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MATTER 5 – PROPOSED SITE ALLOCATIONS - HOUSING SITES AND STRATEGIC SITES

Issue 1: Whether the proposed housing allocations will deliver sustainable housing development to meet identified needs. [Policy LP4 and SS Policies]

c) Soundness of Sites H1-H36 presented in Table 4

5.4 In the context of the constraints and mitigation measures identified within the evidence base, are each of the housing allocations in Table 4 of the Plan soundly based, viable, and deliverable in accordance with the proposed housing trajectory (See TP1 appendix B) and the site capacities as anticipated? Where relevant, an update on the planning status of the sites should be provided.

5.5 Do the site areas and anticipated housing numbers presented in Table 4 correlate with the underpinning evidence including the helpful Site Allocation Conclusion Summaries document (examination document KSD23)? For example different figures arise for sites H32 (site area), H35 (site area and capacity). Can any differences be explained or require modifications to the Plan?

We refer the Inspectors to our representations (2no.) on Policy LP4 Flexibility in Delivery of Housing.

Proposed allocation H5 Pondhouse Farm: As set out in the above representations, CST is of the view that the allocation should be extended to include paddock land to the south of the allocation, as currently drawn. The resulting boundary would then be consistent with planning application ref. CHE/17/00390/OUT that was recommended for approval to planning committee in October 2017, and extant planning application ref. CHE/18/00491/OUT (being a resubmission of CHE/17/00390/OUT). The capacity of the resulting allocation should be increased to a minimum of 23 dwellings, which would be consistent with the combined total of previous applications refs. CHE/17/00225/OUT and CHE/17/00390/OUT, and extant...
applications CHE/18/00491/OUT and CHE/18/00688/OUT (being resubmissions of the previous applications).

**Proposed allocation H35 Land South of Worksop Road, and East and West of Bolsover Road, Mastin Moor:** As set out in the above representations, CST supports the allocation but it should be amended to refer to 650 dwellings and the site area corrected. Extant planning application ref. CHE/17/00469/OUT) for ‘Residential development of up to 650 dwellings (including elderly care and specialist accommodation), a Local Centre (including local retail, health facilities, other local facilities and services), open space, community garden extension (including community building and parking) and associated infrastructure’ is scheduled to be considered by the Borough Councils Planning Committee on 14th October 2019; a recommendation of approval is anticipated. Any update will be reported to the Inspectors at the Hearing.

d) **Soundness of housing provision at Sites SS1-SS7**

**SS5 – Staveley and Rother Valley**

5.26 The Viability Study has applied a clean-up cost of around £50,000 per dwelling at the SS5 site and concludes this renders the site unviable without public subsidy. What are the reasonable prospects of funding to de-contaminate and remediate the site? How would the HS2 project potentially affect the viable redevelopment of the site?

As noted in our representation on **Policy SS5 Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor**, CST has submitted an outline planning application with all matters reserved except part access for a first phase of development on land to the east and west of Works Road ‘for mixed use development of up to 700 dwellings, retail, leisure, hotel, employment and community uses, primary school, canal marina, open space, and associated infrastructure and other works, including demolition, ground remediation and restoration on land off Works Road, Hollingwood, Chesterfield’ (application ref. CHE/19/00103/OUT). CST has undertaken its own viability analysis to inform preparation of that development proposal and options across its wider ownership within the SRVC. This analysis has drawn upon more recent and detailed site investigations and studies than those drawn upon by the Viability Study, including intrusive site investigations and infrastructure requirements. The costs information underpinning CST’s viability analysis is therefore more bespoke than the analysis underpinning the Viability Study.
The clean up cost of ‘around £50,000 per dwelling’ referenced within Question 5.26 is based on historic assessments which relied on relatively limited data and also applied a generic HCA cost/ha rather than a more bespoke costing for the known contamination. CST’s assessment of comparable ‘clean-up costs’ for the scheme presented within application ref. CHE/19/00103/OUT is lower than the figure quoted above. As is to be expected for a complex, previously developed site, site preparation costs remain comparably high. Taking into account infrastructure requirements, development proposed by CST remains ‘viable’; higher development costs do however reduce projected land values. Consequently, as development proposals are progressed, a focus must remain on opportunities for partnership working with funding agencies so as to ensure SRVC-wide delivery of essential infrastructure where that infrastructure provides public benefits and is beyond that required solely to support development by CST (and the other landowners – notably Saint Gobain and Omnivale) within the SRVC, such as the CSRR.

5.28 Is the total cost of the infrastructure requirements and developer contributions sought in Appendix A for SS5 reasonably accurate and would they impede the delivery of development? A number of the infrastructure requirements do not include cost estimates; are the Council in position to set out the likely cost of these?

As noted in our response to Question 5.26 above, CST has undertaken viability analysis to inform preparation of developments across its ownership within the SRVC. CST’s analysis therefore provides a ‘sense check’ of the figures set out in Appendix A. The headline figures quoted in Appendix A from the ‘Options Report’ (Taylor Young, 2010) should be treated with some caution because of the high level nature of the assessment at that time. Costs used by CST in its analysis are more focused, more detailed and more up-to-date. Joint working between landowners, the Borough and County Councils and other parties continues to examine and explore infrastructure requirements and costs associated with the delivery of development across the SRVC. Delivery of the CSRR, which would bring forward significant public benefits beyond the boundary of the SRVC, has been and continues to be the subject of particular focus.

