BOLSOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Matter 2: Soundness of the Local Plan

Issue 5: Is the Local Plan positively prepared, justified and effective in respect of housing?

- Housing Requirement [Policy SS2]
- Housing Distribution [Policies SS3, SS4, SS5, SS6, SS9 and SC1]
- Housing Supply during the Plan period [Policy LC1 and Appendix 5.1]
  - 5 Year Housing supply [Policy LC1 and Appendix 5.1]
- Site Allocations – Strategic Sites: Bolsover North [Policy SS4]
- Site Allocations – Strategic Sites: Clowne Garden Village [Policy SS5]
- Site Allocations – Strategic Sites: Former Whitwell Colliery Site [Policy SS6]
  - Housing Allocations [Policy LC1]
  - Affordable Housing [Policy LC2]
  - Type and Mix of Housing [Policy LC3]
  - Custom and Self Build Dwellings [Policy LC4]
  - Gypsy and Traveller Provision [Policies LC5 and LC6]
  - Occupational Dwellings in the Countryside [Policies LC8 and LC9]

Rob Routledge, Chris McKinney, Adele Rhodes and Jon Hendy on behalf of the Council
Issue 5: Is the Local Plan positively prepared, justified and effective in respect of housing?

**Housing Requirement [Policy SS2]**

Q23. Is the Housing Market Area [HMA], which includes Bassetlaw District, Bolsover District, Chesterfield Borough and North East Derbyshire District the most appropriate basis upon which to assess housing needs? Does it represent an appropriate functional HMA, which is supported by evidence?

**Council Response**

23.1 Assessment of the HMA geography is set out in paragraphs 2.4 – 2.16 of the joint North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Area (2013 SHMA, Document EB25). This considered previous studies, as well as the key sources of information identified in the 2014 PPG: house prices; rates of change in house prices; household migration (benchmarked per 1,000 population) and search patterns; and, contextual data such as travel to work areas to define an HMA based on the ‘best fit’ to administrative boundaries.

23.2 This section of the SHMA concludes that the migration evidence and market characteristics point towards a different set of circumstances within the North Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire area relative to the larger urban centres to the north (Para 2.15). The SHMA considers that the area covered by the four authorities represents an appropriate functioning HMA, albeit that it should be recognised that there are economic links more widely across the City Region.

23.3 The Council recognises that the area’s geography means that there are local linkages (including cross-boundary commuting) with other areas, including with Mansfield, Ashfield and Amber Valley, and has engaged with other authorities beyond the HMA, including with Sheffield, in considering issues related to unmet needs. Authorities beyond the HMA have defined themselves in separate best fit HMAs.

Q24. Is the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for the housing market area based on up to date evidence, including household and population projections, local migration and demographic adjustments and market signals?

**Council Response**

24.1 Yes. Following the publication of the 2014 based Sub-National Population Projections (SNPP) and new household projections in 2016, the four authorities in the North Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire HMA commissioned an update to the 2013 SHMA OAHN, which was published in November 2017 and is document EB23. The assessment was based on the latest available information and the approach set out in the 2014 PPG.
24.2 EB23 took the CLG 2014-based Population and Household Projections as a starting point (EB23 Tables 2 and 3). These showed a need for 894 dpa across the HMA, and 210 dpa in Bolsover.

24.3 EB23 found that there had been modest population growth over the input period to these projections influenced by housing market circumstances (Para 2.27) and concluded that 10 year migration trends provided a more stable and reliable basis for drawing conclusions (Para 2.29). It found that household formation amongst younger households (25-34 and 35-44) had fallen slightly over the 2001-11 period (Para 2.34/ Figure 4) and taking account of the market signals and demographic analysis concluded that it would be appropriate to model a part return to trends in household formation shown in 2008-based Household Projections for these age groups (Para 2.42). These adjustments resulted in a demographic need for 1,101 dpa across the HMA (23% above the starting point) and 247 dpa in Bolsover (18% above the starting point).

24.4 Market signals were considered in Section 4 in EB23, with affordable housing need considered in Section 5. The market signals found an average house price of £138,500 in the HMA in Q3 2016, but values in Bolsover which were 14% below the HMA average and 28% below the regional average (Table 32, p42) with evidence of a growing price divergence between those in the HMA and regional/ national prices over time (Para 4.9). Analysis of rents pointed to a similar picture (Figures 15 and 16). Land values at the district and HMA level were found to be substantial below regional and national averages (Table 34). The evidence pointed to a lower quartile affordability ratio of 5.34 in the HMA and 4.55 in the District in 2016 (Table 35) with evidence that this had been falling over the previous decade. However there was some evidence of an under-provision of housing influenced by housing market conditions. Whilst the market signals evidence pointed to limited comparative pressure from market signals (Para 4.35), it concluded that it would be appropriate to respond to historical housing delivery through making adjustments to migration and household formation and that no further adjustments beyond this were warranted by the evidence.

24.5 The 2018 PPG clearly relates the affordability adjustment in the standard method to the impacts which past housing supply could have had on migration to and household formation within an area.\(^1\) Applying a market signals adjustment on top of the demographic adjustments made would introduce double counting.

\(^1\) Reference ID: 2a-006-20180913
Q25. Does the OAHN have sufficient regard to the economic aspirations of the Sheffield City Region and D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)?

**Council Response**

25.1 Both LEP’s have an agreed Growth Deal from Government under the Local Growth Fund; and, a more aspirational Strategic Economic Plan (SEP).

25.2 In the case of the D2N2 LEP, the Growth Deal was for 18,000 new jobs, and 8,000 new homes across the LEP area by 2021. The SEP aims to deliver 55,000 new private sector jobs and 77,000 new homes across the LEP area by 2023.

25.3 In Sheffield City Region the LEP Growth Deal was for 8,000 new jobs and 5,000 new homes across the LEP area by 2021. The SEP aimed to deliver 70,000 new jobs and a minimum of 6,000 new homes across the LEP area over the 2013-23 period.

25.4 A study by Ekosgen sought to disaggregate the Sheffield City Region jobs target to a district level, and the findings of this were considered in EB23. This was found to result in a lower level of employment growth in the district than in the Oxford Economics baseline forecasts (EB23, Para 3.26).

25.5 The D2N2 LEP have confirmed that the growth proposed in the LPfBD is consistent with supporting the aims and objectives of the current and emerging D2N2 SEP’s (attached as Appendix A to this Statement).

25.6 The SCR LEP recognise the important contribution the LPfBD is making to the wider economic ambitions set by the LEP and the support this will give to the jobs target in the SCR SEP. In relation to housing, the SCR LEP considers that the level of housing proposed in the LPfBD will support the delivery of ambitions set out in the SCR SEP (attached as Appendix B to this Statement).

Q26. Have employment trends been taken into account?

**Council Response**

26.1 Yes. There has been detailed consideration of the inter-relationship between economic growth and housing need, in the 2013 SHMA (EB25), the OAN Update (EB23), the Economic Alignment Study (EB19) and Housing Requirement Position Paper (PP1) and in particular the appendix to this.

