BOLSOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION
Matter 2 SOUNDNESS OF THE LOCAL PLAN

Issue 10: Is the Local Plan consistent with national policy in respect of open space, recreation and community facilities?

Rob Routledge and Jon Hendy.

……..

Wednesday 06/02/2019 -PM
Issue 10

Is the Local Plan consistent with national policy in respect of open space, recreation and community facilities?

Q182. Does Figure 8A: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network [page 133] accurately show the route of the Archaeological Way?

182.1 The Council has taken the opportunity afforded by the Inspector’s question to recheck with Bolsover Countryside Partnership about the accuracy of the route of the Archaeological Way shown in figure 8A. Following this conversation the following changes are proposed and shown in Appendix A.

1. Change to Policies Map and Figure 8A to show Mag Lane as part of the existing route (Solid Green) (Omitted, initially, it was already a country lane i.e. already an accessible route)
2. Change to Policies Map and Figure 8A to show Sookholme Road as part of the existing route (Solid Green) (Omitted, initially because we showed this section as part of the Cycle network red dashed line)
3. Change to Policies Map and Figure 8A, to change Frithwood Lane from an existing route to a proposed route, (Dotted green line) and a change to Policy ITCR 2 to amend the title of 3) Archaeological Way Link from Frithwood Lane Bridleway to Gypsy Lane, Creswell to instead say 3) Frithwood Lane Bridleway and link to Gypsy Lane, Creswell (part of Archaeological Way).

182.2 A representation (8321) was received from Bolsover Countryside Partnership in support of Policy ICTR 2 but also asking for the clarification of the detail of an additional proposed trail to link the Archaeological Way to the Clowne Branch Line. This link is shown on the northern policies map on the inset map for Creswell.

182.3 Subject to the formal agreement of the Council, modifications are proposed to the plan, reflecting these changes to amend Policy ITCR 2, the Policies Maps and Figure 8A.

Q183. Has the impact of the Multi-User Trails 20) and 21) in Policy ITCR2 on 2 Local Wildlife Sites located between Clowne and Creswell been fully assessed?

183.1 The proposed Multi user trails reflect Derbyshire County Council’s approach to improving such facilities, as the responsible authority. One of the Proposed Multi-User routes, Clowne branch Line from Gypsy Lane, Creswell to Seymour Junction has planning permission and the impact on Biodiversity would have been considered as part of that application. The same
considerations would take place should an application be submitted for the other route.

183.2 Based on a better understanding of the situation, Derbyshire Wildlife Trust have agreed to withdraw representation 8597 as referred to in the Statement of Common Ground (ED 18).

Q184. **Has the impact of the inclusion of Multi-User Trails within the Consultation Zones for the Rough Close Works been fully considered in respect of the risk to public safety? [Policy ITCR2]**

184.1 The Council has agreed to delete the small distances of the Proposed Multi-User trails that are shown within the Inner Consultation Zone. The proposed modifications to the Policies Maps are shown as PM 45 in (ED5). The amendments reflect discussions that have also involved Derbyshire County Council as the relevant authority.

184.2 Leith Planning are happy with these modifications and have withdrawn representation 8479 as agreed in a Statement of Common Ground (ED 29) with the Council.

Q185. **Should any other Multi User Trails be added? [Policy ITCR2]**

185.1 The Council received a representation (8229) about including a new Proposed Multi User Trail between Creswell Crags and Hodthorpe that would link into the network in Nottinghamshire. In consultation with Derbyshire County Council, the Council has agreed to this and proposes a modification to Policy ITCR 2: Multi-User Trails, PM 46 (ED 5).

185.2 Based on a better understanding of the situation, Notts Ramblers / Sherwood Forest Project have agreed to withdraw representation 8229 as referred to in a Statement of Common Ground (ED 28).

185.3 No further Multi-User Trails are proposed to be added.

Q186. **Is Policy ITCR4 effective and consistent with national policy in respect of the protection of local shops and community facilities?**

186.1 Yes, Policy ITCR 4 is consistent with Paragraph 70 of the NPPF (2012) which states:

“To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:
- plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural
buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;

- guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs;

- ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community; and

- ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services”.

186.2 Policy ITCR4 is also considered to be effective in the sense that it is deliverable over the plan period. It is considered that local shops and community facilities do not raise any significant cross boundary issues requiring joint working.

Q187. Is Policy ITCR5 justified and consistent with national policy in respect of the provision of green space and play provision?

187.1 Under, ‘Using a proportionate evidence base’, Para 158 of the NPPF requires planning policies to be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence of the need for open space. The assessments should identify specific needs for open space and quantitative and qualitative deficits or surplus of open space. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space is required.

187.2 Policy ITCR 5 uses information gained in the assessments known as the evidence base documents Green Space Strategy (EB1) and the Green Space Quantity and Accessibility Report (EB2). The Green Space Strategy identifies settlement quantitative standards against which settlements record either a surplus or a deficit, and qualitative standards for green spaces against which a minimum quality standard of 60% is sought. The policy requires new green space based upon standards per 1000 population applied to the likely new population added from the development proposal.

187.3 However, for settlements that have a surplus of green space, the policy allows a reduction in the amount required based upon how much of the development site that is within 400 metres from the edge of a green space. Information used in the assessments is also used to inform the requirement for qualitative improvements.

187.4 The Council has proposed modifications to Policy ITCR 5 based on representations received from Sport England (9100) and Persimmon Homes (8674). In respect of the Sport England representations, the Council has taken out the references to Playing Pitches and made consequential amendments to Policy ITCR 7: Playing Pitches. The modifications PM 49
(ED5) relate to Policy ITCR 5 and PM 50 (ED5) relate to policy ITCR 7: Playing Pitches. A Statement of Common Ground exists between Sport England and the Council whereby Sport England have agreed to withdraw representation 9100 based on these modifications (ED 32).

187.5 The representation from Persimmon Homes (8674) is in respect of the requirement to provide improvements to the quality of green spaces. The Council recognises that Policy could be improved with some amendment and therefore proposed modification (shown as PM 48 (ED5)) is proposed based on standard recognised distances from Fields in Trust: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2015).

Q188. Is Policy ITCR6 effective and consistent with national policy in respect of the protection of open space?

188.1 Policy ITCR 6 fulfils the requirements of NPPF (2012) paragraph 74. However the Council accepts that the wording could be improved. so proposes a modification with PM 50 (ED5) so that the wording is more consistent with paragraph 74 The Council has agreed a Statement of Common Ground in respect of Sport England's representation 9101 (ED 32).

188.2 The Council considers that the policy is effective in that it is deliverable over the plan period. None of the protected green spaces cross over into neighbouring districts and therefore joint working is not required in this case.
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