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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]

d) Soundness of housing provision at Sites SS1-SS7

Paragraph 5.8

1. In the context of the constraints, mitigation measures and infrastructure requirements identified within the evidence base, are each of the SS allocations soundly based, viable and deliverable in accordance with the proposed housing trajectory (See TP1 appendix B) and the site capacities as anticipated?

1.1 As referred to in more detail in our response below and to Matter 6, the SS6 allocation is soundly based, viable and deliverable subject to changes to years 18/19 and 19/20 in the housing trajectory.

1.2 Our conclusions on this have been informed by:

- Discussions with Chesterfield Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council and the local cricket club;
- William Davis’s on-site experience with the delivery of Phase 1, in respect of site conditions, development costs and sales values; and
- the initial site survey work (outlined at footnote 1 of the SoCG) submitted with representations to the Local Plan, which have informed the Council’s Land Availability Assessment (with reference to sites 293, 294 and 295).

Paragraph 5.39

2. Paragraph 11.30 of the LP sets out that planning permission is in place on land to the west of Dunston Lane. Are there any updates on the planning status of the wider SS6 site?

2.1 William Davis are currently updating and carrying out further survey work to inform and support a planning application that will be submitted in year
2020/2021. Informal pre-application discussions have already been instigated by William Davis and a formal request for pre-application advice and an Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion from Chesterfield Borough Council is about to be submitted.

Paragraph 5.40

3. The Statement of Common Ground with DCC Highways identified that “the main difference” between Core Strategy and Local Plan from a highway modelling perspective is the proposed strategic allocation at Dunston (SS6). There is current work being carried out as a result of the granting of planning permission for the first phase of the Dunston scheme to ensure that there is sufficient mitigation for the whole development. What assurances are there that the additional growth proposed at Dunston will not result in a severe impact on the highway network for all users? Is Policy SS6 justified and effective in relation to securing necessary transport mitigation?

3.1 A thorough Transport Assessment (TA) was produced to support the consented first phase of development for 300 residential units. The TA for this scheme considered the impact of the development traffic at the following off-site junctions:

   i) Dunston Road/Dunston Lane ghost island priority controlled T-junction
   ii) Dunston Lane/Littlemoor/local shops access cross roads junction
   iii) St John’s Road/Stand Road mini-roundabout
   iv) Newbold Road/Littlemoor mini-roundabout.

3.2 It was agreed with DCC as part of the 300 unit scheme TA that mitigation measures would be limited to the Dunston Road/Dunston Lane ghost island priority controlled T-junction, which would be upgraded to signal control. Impact on other off-site junctions was not deemed to be material and hence no further mitigation measures were required. The impact of the wider SS6 site at these off-site junctions, together with any others which DCC may consider need reviewing, will be further assessed as part of a future TA.

3.3 This is also the view of Chesterfield Borough Council and Derbyshire County Council (as highway authority) who have agreed at sub-section 3 within their Statement of Common Ground dated June 2019 that “[t]he 2011 Traffic Impact Study remains an appropriate baseline for Local Plan preparation on the basis that:
The emerging spatial strategy for Chesterfield remains broadly similar across most of the Borough to the scenarios tested in terms of the broad locations of growth. Where there is material change, in the north-west of the Borough, the authorities are content that development impacts can be adequately assessed on a case-by-case basis through Transportation Assessment. It is anticipated, though, that the authorities will need to agree a broader mitigation package drawing upon CIL as well as any Section 106 contributions relating to the direct impacts of development.”

3.4 The concept masterplan prepared for the site shows opportunities for providing new pedestrian and cycle links as part of the proposals and to tie in with existing public rights of way to the north-east and south-east. Access into the site will be taken from Dunston Road with a link through Phase 1 onto Dunston Lane. Improvements to crossings and footpaths on Dunston Lane have already been implemented as part of Phase 1. New footpath and cycle route connections could be made to the south of the site via Cordwell Avenue, where there is a network of relatively lightly trafficked residential roads which link to Chesterfield Town Centre, providing suitable opportunities for cyclists to make use of the network.