26.2 Section 3 in EB23 set out upfront that the interaction between the housing market and economy is complex and influenced by a range of factors including commuting and changes in economic participation and uncertainties in how economies will perform in the longer-term (Paras 3.1-3.2). It modelled a trend-based economic
growth scenario, based on Oxford Economics’ forecasts, which saw jobs growth of 8,500 across the HMA and 3,000 in Bolsover between 2014-34 (Table 24) together with a Growth Scenario which sought to test the potential implications of stronger employment growth on housing need. In relating jobs and homes, it adopted a number of modelling assumptions including that the commuting ratio and levels of ‘double jobbing’ remained constant (Paras 3.37 and 3.39). In considering economic participation it modelled assumptions derived from a) the Jan 2017 Office for Budget Responsibility Fiscal Sustainability Report; and b) Experian national assumptions, applying these to a 2011 baseline for Bolsover and taking the average of the two in drawing conclusions. The modelling results were shown on Tables 30 and 31 on Page 38.

26.3 In Para 3.37 GL Hearn concluded that the baseline (trend-based) forecasts should be used in defining minimum OAN figures noting that these were robust forecasts, which take account of sectoral structure, past performance and expected future economic trends. For Bolsover these show a need for 249 dpa. GL Hearn recommended that the Councils test the potential to support higher economic growth and the alignment of strategies for homes and jobs in bringing together evidence (EB23, Para 3.59). This is what the Council has done through commissioning EB19 and considering these issues in the Housing Requirement Position Paper (PP1).

26.4 Section 2 in EB19 provides updated conclusions on the need for employment land in the District. This concluded that provision for offices based on the FLUTE modelling would be appropriate; for manufacturing based on the midpoint between the Flute modelling and past take-up; and for distribution based on past take-up. The level of employment land provision in the Plan has been informed by the evidence, and it is clear that this does not align to one particular scenario for employment growth. It has taken into account a range of scenarios, as well as property market dynamics and engagement with agents consistent with the approach advocated in the PPG.

26.5 This approach is considered appropriate recognising that as a result of productivity improvements, manufacturing output (and land requirements) can grow without employment numbers necessarily increasing; whilst a significant component of demand for distribution development arises from the replacement of older warehouse stock which is no longer suitable.

26.6 In drawing together the evidence in the Housing Requirement Position Paper (PP1), the Council has noted that:

The District’s Geography

- The District’s geography is of a long, slim and predominantly rural area with a number of towns and larger settlements located close to its borders, but with four M1 junctions which serve these settlements located in Bolsover (see PP1 Figure 1, p32).
- The functional housing and economic market areas are not confined to the district’s boundaries, with the District straddling two Travel to Work Areas based
on Chesterfield and Mansfield (EB19, Para 3.15/ Fig 2) and evidence of significant cross-boundary commuting flows.

- The labour market from which companies in the District draw workers extends to include Chesterfield, NE Derbyshire, Amber Valley, Bassetlaw, Mansfield and Sheffield (EB19, Para 3.21/ Fig 3.3).

**Historically Weak Relationship between Employment Growth and Housing Demand in the District**

- The 2013 SHMA found that the economy was not a significant driver of housing demand in the District, noting the potential of commuting to flex and finding no convincing evidence that housing demand would need to increase above the demographic projections per se to support economic growth (EB25 Para 11.27). The District is a net exporter of labour.
- Evidence that employment growth in the district in recent years has been particularly driven by strategic warehousing development in accessible locations which are close to the district’s boundaries and draw their workforce from a wider labour market (with < 30% living in the district) (EB19 Paras 3.45 – 3.58). The sector also has high level of employment in zero hours and temporary contracts.
- Historical evidence that even though the scale of jobs growth in Bolsover has significantly exceeded population growth (EB19 Paras 5.33 – 5.34), house price and rental growth has remained below wider benchmarks and land values remain low (EB23 Section 4).

### 26.7 The Council’s approach has been to provide for the levels of growth in both housing and employment that we believe are realistic and achievable within the Plan period. In common with the government’s standardised approach to housing requirements, the housing figure is not dependant or reliant on the level of employment provision, but are integrated on the basis of an understanding of market geographies and economic interactions between areas what the Council believe can be achieved. The Council’s approach has been agreed with other authorities in the HMA (Document KSD6) and with Mansfield District (Document KSD8).

### 26.8 In going forward with the Plan, the Council will clearly have to comply with the new standardised method and if job growth leads to greater housing demand and pushes up the affordability ratio in the future, then we may reach a point where additional sites will be required in order to maintain a five year housing land supply.

**Q27. Does the housing requirement of 5,168 dwellings between 2014 and 2033 (272dpa) reflect the full OAHN Need for market and affordable housing in the HMA?**

**Council Response**

- **Yes.** The key evidence in relation to the full OAHN is contained in the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN Update Report (November 2017 – submitted with the LPfBD as document EB23). Table 92 contains a breakdown of the component parts of the 272 dpa full OAHN. This includes an affordability uplift of 25 dpa above the demographic need to increase the delivery of affordable housing.
27.2 The OAN Update Report analysis points to an affordable housing need of 126dpa (EB23 Table 84). This is a gross figure which includes existing households as well as those who are newly-forming or concealed. Where existing households move home, this would release a property for another household with no effect on overall housing requirements.

27.3 In line with the 2014 PPG (paragraph 2a-029), the Report considered the affordable housing need within the context of the notional level of affordable housing which might be expected on market led housing developments (Table 51, page 64) but notes that affordable housing delivery is impacted by residential development viability, and that the HMA is a relatively low value housing market area. On this basis it considers that it would not be realistic to meet the affordable housing need in full. It notes that affordable need itself is sensitive to market housing costs and incomes and there are other means of delivering affordable housing.

27.4 The OAN Update Report considers that a further 10% upward adjustment to the demographic need should be made to support additional affordable housing delivery (paragraph 9.22).

27.5 The OAN Update Report’s authors and the Council consider it important to recognise that any upward adjustments from the demographic starting point of 210 dpa (from the 2014 based SNPP, and set out at table 13 of the Report) would deliver additional market and affordable housing. In this context it is important to recognise that the proposed OAN of 272 represents a 30% increase on the demographic starting point. This supports significant additional market and affordable housing delivery.

27.6 The Council’s Housing Requirement Position Statement has also considered affordable housing delivery in drawing conclusions on the housing target, and noted that the District has a large existing Private Rented Sector and that lettings information did not point to existing social housing stock being under particular pressure (PP1, Para 3.10).

Q28. Should the housing requirement be increased to include a 10% buffer above the OAHN given the lapse rate of 5.1% identified within the District for major applications between 2009/10 and 2014/15 which would give a target of ‘up to 5,700 dwellings’?

Council Response

28.1 The Council’s approach to this issue is set out at paragraphs 4.4 - 4.6 onwards of the Council’s Position Paper relating to the Housing Requirement (submitted with the Local Plan for Bolsover District (LPfBD) as document PP1). The important point
is that the requirement should reflect the housing need, the ‘buffer’ is an additional, separate supply-side provision to provide for flexibility and choice. They need to be seen as separate elements within the overall housing provision within the Plan.

28.2 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires local authorities to use their evidence base meets the full, objectively assessed needs for housing in their housing market area. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF of the NPPF requires Local Plans to have sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. Given these objectives, the Council considered it prudent, in determining the level of supply to provide for, to include a buffer above the OAHN to provide flexibility and choice for developers.

