best and most versatile agricultural land (i.e. grades 1, 2 and 3a) should be avoided but where development of agricultural land is unavoidable it should be focused on grades 3b, 4 and 5, which are seen as being of poorer quality. The information is not available to differentiate between grades 3a and 3b in Chesterfield. Consequently, this assessment will consider all grade 3 sites as being of the same quality unless evidence to make this distinction is provided.

3.19 Sites will be assessed against the following impacts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on agricultural land</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact on agricultural land</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Grade 3, 4 and 5 agricultural land</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 3:** Is the site susceptible to surface water flooding?

3.20 Flooding from surface water happens when the local drainage system cannot cope with the rainfall. It is extremely difficult to predict precisely where surface water flooding will happen as it is dependent on ground levels, rainfall, and the local drainage network. Historically the split in responsibilities between local authorities and water companies has meant that there has not been a common approach to the management of drainage systems in urban areas.

3.21 Chesterfield borough has a number of areas that are susceptible to surface water flooding, new development should not worsen the susceptibility of sites to surface water flooding or pass the problem onto other sites or existing developments. Mitigation measures in the form of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be provided on site in order not to exacerbate the problem. As the approval body and lead local flood authority, Derbyshire County Council will have to be satisfied within any proposed SuDS schemes before they go ahead.

3.22 Sites will be assessed against the following impacts:

| Site is Outside areas identified as being Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding | GREEN  |
| Site is in an area with a level of Low or Intermediate Susceptibility to Surface Water Flooding | AMBER  |
| Site is in an area More Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding                  | RED    |
**Criterion 4:** Will the development detract from or enhance the existing green infrastructure networks of the settlement or neighbourhood?

3.23 Green Infrastructure comprises networks of open spaces in both rural and urban areas. These open spaces (e.g. Local Wildlife Sites, Parks or areas of woodland) support natural and ecological processes and are integral to the health and quality of sustainable communities. Increasing the connectivity between green infrastructure networks is seen as an important outcome with any development.

3.24 Sites will be assessed to determine if their development would be likely to add to, or detract from, this network of open spaces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of the site is likely to enhance existing Green Infrastructure</th>
<th>GREEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the site is unlikely to either detract from or enhance existing Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the site will result in a loss of Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 5:** Will the development impact upon highway safety and or highway capacity?

3.25 There are heavy flows of traffic through Chesterfield borough, particularly along the A61 in the Derby and Sheffield directions and between the M1 and the Peak District along the A619/A617. This is partly due to the location of the borough at the intersection of regional routes, and partly the amount of in and out commuting for work journeys that the borough experiences.

3.26 Those proposing development must consider the impact of their proposals upon highway safety and capacity. The impact of significant developments on the transport network will be tested on the Chesterfield Area Transport Model run by Derbyshire County Council the local highway authority.

3.27 For purposes of this consultation, sites will be assessed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive or neutral impact upon safety and/or highway capacity</th>
<th>GREEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor impact upon safety and/or highway capacity</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major impact upon safety of highway capacity, inappropriate use for the area</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 6:** Will the development detract from or enhance the existing built character of the settlement or neighbourhood?

3.28 It is important that new development sites are appropriate to the existing, sometimes sensitive, built form of neighbourhoods or settlements, complementing or enhancing that which already exists. In
some settlements there are areas that would benefit from new
development, where this would result in a positive impact on a derelict
site or poor quality streetscape. Sites will be assessed against their
potential impact on the area in which they are situated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 7: Is the site available for development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the site is likely to enhance the existing built form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the site is unlikely to detract from or to enhance the existing built form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the site is likely to detract from the existing built form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.29 Some sites that are included in this Issues and Options document may become unavailable for development during preparation of the Preferred Option document, for example if landowners are unknown or are not interested in developing the site. During the preferred options stage landowners will be approached to discuss up-to-date intentions for sites. Landowners and occupiers are also encouraged to contact the council now to give their views about future development of the sites and boundaries shown within the document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 8: Are there identified and unresolved constraints to the delivery of the site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land owner has put site forward for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land owner intentions are unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land owner does not want to put site forward for development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.30 Various constraints may have been identified for a site. Many of these will have been highlighted in the site’s initial assessment in the SHLAA or the Northern Sub-Region Employment Land Study, or through discussions with a site’s promoter.

3.31 Furthermore, even if the council’s work with infrastructure providers to date has not identified any significant strategic infrastructure problems, the development of an individual site may only be achievable if a number of locally specific-infrastructure improvements are delivered before or alongside the development of the site.

3.32 For a site to progress to the Preferred Options stage, site promoters will be expected to have demonstrated that any identified constraints have been, or are, resolvable. The resolution of any identified constraints may come, for example, through Section 106 contributions or appropriate design solutions.

3.33 Finally, developers are often minded to provide facilities of value to the community as an integral part of their development (e.g. a doctors’ surgery or a community hall) and are usually required to deliver
affordable housing as part of significant residential developments. These community benefits may also be considered as an approach to overcoming an identified constraint that the development of the site would create.

3.34 In considering the above, all relevant sites will be re-assessed to determine the extent of any constraints and the likelihood of their resolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints Description</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site has no existing constraints</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has some constraints, which have been or can be resolved</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has constraints that have not been or cannot be resolved</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 9:** Is the local community supportive of the development of the site?

3.35 Public opinion is a consideration in the site allocation process. While, clearly, the nature of planning is such that it is often impossible to reach a decision that satisfies all interested parties, the level of support for or against a particular site will be a factor in the decision-making process. This will be particularly important where there are a number of sites in a given locality between which it is difficult to decide.

3.36 It is recognised that land owners or prospective developers may hold their own independent consultation with local communities to gauge support for the development of a site. If the results of these consultation exercises are submitted to the Council, they will be considered accordingly alongside the responses council receive through its own consultation processes such as the Issues & Options Consultation Paper.

3.37 Consultation responses on each site will be considered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Level</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is strong support for development of the site</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is some support for development of the site</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no support for development of the site</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 10:** Is the proposed site suitable for the proposed use?

3.38 Suitability is a key consideration at the Issues and Options stage as to whether sites are taken forward and promoted as part of a Preferred Option. Sites will be checked to see whether they can provide a suitable living environment in a sustainable location, without major policy or physical constraints.

3.39 Policy constraints could include not being in the identified growth areas within the Cores Strategy, or being located in an area...
protection from development such as the Green Belt. Physical constraints could stem from flood risk to coal mining legacy.

3.40 All of which will be considered to decide whether a site is suitable for certain uses, consultation responses on each site will be considered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is suitable for the proposed use (no policy or physical constraints)</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site maybe suitable for the proposed use (some policy or physical constraints that can be overcome or mitigated)</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not suitable for the proposed use (major policy or physical constraints)</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions for Consideration**

Q3. Are the proposed criteria for assessing sites the best approach? If not, please indicate what changes you would like to be made, including reference to the specific criterion.
4.0 **Issues and Options for Consideration**

4.1 The council has used previous evidence base work to identify key issues and options for each of the highlighted sites and boundaries.