3.5 Three bus services can be accessed from local stops on Consiton Road and Cobnar Drive to the south of the site at a combined frequency of four to six buses per hour during the week. On Sundays, two buses per hour can be accessed during the day. Circular 10 provides one bus every 10-20 minutes to and from Chesterfield. Service 44 terminates within Chesterfield Town Centre, where interchanges with the full range of town buses are available, facilitating access to all other parts of town.

3.6 Whilst these bus services are within walking distance of the majority of the allocation, the scheme has been designed to facilitate bus access into the site, such that service 44 could be diverted into the site from Dunston Lane to collect passengers before it continues its journey north/southbound along Dunston Lane. In addition, the number 10 service could be diverted via the principal route within the site, providing access to the service for all of the new residents.

3.7 In addition, the proposed school will accommodate potential pupils from the allocation, and from the local Dunston ward, and the local centre has been proposed to cater for the proposed residents. Hence the trips generated by these
elements will primarily be linked to the residential element or immediate local area, thus reducing the impact on the wider highway network.

3.8 Accordingly, Policy SS6 will provide for opportunities for sustainable forms of transportation to reduce the impact on the highway network for all users through the policy requirement to demonstrate that the development includes proposals for walking and cycling provision within the site. In addition, any development will be assessed against the Development Plan as a whole and therefore will be required to comply with Policy LP23: Influencing the Demand for Travel, which requires development to reduce the need to travel by private car and mitigate the impact of any remaining traffic impacts on the highway network.

3.9 If modifications are necessary to Policy SS6 so that it is justified and effective in securing the necessary transport mitigation then it is suggested that the policy wording includes the following criteria:

- Minimise any adverse impact on the local highway network as a result of the development and where necessary mitigate any residual unacceptable impacts on highway safety in accordance with Policy LP23.

**Paragraph 5.41**

4. Policy SS6 bullet point one refers to ‘access arrangements’. To ensure the policy is effective and clear, should it require that access arrangements are acceptable?

4.1 William Davis agrees that this modification to the policy would ensure it is effective and clear.

**Paragraph 5.42**

5. The site is within 500m of heritage assets, should Policy SS6 require consideration of this?

5.1 Policy LP22 outlines the requirements to conserve or enhance the historic environment which the development will comply with however, if modifications are necessary to Policy SS6 so that it is justified and effective in consideration of the heritage assets within the vicinity of the site then it is suggested that the policy wording includes the following criteria so that the development must demonstrate that it has:-
• Considered the impact upon heritage assets and their settings and identified any means of mitigation through submission of a Heritage Impact Assessment.

**Paragraph 5.43**

6. Would the total cost of the infrastructure requirements and any developer contributions necessary impede the delivery of site SS6? No cost estimates have been provided for infrastructure requirements; are the Council in position to set out the likely cost of any that are necessary?

6.1 The total cost of the infrastructure requirements for Phase 1 have already been accepted and agreed as part of the S106 Agreement associated with planning permission CHE/16/00016/OUT. In terms of Phase 2, the infrastructure requirements will be funded via condition, developer contributions and/or CIL. The allocation will fall within the Medium Residential rate of £50 per sqm.

6.2 Through discussions with Derbyshire County Council (DCC), as education authority, it has already been identified that Dunston Primary and Nursery Academy is over capacity and DCC are working with the Academy to reconfigure the existing school site to expand capacity. The Academy would not have capacity to take the projected number of pupils from the proposed development at present, and therefore Policy SS6 requires a site to reserved for a one form entry primary school to cater for the pupils as a result of the allocation. The Council’s CIL Regulation 123 List includes the following education provision requirements “the provision of additional pupil capacity in existing schools and contributions to a new school or schools to address shortfalls in capacity arising from new housing growth” and therefore Chesterfield Borough Council will accept the transfer of land or infrastructure to the Council as payment in accordance with Regulations 73, 73A, 73B and 74 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended) and the Council’s Payment in Kind Policy Statement.

6.3 There were no infrastructure requirements or developer contributions that impeded the delivery of Phase 1 and it is not envisaged that there will be any infrastructure requirements or developer contributions that will impede the delivery of Phase 2.