28.3 Paragraphs 4.5 - 4.14 of the Position Paper considers what would be an appropriate level of buffer. It is considered important that the level of the buffer is sufficient to deliver choice and flexibility. However, it is also considered that the level of the buffer should not be such as to undermine a plan led approach to development or undermine work in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal work or Infrastructure Planning.

28.4 It is considered that the 10% buffer proposed best fits the considerations set out above.

Q29. Is Policy SS2 sufficiently clear in expressing the required housing target as a minimum?

Council Response

29.1 It is considered that the reference to the housing requirement, and the 10% buffer in both the policy and explanatory paragraphs preceding it are clear.

Q30. Do the latest household projections, published by the Office for National Statistics [ONS] on 20 September 2018, represent a meaningful change in the housing situation in Bolsover and, if so, would this have any bearing on the soundness of the Local Plan?

Council Response

30.1 This question is fully addressed in the paper attached as Appendix C to this Statement. In short the paper recognises that the 2016 figures would that on the basis of the above, the updated demographic projections do not point towards a meaningful change in the scale of the OAN, and that it remains appropriate to consider the OAN to be 272 dpa.
Q31. Should the housing requirement include an allowance to accommodate unmet need from Sheffield City or North East Derbyshire District?

Council Response

30.1. In simple terms no, as the question assumes that there will be a degree of unmet need from Sheffield City or North East Derbyshire, which in itself appears to be a false position, as explained below.

30.2. During the development of the LPfBD the Council has received only two enquiries from nearby authorities regarding unmet housing need.

30.3. The first of these was from North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC) in January 2018. This followed a detailed Urban Capacity Study which suggested that NEDDC would need to release suitable land from the Green Belt in the north of the District to meet their housing target. NEDDC has since published its draft Local Plan (Feb 2018) with a housing requirement which meets and indeed exceeds its OAN, and submitted the Plan for examination in May 2018. The housing requirement of 330 dpa in the Plan exceeds the OAN of 283 dpa by 17%; and the Plan includes sufficient proposed allocations to meet this together with an appropriate supply-side buffer.

30.4. In relation to Sheffield, Bolsover district does not have a border with Sheffield City. Sheffield City Council has acknowledged the housing market relationship between Sheffield and Bolsover is weak compared to other districts closer to Sheffield City (See Appendix B to this Statement). In response to Bolsover District Council’s consultation on their Identified Strategic Options in November/December 2015, Sheffield City Council stated that there was no need for Bolsover Council to adopt a target higher than identified need in order to meet any of Sheffield city’s housing needs.

30.5. In an e-mail sent to all of the authorities in the city region (17th April, see Appendix D to this Statement), Sheffield City Council (SCC) asked if Bolsover would be in a position to allocate land to contribute to meeting some of Sheffield’s housing needs. Like NEDDC, the issue was not that needs could not be met within the authority’s area, but that meeting the full OAHN could require some loss of Green Belt.

30.6. The request anticipated that any new homes provided to meet Sheffield’s needs may best be delivered in the districts immediately neighbouring Sheffield, if Sheffield found itself unable to meet its own needs. As noted above, Sheffield City Council reiterated that the links between our two authorities are weak and therefore the grounds to suggest that providing for land within Bolsover is a reasonable approach to meeting a Sheffield need, are weak.

30.7. Sheffield City Council is producing a full Local Plan. It is currently anticipated that consultation under Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 will take place early in 2019. It is expected that Sheffield’s full OAHN will be provided for within the City (attached as Appendix E to this Statement). Full details of the requests are set out at paragraphs 6.12 –
6.20 of Bolsover Council's Duty to Co-operate Statement (submitted with the LPfBD as document KDS 5).

30.8. In short there are no outstanding requests for Bolsover District Council to accommodate unmet needs of another authority. In the Joint HMA wide Statement of Common Ground (submitted with the LPfBD as KSD6) the authorities in the HMA have agreed to meet their own OAHN to ensure the need arising in the HMA is met within the HMA.
**Housing Distribution**

Q32. **Does the distribution of housing in the Local Plan reflect the spatial strategy of focussing development on the more sustainable settlements, whilst also supporting regeneration needs and tackling deprivation?**

**Council Response**

32.1 It is the Council’s view that the distribution of housing in the Local Plan for Bolsover District does reflect the spatial strategy of focussing development on the more sustainable settlements, whilst also supporting regeneration needs and tackling deprivation.

32.2 Drawing upon the economic, social and environmental roles of the Local Plan Vision, paragraph 4.17 of the Local Plan explains that “the Council’s spatial strategy has a strong focus on sustainable development with an appropriate balance between achieving more difficult regeneration aims and securing more immediate viable developments in order to contribute to the delivery of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives regarding sustainable growth.”

32.3 In accordance with this, the Council is clear that the distribution of housing set out in policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development, which sees greater levels of housing growth directed to more sustainable settlements such as the towns rather than large villages, and in turn to large villages rather than small villages, represents a sound and appropriate approach. It reflects the opening line of the Ministerial foreword at the front of the 2012 NPPF that states “The purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development” and is in accordance with the 2012 NPPF’s requirements for Local Plans, particularly that Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. Furthermore, the direction of housing growth to brownfield sites in the former mining settlements of Whitwell, Creswell and Shirebrook clearly demonstrates how the Council’s distribution of housing supports the District’s regeneration needs and aims to help address deprivation whilst overall planning for sustainable development.

Q33. **Is the distribution of housing development around the District appropriate? [Policy SS3]?**

**Council Response**

33.1 As stated above in response to Q32, it is the Council’s view that the distribution of housing development represents a sound and appropriate approach that is accordance with the first NPPF’s requirements for Local Plans, particularly that Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic.
Q34. Are the 3 Strategic Sites at Bolsover North, Clowne Garden Village and the Former Whitwell Colliery Site located in the appropriate place to assist in the delivery of the Council’s spatial strategy? [Policies SS4, SS5 and SS6]?

Council Response

34.1 It is the Council’s view that the three strategic site allocations at Bolsover North, Clowne Garden Village and the former Whitwell Colliery site are located in appropriate places to strongly assist in the delivery of the Council’s spatial strategy.

34.2 As stated above in response to Q32, paragraph 4.17 of the Local Plan explains that “the Council’s spatial strategy has a strong focus on sustainable development with an appropriate balance between achieving more difficult regeneration aims and securing more immediate viable developments in order to contribute to the delivery of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives regarding sustainable growth.”

34.3 In accordance with this spatial strategy, when considering these three potential strategic sites during its plan-making work the Council recognised that Bolsover North and Clowne Garden Village are located in two of the District’s most sustainable settlements that are suitable and prioritised for growth. Whilst the former Whitwell Colliery site is located in the next tier down in the settlement hierarchy, it does represent one of the few large areas of post-industrial land within the District in need of restoration or re-use.

34.4 As such, whilst recognising the greater challenges of addressing brownfield sites, the Council is clear that the three strategic site allocations are located in appropriate places to strongly assist in the delivery of the Council’s spatial strategy.

Q35. Should the spatial strategy and distribution of development allow for more development in less sustainable rural locations? [Policy SS3]?