CST’s analysis continues to assure that comprehensive development across the SRVC can be delivered. CST’s significant investment in the preparation and submission of its planning application for a first phase of development is an expression of that confidence.
5.32 **What work has been undertaken to establish the effect contamination and unstable land would have on site capacity?**

As noted in our representation on **Policy SS5 Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor** and above, CST has submitted an outline planning application for a first phase of development on land to the east and west of Works Road (application ref. CHE/19/00103/OUT). Saint-Gobain and Omnivale have submitted an outline planning application for the development of their land in the western part of the SRVC. The two applications reflect joint working and the valley-wide masterplan prepared to inform the respective proposals.

CST’s application includes an Environmental Statement and illustrative masterplan. Both of those documents, and the application proposal as a whole, have been informed by an extensive programme of ground investigations and site remediation and restoration options analysis, aligned with assessment of costs. The illustrative masterplan avoids development within areas that may be potentially unstable, e.g. land around former mine shafts (that will be removed and remediated to agreed standards) to the west of Works Road identified as public open space, land that was subject to open cast coal extraction and restoration but is unsuitable for building upon at the eastern end of the application site identified as school playing fields, public open space and drainage infrastructure, with related landscaping and ecological enhancements. Chapter F ‘Ground Conditions and Contamination’ of the aforesaid Environmental Statement addresses related matters in detail. CST’s extant planning application is therefore an accurate and realistic presentation of the development capacity of that part of the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor.

### Issue 2: Whether the Regeneration Priority Areas are justified and deliverable [Policy RP1]

5.51 **Policy RP1 anticipates that the Mastin Moor RPA would deliver 400 new homes, which corresponds with the 400 homes anticipated from allocation H35. However, in the context of the total site area for H35 and the planning application history at the site, is the expected number of houses set out accurate and appropriate?**

We refer the Inspectors to our representations (2no.) on **Policy LP4 Flexibility in Delivery of Housing**. Proposed allocation H35 Land South of Worksop Road, and East and West of Bolsover Road, Mastin Moor should be increased to 650 dwellings so as to reflect outline planning application ref. CHE/17/00469/OUT. The application is scheduled to be considered by the Borough Council’s Planning Committee on 14th
October 2019; a recommendation of approval is anticipated. Any update will be reported to the Inspectors at the Hearing.

Notwithstanding the demonstration of deliverability of 650 dwellings within the proposed allocation by way of outline planning application ref. CHE/17/00469/OUT, reasons as to why the policy basis for the allocation should be adjusted to refer to 650 dwellings rather than 400 dwellings include both ‘supply’ and ‘demand’ side factors.

The policy basis for development in this locality is underpinned by the need for regeneration. This presents CST, as landowner, with an extensive range of policy-based aspirations and expectations, in terms of the form of development, benefits that must accrue from it, developer obligations etc. The proposed allocation is however located within an area characterised by depressed development values. The regeneration-led benefits sought by the Council can therefore only be realistically delivered if a higher quantum of development is supported. This has been acknowledged by the Council through its review of viability analysis submitted in support of the above outline application. The higher (650 dwelling) quantum of development is required to ensure the development remains viable, if the policy-based aspirations and expectations are not to be forgone.

Part of the site is subject to elevated development costs, having been open casted during the Second World War, and therefore subject to difficult ground conditions, in addition to other historic ground condition challenges such as bell pits. Site topography and the need for new infrastructure also contributes to higher build costs. Significant parts of the proposed development would be given over to public open space, in part a response to site topography and part so as to ensure a high quality development that will help to deliver community benefits through, for example, improved recreation and leisure opportunities, with related health and well-being advantages. These benefits stand alongside the need to deliver a significant boost to housing supply.

As such, it is clear that the proposed allocation H35 Land South of Worksop Road, and East and West of Bolsover Road, Mastin Moor should be increased to 650 dwellings.
5.52 In 2015 modelling was done to support the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor proposals which also included potential growth of up to 650 dwellings at Mastin Moor. Does this evidence indicate a need for any site specific policy for highways infrastructure (on or off site) for the 400 dwellings proposed at Mastin Moor through Policy RP1?

No. The transport assessment undertaken in support of application CHE/17/00469/OUT (the scope of which was agreed with Derbyshire County Council (DCC) as the Local Highways Authority) confirms that the proposed site access arrangements, including signal controlled and priority type junctions (all ‘on-site’), are appropriate. Some adjustments to the timing of existing signal controlled junctions (Worksop Road/Norbriggs Road and Worksop Road/Bolsover Road) may be beneficial but no requirement for off-site highway works was identified as necessary to ensure continued safe operation of the local highway network. Detailed approval for these highway works is sought within application CHE/17/00469/OUT; DCC Authority has no objections to the application and has agreed the extent of highways works required.

5.55 In certain circumstances, subject to landscape, infrastructure and highways impacts, Policy RP1 allows the level of housing growth for each RPA to be exceeded. Is this aspect of the policy clearly written, justified and appropriate? Generally, are the housing numbers for the RPAs to be considered minimum figures?

As written, RPA1’s target of the delivery of ‘400 new homes’ within the Mastin Moor Regeneration Priority Area must be read as a minimum. CST’s extant outline planning application (ref. CHE/17/00469/OUT) seeks approval for up to 650 dwellings. As noted above, that application is scheduled to be considered by the Borough Councils Planning Committee on 14th October 2019. A recommendation of approval is anticipated. No tension between the application proposals and the emerging Local Plan that might otherwise stand in the way of a positive officer recommendation has been identified by officers. In this context, the ‘400 new homes’ can only be interpreted as a minimum.

We also refer to our response to Question 5.51 as to why the quantum of development within RPA1 should be increased to 650 dwellings.