Council Response

35.1 It is the Council’s view that the spatial strategy and distribution of development set out in policy SS3 achieves a sound and appropriate level of growth in the District’s less sustainable rural locations, such as Scarcliffe and Glapwell. Allowing for more development in less sustainable rural locations would be contrary to the golden thread of sustainability running through the NPPF.

35.2 The Settlement Hierarchy Study [EB39] provides a robust methodology to assessing the sustainability of the District’s settlements, taking into account the four key factors of population, jobs, services / facilities and public transport facilities. In doing so, the Council’s evidence considers where people’s journeys to work, shops, services and facilities start and finish at. It considers the levels of shops, services and facilities within their settlement and so within realistic walking distances of their home or work location; and the ability to reach their town or village centre or neighbouring town or village centres by public transport.
35.3 In light of this evidence, the Council considered how best to achieve sustainable development and in doing so rejected options that directed greater amounts of development to the less sustainable rural locations and thus would see greater reliance on private transport to reach work, shops, schools and other day-to-day services and facilities.

35.4 As such, it is the Council’s view that the spatial strategy and distribution of development set out in policy SS3 achieves a sound and appropriate level of growth in the District’s less sustainable rural locations.

Q36. Does the proposed distribution of housing meet the needs of both urban and rural communities? [Policy SS3]?

Council Response

36.1 It is the Council’s view that the proposed distribution of housing set out in policy SS3 meets the needs of both urban and rural communities by both planning for residential growth in the District’s larger and more urban communities and making some proportional provision for residential growth in its rural communities.

36.2 In relation to the rural communities within the District’s small villages, each of this type of settlement has been allocated a Development Envelope, within which urban forms of development will generally be acceptable in principle. This is considered to enable a sustainable amount of ‘windfall’ type of residential development to come forward where this would not have an unacceptable impact on local infrastructure.

36.3 Beyond the small villages and in the small settlements in the countryside, urban forms of development are more restricted in recognition of those settlements being not sustainable locations for urban forms of development, such as housing. However, within this restrictive policy framework there still remain opportunities for new housing to meet local needs but only in certain circumstances, such as for occupational dwellings and on infill plots.

36.4 As such, it is the Council’s view that the proposed distribution of housing set out in policy SS3 meets the needs of both urban and rural communities.

Q37. Is limiting infill development to single plots in Small Settlements in the Countryside overly restrictive? [Policy SS3]?

Council Response

37.1 It is the Council’s view that the restrictive policy framework for the Small settlements in the Countryside is appropriate given that they are not sustainable locations for urban development. However, the Council has noted the representations made by the National Farmers Union (NFU) and by the Planning and Design Group (P&DG) on behalf of Chatsworth Estates in relation to this element of policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development (representations ref. 8394 and 8570 respectively).
37.2 As part of its consideration of the Regulation 19 representations, the Council has proposed a modification to policy SS3 to address the representations above and this is set out as modification number PM5 within its Proposed Modifications to the Submitted Local Plan [ED5] (shown below).

The Small Settlements in the Countryside are considered to not be sustainable settlements and the Local Plan will not support urban forms of development beyond infill development on single plots and conversion of agricultural buildings to employment uses where appropriate.

37.3 Based on discussions with the NFU and P&DG, they have both agreed that their representations ref. 8394 and 8570 to the Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District have been addressed and can be withdrawn subject to modification number PM5 being made to the Plan. These agreements are set out in the Statements of Common Ground with the NFU and Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [ED16 and ED31 respectively].

37.4 In light of the Council’s proposed modification and the Statements of Common Ground entered into with the NFU and P&DG, it is considered that the policy framework for the Small settlements in the Countryside set out in the submitted Local Plan as amended is appropriate.

Q38. Are the development envelopes defined on the Policies Map justified and effective? [Policies SS3 and SC1]

Council Response

38.1 It is the Council’s view that the development envelopes defined on the Policies Map are justified by proportionate evidence and are effective and deliverable over the plan period.

38.2 Underpinning the Local Plan’s Development Envelopes allocations is the Development Envelope Review [EB32] and this sets out a clear methodology to facilitate a consistent approach to this policy allocation throughout the District.

38.3 The Council has noted the representations made on this policy and in particular those made by the Planning and Design Group (P&DG) on behalf of Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (representation ref. 8569). As part of its consideration of the Regulation 19 representations, the Council has proposed a modification to the Development Framework for the small village of Scarcliffe to address the representation above and this is set out as modification number PM34 within its Proposed Modifications to the Submitted Local Plan [ED5]. However, this proposed modification at the time of writing has not been agreed with Chatsworth Settlement Trustees.

38.4 Based on this, it is the Council’s contention that the Development Envelopes as used in policies SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development and SC1: Development within the Development Envelope (as potentially amended by
Q39. **Is Policy SS9 effective in enabling sustainable development and previously developed land to come forward for development in the countryside?**

**Council Response**

39.1 It is the Council’s view that policy SS9: Development in the Countryside is effective in enabling sustainable development and previously developed land to come forward for development in the countryside.

39.2 However, the Council has noted the representations made on this policy and in particular those made by the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) and by the Planning and Design Group (P&DG) on behalf of Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (representations ref. 8824 and 8573 respectively).

39.3 As part of its consideration of the Regulation 19 representations, the Council has proposed two modifications to criteria a) and b) of policy SS9 to address the representations above and these are set out as modification numbers PM19 and PM20 within its Proposed Modifications to the Submitted Local Plan [ED5] (shown below).

   a) involve a change of use or the re-use of vacant, derelict or previously developed land, provided the proposed use is sustainable and appropriate to the location

   b) Are necessary for the efficient or viable operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry and or other appropriate land based businesses, including the diversification of activities on an existing farm unit

39.4 Based on discussions with P&DG, they have agreed that their representation ref. 8573 to the Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District has been addressed and can be withdrawn subject to modification number PM20 being made to the Plan. This agreement is set out in the Statements of Common Ground with Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [ED31]. In relation to the position with CPRE, clarification of their final position on a number of their representations is still being sought.

39.5 In light of the Council’s proposed modification and the Statement of Common Ground entered into with P&DG, it is considered that policy SS9 as amended is effective in enabling sustainable development and previously developed land to come forward for development in the countryside.
Q40. Should criterion b) of Policy SS9 be amended to replace ‘and’ with ‘or’?

Council Response

40.1 As stated in relation to Q39, the Council has proposed modification PM20 to amend criterion b) of policy SS9: Development in the Countryside so that the word ‘and’ is replaced with ‘or’ in order to make the policy more effective.
Housing Supply during the Plan period [Policy LC1 and Appendix 5.1]

Q41. Have sufficient sites been allocated in the Local Plan to meet the target of 5,700 homes? [Policy LC1]

Council Response

41.1 It is worth clarifying here that the Council’s Housing OAN is 272 dwellings per year. The SHMA OAN update report [EB23] which underpins the Council’s Housing OAN takes its base date from 1st April 2014 and the 2014 Sub National Population projections. Accordingly, the requirement needing to be met between 2014 and 2033 is 5,168 dwellings, i.e. 272 dwellings per year x 19 years, and not 5,700 dwellings as stated in the question.

41.2 The 5,700 dwellings figure reflects the Council’s scale of housing provision and includes a 10% buffer to provide a degree of site flexibility over the plan period in order to ensure the Council meets its Housing OAN requirement. This means that instead of just allocating sufficient land to deliver the required 5,168 dwellings, the Council has decided to allocate more land to deliver in the region of 5,700 dwellings. It is also worth pointing out that the 5,700 figure represents a rounding up of 5,685, i.e. 5,168 dwellings x 10%.

41.3 Finally, it is also worth clarifying that the Council’s completions since 2014 and its strategic site allocations and other site allocations provide sufficient land to deliver 5,708 dwellings (as updated in the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2]). Therefore, when set against the Housing OAN of 5,168 dwellings or even the 10% buffer figure of 5,700 dwellings figure, the Council is clear that it has taken a sound approach to the allocation of housing sites to meet its Housing OAN.

41.4 Therefore, the Council is clear that the Local Plan for Bolsover District allocates more than sufficient sites for housing development to meet its Housing Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). How this is met, through completions, strategic site allocations and other site allocations is clearly set out in paragraphs 5.5 to 5.12 of the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District.

Q42. Has the housing site selection process been based on a sound process of SA and the testing of reasonable alternatives?

Council Response

42.1 Yes, the housing site selection process is based on a sound process of SA and the testing of reasonable alternatives.

42.2 Section 5.5 of the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3] advises that “all proposed plan allocations and reasonable alternatives have been subject to SA as part of the preparation of this report using the tailored appraisal criteria and associated thresholds of significance.” This Sustainability Appraisal work drew upon the available sites within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27]. The Council used the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal process to inform its plan-making and the selection of housing allocations within the Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District.
Bolsover District and also prior to that at the Consultation Draft Local Plan stage in 2016 [BD1 and BD2].

Q43. The Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 indicates how 4,551 (Amended to 4,585 dwellings in the updated Housing Trajectory in Appendix B of Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2]) dwellings would be completed in the plan period – is the Council reliant on other sites coming forward to meet its housing target and, if so, should these be included in the trajectory, or is this made up of actual completions from 2014/15 to 2017/18 which equates to 1,123 dwellings?

Council Response

43.1 The Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 of the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District was updated within the updated Housing Trajectory in Appendix B of Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] to take account of the latest information provided by the 2018 update to the Residential Land Assessment and the Five Year Supply Assessment.

43.2 As such, the Council's position at the point of Submission in relation to how it will meet its Housing OAN plus the 10% buffer was that set out in the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and as illustrated in its Appendix B, namely:

| OAN (2014-2033) (272 dwellings per year x 19 years) | 5,168 dwellings |
| 10% buffer for flexibility | 517 dwellings |
| TOTAL (approximately) | 5,700 dwellings |

| Completions 2014/15 to 2016/17 | 872 dwellings |
| Expected Actual completions 2017/18 | 303 251 dwellings |
| Strategic site allocations | 2,100 dwellings |
| Other site allocations | 2,455 2,485 dwellings |
| TOTAL | 5,730 5,708 dwellings |

43.3 The updated Housing Trajectory in Appendix B of Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] shows the expected delivery rates for the allocated sites which add up to 4,585 dwellings. Therefore, it is correct that the difference between the 4,585 dwellings figure and the 5,700 dwellings scale of housing provision is the 1,123 completed dwellings since 1st April 2014, rather than any other sites coming forward.
Q44. Does the Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 accurately reflect the likely start dates, build out rates and completions of the allocated sites?

Council Response

44.1 The Council takes a cautious approach to forecasting completions on sites within its residential land supply and sets expected starts dates, build out rates and completions informed by information provided by the site promoter on their market and / or construction intentions. This cautious approach is set out in more detail within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2].

44.2 Based on this cautious approach, it is the Council’s contention that the Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 of the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District (as amended by the updated housing trajectory within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2]) accurately reflects the likely start dates, build out rates and completions of the allocated sites.

44.3 Despite this, the Council recognises the 'moveable feast' nature to forecasting start dates, build out rates and completions and how sites can be both advanced and delayed by events. An example of this is provided by the proposed land at Brookvale, Shirebrook residential site allocation, which has seen a significant acceleration in delivery that has led to twice the amount of completions, 80 rather than 40 dwellings, since 1st April 2018 than that forecast by the Council.

44.4 To show the most up-to-date position, taking into account new information regarding the likely start dates, build out rates and completions of the allocated sites obtained since August 2018 through site monitoring and the entered into Statements of Common Ground [ED23 to ED27], the Council has updated the Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 of the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District (as amended by the updated housing trajectory within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2]) and this is contained in Appendix F to this Statement.

Q45. On what basis have the likely start dates, build out rates and completions been assumed?

Council Response

45.1 As stated in the response to Q44, the Council takes a cautious approach to forecasting completions on sites within its residential land supply and sets expected starts dates, build out rates and completions informed by information provided by the site promoter on their market and / or construction intentions. This cautious approach is set out in more detail within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2]. As such, the Council does apply any standard assumptions to its forecasting but pursues an informed approach instead.
Q46. Are the proposed changes to the Housing Trajectory put forward by the Council in respect of the allocated sites (listed below) appropriate and supported by substantial evidence?

a) Land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane, Bolsover; c) Land between Shuttlewood Road and Oxcroft Lane, Bolsover; e) Land at Brookvale, Shirebrook; f) Land at Station Road, Langwith Junction, Shirebrook; g) Land to the rear of 1 to 35 Red Lane, South Normanton; h) Land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, Alfreton Road, South Normanton; j) Land to rear of 169-207 Creswell Road, Clowne; l) Land at High Ash Farm, Mansfield Road, Clowne; m) Land north of Chesterfield Road, Barlborough; n) Land rear of Skinner Street, Creswell; o) Land south of Creswell Model Village, Creswell; q) Land south of Overview Moor, Tibshelf; and, r) Land west of Spa Croft, Tibshelf

Council Response

46.1 It is the Council’s contention that the proposed changes to the Housing Trajectory (as set out now in Appendix B to this Statement) for the sites listed above are all appropriate and supported by substantial evidence and that is set out within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2].

46.2 In addition to this and in light of five year supply practice evolving to include statements of common ground as a suggested way of setting out the clear evidence behind a deliverability assessment (see Planning Practice Guide Paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 3-036-20180913), the Council is now developing a range of such statements with site promoters for the sites within its housing supply.

46.3 Due to the focus on the Local Plan Examination, this work has prioritised residential site allocations specifically identified within the Inspector’s Draft Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination as set out in the entered into Statements of Common Ground [ED23 to ED27].

Q47. Are the housing sites allocated in the Local Plan deliverable and/or developable having regard to Footnotes 11 and 12 in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 [NPPF]?

Council Response

47.1 It is the Council’s contention that the housing sites allocated in the Local Plan are deliverable and/or developable having regard to Footnote 11 and 12 in the first NPPF and that this is set out within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2].

47.2 As stated in the response to Q46, in addition to this and in light of five year supply practice evolving to include statements of common ground as a suggested way of setting out the clear evidence behind a deliverability assessment (see Planning Practice Guide Paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 3-036-20180913), the Council is now developing a range of such statements with site promoters for the sites within its housing supply.
47.3 Due to the focus on the Local Plan Examination, this work has prioritised residential site allocations specifically identified within the Inspector’s Draft Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination as set out in the entered into Statements of Common Ground [ED23 to ED27].

Q48. Is too much reliance placed on the development of large sites? Are there any risks to the housing supply in this approach?

Council Response

48.1 It is the Council’s contention that the Local Plan for Bolsover District sets out an appropriate mix of sizes of sites through its strategic site allocations and other residential allocations, ranging from only one large site of over 100 hectares down to five sites of less than 1 hectare, and that this appropriate mix is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

48.2 During its plan-making work, the Council has noted the risks of over-reliance on either too many large or small sites, such as having housing supply essentially dependent of the delivery of a small number of large or strategic sites, or conversely putting infrastructure capacity at risk from pursuing a strategy relying on too many small sites and thus not having sufficient ability to provide land or financial contributions to deliver the required infrastructure improvements.

48.3 To mitigate against these risks, the Council has tested in detail the delivery of its largest sites and tested the overall burdens placed on developments through its Whole Plan Viability Assessment [EB54]. Based on this work, together with the rest of the Council’s proportionate evidence base, the Council is clear that its approach is appropriate and sound.

48.4 The Council will identify any delivery issues as part of the five year Local Plan review process required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and then address them through new plan-making decisions about housing allocations.

Q49. Should more small and medium sized sites be allocated for housing to enable development to come forward more quickly?

Council Response

49.1 As stated in the response to Q48, it is the Council’s contention that the Local Plan for Bolsover District sets out an appropriate mix of sizes of sites through its strategic site allocations and other residential allocations, ranging from only one large site of over 100 hectares down to five sites of less than 1 hectare, and that this appropriate mix is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

49.2 The Council will identify any delivery issues as part of the five year Local Plan review process required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)
Q50. Should an allowance be made for windfall sites?

Council Response

50.1 The Council recognises that windfall sites contribute to the number of actual completions. However, as set out within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] the Council has not built an allowance from windfall sites into its anticipated residential land supply calculations based on historic windfall delivery rates as is permissible in accordance with the NPPF. Instead, the Council has decided to plan positively with major sites, supported by specific land allocations within the Local Plan, to deliver a sufficient supply of homes and to treat windfalls as one of the ways the Council will provide for flexibility in residential land supply.

Q51. With regards to other sources of supply, on what basis does the Council consider that the 3 sites with outline planning permission referred to in paragraph 3.75 of the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] are not suitable and have questions over whether they are achievable? Would these sites add to the flexibility of the supply?

Council Response

51.1 The three sites referred to in paragraph 3.75 of the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] were judged to be not suitable or achievable on the following basis:

- **Land north-west of Broad Lane, Hodthorpe** – this site was granted outline planning permission when the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites (February 2016). At the time, the Council considered that despite the proposed development representing too much development in a small village like Hodthorpe, under the first NPPF and its strong emphasis on boosting the supply of housing a refusal would be hard to sustain at Appeal. However, subsequent to approval the site proponent has advised during the Council’s annual Five Year Supply Assessments that the approved development is not deliverable and unlikely to come forward within 5 years.

As such, as part of its consideration of potential residential allocations for the Local Plan for Bolsover District, the Council decided that the site would not be suitable and would have difficulties in demonstrating that it was developable during the plan period. In light of this assessment, together with the other relevant considerations, this site was not selected as a residential allocation.
• **Field adjacent to Pattison Street, off Bolsover Road, Shuttlewood** – this site was granted outline planning permission when the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites (August 2013). At the time, the Council supported growth in Shuttlewood within its emerging Core Strategy type document (submitted for Examination in December 2013 but withdrawn July 2014). In accordance with the granted outline, reserved matters were approved in November 2016. However, subsequent to approval the site proponent has advised during the Council’s annual Five Year Supply Assessments that the approved development could not come forward within 5 years as the negotiations regarding the development option with the landowner had reached a legal impasse. This has been subsequently been resolved at Tribunal and a start on site has now been made.

As such, as part of its consideration of potential residential allocations for the Local Plan for Bolsover District, the Council decided that the site would require a change to its spatial strategy and would have potential difficulties in demonstrating that it was deliverable due to the stalled negotiations. In light of this assessment, together with the other relevant considerations, this site was not selected as a residential allocation.

• **Land at Blind Lane, Bolsover** – this site was granted outline planning permission when the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites (January 2012 and March 2015). This was followed by a further renewal of the outline planning permission in January 2017. However, the submitted reserved matters from the landowner under the approved outline planning permission (received in October 2016) were finally disposed of by the Council in August 2018 following no contact from the landowner for six-months following the expiry of the most recent agreed extension of time.

For information, the Council was able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites from October 2016. However, the Blind Lane site has never featured within the Council’s deliverable supply due to the landowner confirming during the Council’s annual Five Year Supply Assessments that they have been unable to secure an acceptable development deal with a house builder due to the site’s abnormal development costs associated with the site’s topography.

Currently, the Council is considering two applications for the Blind Lane site. The first is a separate but parallel full planning application from Gleeson Homes for residential development on the site that was received in April 2017. The second is the submitted reserved matters from Gleeson Homes received in September 2018 which essentially takes forward the reserved matters layout originally submitted by the landowner under the approved outline planning permission that were finally disposed of by the Council in August 2018. As of November 2018, the two applications are now running in parallel with the same layout and numbers of dwellings, but under different positions of principle and potential planning obligations.
As such, as part of its consideration of potential residential allocations for the Local Plan for Bolsover District, the Council decided that the site would require an increase in its planned quantum of growth in Bolsover town and would have potential difficulties in demonstrating that it was deliverable due to the clear record of poor delivery and the unresolved abnormal costs issue that have to date frustrated the site coming forward. In light of this assessment, together with the other relevant considerations, this site was not selected as a residential allocation.

51.2 Despite all of this, as stated in paragraph 3.77 of the Council's Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] it is still noted that at the time of writing each site has a legal permission that could lead to them coming forward. Therefore, these other sources of supply potentially add to the flexibility in the supply of residential land, over and above the Council's planned 10% buffer in the amount of land allocated within the Local Plan for Bolsover District to meet its Housing OAN and the Council's approach to make no allowance for either major or minor windfall sites.
5 Year Housing Land Supply [Policy LC1 and Appendix 5.1]

Q52. Is it robustly demonstrated that the Local Plan can deliver a 5 year housing land supply throughout the Plan period?

Council Response

52.1 It is the Council’s contention that it is robustly demonstrated that the Local Plan can deliver a 5-year housing land supply throughout the Plan period.

52.2 For the immediate 5-year period, it is the Council’s view that it has a robust 5-year housing supply position. This is demonstrated first within its published 5-year supply annual position statement (4th July 2018), which states that the Council can demonstrate sufficient deliverable sites to provide just over 7.75 years supply for the period 2018/2019 to 2023/24. This position was upheld at several Section 78 Appeals by different Inspectors. Furthermore, since the publication on 24th July 2018 of the new NPPF with its more detailed definition of ‘deliverable’ for the purposes of maintaining the supply and delivery of housing, the Council has also been found at a further Section 78 Appeal by another Inspector to have a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

52.3 For the middle and later 5-year period of the Plan period, the Council considers that it can also robustly demonstrate that the Local Plan can deliver a 5-year housing land supply. For the middle 5-year period, based on the updated Housing Trajectory within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] the Council is clear that sufficient supply will be made, ranging between 375 and 313 dwellings per year, to ensure a robust 5-year housing land supply position is maintained. For the final 5-year period, based on the updated Housing Trajectory within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] the Council notes that supply tapers off towards 2032/2033 as the Local Plan’s allocations increasingly should be built out or coming to completion. This is considered to be normal for a Local Plan’s housing trajectory, which to a degree cannot plan or show the year’s beyond its Plan period. However, if this planned trajectory is built out accordingly, the Council’s 5-year housing land supply will benefit from a large surplus and thus will maintain a robust position. Furthermore, the Local Plan does include two allocations where supply is shown beyond the Plan period that could address any potential shortfall at those later years.

52.4 It should also be noted that over this period the Council will have undertaken several reviews of the Local Plan as required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. These reviews would have identified any housing delivery issues, leading to the Council addressing them through new plan-making decisions about housing allocations.
Q53. What evidence is there to show that those sites included in the 5 year housing land supply are deliverable?

Council Response

53.1 As set out in the answer to Q52, it is the Council’s view that it has a robust 5-year supply position. This is demonstrated first within its published 5-year housing supply annual position statement (4th July 2018), which states that the Council can demonstrate sufficient deliverable sites to provide just over 7.75 years supply for the period 2018/2019 to 2023/24. This position was upheld at several Section 78 Appeals by different Inspectors. Furthermore, since the publication on 24th July 2018 of the new NPPF with its more detailed definition of ‘deliverable’ for the purposes of maintaining the supply and delivery of housing, the Council has also been found at a further Section 78 Appeal by another Inspector to have a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

53.2 In addition to this and in light of five year supply practice evolving to include statements of common ground as a suggested way of setting out the clear evidence behind a deliverability assessment (see Planning Practice Guide Paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 3-036-20180913), the Council is now developing a range of such statements with site promoters for the sites within its housing supply. Due to the focus on the Local Plan Examination, this work has prioritised residential site allocations specifically identified within the Inspector’s Draft Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination as set out in the entered into Statements of Common Ground [ED23 to ED27].

53.3 This, taken together, is considered by the Council to provide clear evidence that it has a robust 5-year housing supply position and that those sites included in the 5-year housing land supply are deliverable.

Q54. The changes proposed to the Housing Trajectory include 20dpa for housing allocation c) Land between Shuttlewood Road and Oxcroft Lane from year 2020/21, but this is not reflected in the table in Appendix B of the Council’s 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report, dated 4 July 2018. Should it be?

Council Response

54.1 The information contained within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] post-dates the information set out in Appendix B of the Council’s Five Year Housing Land Supply Report dated 4th July 2018. As such, whilst it was not expected that the land between Shuttlewood Road and Oxcroft Lane would be deliverable within 5-years when the Council prepared its Five Year Housing Land Supply Report, new evidence in the form of submitted reserved matters for the site from Jones Homes on 25th July 2018 came in ahead of expectations due to the successful sales rates on Jones Homes’ other site (housing allocation b) the former Courtaulds factory site). This new evidence accounts for the difference referred to in Q54 and the updated trajectory put forward by the Council within its Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2].
54.2 Ultimately, the Council will take account of the latest evidence provided by Jones Homes and other site promoters when it prepares a 2019 update to its Five Year Housing Land Supply annual position.

Q55. The table in Appendix B of the Council’s 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report, dated 4 July 2018, indicates that housing allocation v) Land east of Pleasley Pit, Pleasley will deliver 9 dwellings in 2018/19 and 8 dwellings in 2019/20. This differs from the Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 of the Local Plan which shows that this site will deliver 9 dwellings in 2019/20 and 10 dwellings in 2020/2. The Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply confirms that the former is correct, but does not recommend a change be made to the Local Plan Housing Trajectory. Should it do so?

Council Response

55.1 Housing allocation v) land east of Pleasley Pit is based on a planning permission for 19 dwellings. At 1st March 2018, 2 of the 19 dwellings had been completed, leaving 17 remaining on site. This completions information post-dates the information set out in Appendix 5.1 of the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District and was updated in the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2], although it is noted that this update was not specifically referred to in paragraph 3.63.

55.2 Despite this, the information contained within Appendix B of the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and carried forward into Proposed Modification PM22 within the Council’s Schedule of Proposed Modifications [ED5] is correct.
Bolsover North: [Policy SS4] [950 dwellings]

Q56. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

Council Response

32.4 Yes, the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation is justified and appropriate and this is demonstrated by clear appraisal and evidence.

32.5 In relation to the allocation being justified as the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3] found that the Bolsover North option was one of the best performing options available to the Council for consideration. This finding followed a rigorous appraisal of the potential social, environmental and economic effects of the Bolsover North option and of several other alternatives for broad strategic directions for growth in Bolsover. This is set out in detail in Section 5.4 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3].

32.6 The Council used the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal process to inform its plan-making. Based on this, together with the findings of the Council’s proportionate evidence base, the Council is clear that the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation is justified.

32.7 In relation to the allocation being appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development, the Council’s Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] concluded for the Bolsover North site that “the site is available, achievable and potentially suitable. Therefore, the site could be considered for allocation within the emerging Local Plan.” In addition to this evidence, the Council granted outline planning permission for the Bolsover North site on 25th October 2017 (application reference 14/00080/OUTEA) following careful assessment of the benefits and any adverse impacts of the proposed development.

32.8 In addition to this evidence, the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation was identified as a potential strategic site within the Local Plan for Bolsover District: Identified Strategic Options [BD4] in October 2015. Following careful consideration of the representations received at this time, together with the findings of its evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, the Council decided in February 2016 to support the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation for further testing. Based on this testing providing confirmation that the potential strategic site allocation would appear to be justified and appropriate, the Council included the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation within its Consultation Draft Local Plan for Bolsover District (October 2016) [BD1]. Again, following careful consideration of the representations received, together with the findings of its evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, the Council approved the allocation of the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation in April 2018 and set out its policy for this allocation in its Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District [SD2] in May 2018. The proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation has therefore been subjected to three rounds of consultation and tested against objections at
32.9 In parallel to the plan-making process, Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire) and Strata Homes submitted a joint outline planning application for the proposed Bolsover North site in February 2014 and this was granted in October 2017 (application reference 14/00080/OUTEA) following careful assessment of the benefits and any adverse impacts of the proposed development.

32.10 Therefore, the Council is clear that the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation is appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development based on the following:

a. the findings of the Council’s evidence base, in particular the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27];
b. the findings of the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3];
c. the outcome of the consultation exercises during the Council’s plan-making work as set out in the Council’s Statement of Consultation [SD4];
d. the Council’s careful consideration and determination of the submitted outline planning application (application reference 17/00640/OUT) for the development of the site.

Q57. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it?
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Council Response

57.1 Yes, the site is deliverable and developable in accordance with the Council’s updated housing trajectory and this is demonstrated by clear evidence.

57.2 In overview, the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] advises that the updated housing trajectory for the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation is based on discussions with the house builders bringing the site forward, Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire) and Strata Homes. To help provide clear and substantial evidence of these discussions and the milestones underpinning the planned build out trajectory, the Council has entered into a Statement of Common Ground with Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire) and Strata Homes [ED25]. This Statement of Common Ground takes account of the latest site deliverability information and reduces the first year’s completion numbers slightly, reflecting the fact that Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire) and Strata Homes have developed their business plans in advance of submitting the reserved matters for the first phase of the development. Based on this evidence, the Council believes that the...
proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory.

57.3 In relation to question a., Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire) and Strata Homes have confirmed they have controlling interests over the land and that the site is available for residential development. This is clearly demonstrated within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27], the outline planning application documents (application reference 14/00080/OUTEA) and the reserved matters documents (application reference 19/00005/REM).

57.4 In relation to question b., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the outline planning application documents (application reference 14/00080/OUTEA) clearly demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided. Furthermore, the Council’s decisions to both allocate the Bolsover North site and to grant outline planning permission for the proposed development of the site underline this position. This is further confirmed by the reserved matters documents (application reference 19/00005/REM).

57.5 In relation to question c., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the outline planning application documents (application reference 14/00080/OUTEA) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain. Furthermore, the Council’s decisions to both allocate the Bolsover North site and to grant outline planning permission for the proposed development of the site underline this position. This is further confirmed by the reserved matters documents (application reference 19/00005/REM).

Q58. Are there any constraints to development?

Council Response

58.1 As stated in relation to Q57, the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the outline planning application documents (application reference 14/00080/OUTEA) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain. Furthermore, the Council’s decisions to allocate the Bolsover North site and to grant outline planning permission for the proposed development of the site underline this position. This is further confirmed by the reserved matters documents (application reference 19/00005/REM).
Q59. Are the proposed changes to the Housing Trajectory put forward by the Council in respect of this Strategic Site appropriate and supported by substantial evidence?

Council Response

59.1 As stated in relation to Q57, the updated housing trajectory for the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation is based on discussions with the house builders bringing the site forward, Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire) and Strata Homes. To help provide clear and substantial evidence of these discussions and the milestones underpinning the planned build out trajectory, the Council has entered into a Statement of Common Ground with Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire) and Strata Homes [ED25]. This is further confirmed by the reserved matters documents (application reference 19/00005/REM). Based on this clear evidence, the Council is clear that the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory.

Q60. Is Policy SS4 sound given that it refers to an ‘approved masterplan or any subsequent approved document’? Should the policy clearly set out the requirements for the development of this site?

Council Response

60.1 Policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North was prepared to clearly set out the requirements for the development of the site and these are listed in criteria a) to q). These criteria set out both the key development requirements, such as the quantum of development and the key infrastructure requirement, but also the policy requirements such as minimising the need to travel by private car and contributing towards conserving and enhancing biodiversity.

60.2 The purpose of the reference within the policy text to “the development being guided by the approved masterplan for the site” is to ensure that the overall form and layout of the development is specified within the Local Plan so that the spatial requirements of the strategic site allocation are not lost or undermined by later phases of the development. However, given the long period for the construction of the development it was judged that a degree of flexibility was required to enable the masterplan to evolve to respond to future trends or events. To achieve this degree of flexibility, the text of the policy also includes “or any subsequent approved document” so that any changes to the agreed masterplan can be achieved. The expected route to agreeing changes to the masterplan is through subsequent reviews or revisions to the proposed Supplementary Planning Document.

60.3 Based on this background to the preparation of policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North, it is the Council’s contention that policy SS4 as written meets the tests of soundness within the NPPF.
Q61. Should Policy SS4 include reference to the proposed SPD or would this be better located in the supporting text?

Council Response

61.1 The purpose of the reference within the policy text to the proposed Supplementary Planning Document is to support the approach explained above in relation to Q60.

61.2 Based on this background to the preparation of policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North, it is the Council’s contention that policy SS4 as written meets the tests of soundness within the NPPF.

Q62. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on the sewage infrastructure and to the impact of odour from the Sutherland Poultry Farm on future occupiers?

Council Response

62.1 Yes, full consideration has been given to the impact of this development on the sewage infrastructure and to the impact of odour from the Sutherland Poultry Farm on future occupiers.

62.2 These issues were fully considered during the Council’s plan-making work during the assessment of the suitability and achievability of the site within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and during the infrastructure planning work recorded within the Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan [EB38]. In addition, these issues were fully considered during the Council’s careful assessment and determination of the outline planning permission for the Bolsover North site which was granted on 25th October 2017 (application reference 14/00080/OUTEA).

Q63. What is the timescale for the relocation and expansion of the existing Infant and Nursery School and the expansion of the existing Primary School? Should this be included in the policy or supporting text?

Council Response

63.1 The timescale for the relocation and expansion of the existing Infants and Nursery School and the expansion of the existing Junior School is based on the planned housing trajectory and this has been established in co-operation with Derbyshire County Council during the infrastructure planning work recorded within the Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan [EB38].

63.2 Based on this work, trigger points for financial and land contributions from the proposed Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation to facilitate this timescale were established within the S106 Agreement Heads of Terms and were agreed by the site proponents, Bolsover District Council and Derbyshire County Council. These Heads of Terms are:
Relocation and expansion of the existing Infants and Nursery School

- Transfer of Land upon commencement of development;
- Pay £250,000 to facilitate design and procurement development work 7 days later;
- Pay £1.225m to facilitate building of replacement Infants School upon notice of contractor appointment;
- Pay a further £1.225m to facilitate the building works a year later.

Expansion of the Junior School

- Pay 50% of the agreed contribution (£1,302.74 per dwelling) to facilitate expansion of Junior School at 50% occupation of the relevant phase of development;
- Pay the remaining 50% of the agreed contribution (£1,302.74 per dwelling) to facilitate expansion of Junior School at 75% occupation of the relevant phase of development.

63.3 Following the agreement between the site proponents, Bolsover District Council and Derbyshire County Council on these Heads of Terms, these were incorporated into the S106 Agreement and this has been circulated for signing and this provides the legal framework for the timescale for these infrastructure improvements.

63.4 However, the Council has judged that it would not be necessary or appropriate to include the timescales within the policy or preceding text due to the relatively detailed mechanism for delivering them.

Q64. Is the boundary of the site shown on the Policies Map correct? Does it accord with the site granted outline planning permission and shown in Figure 4B: Bolsover North – Approved Masterplan (page 42)?

Council Response

64.1 Yes, in general the boundary of the site shown on the Policies Map is correct. However, the Council has noted the representation made by Mr K Johnson that the Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation boundary as shown on the Policies Map should follow the boundary shown in Figure 4B: Bolsover North - Approved Masterplan (representation ref. 8268).

64.2 As part of its consideration of the Regulation 19 representations, the Council has proposed a very minor modification to the Policies Map to address Mr K Johnson’s representation above and this is set out as modification number PM8 within its Proposed Modifications to the Submitted Local Plan [ED5]. Based on discussions with Mr K Johnson, he agrees that his representation ref. 8268 to the Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District has been addressed and can be withdrawn subject to modification number PM8 being made to the Plan. This agreement is set out in the Statement of Common Ground with Mr K Johnson [ED15].
Q65. Has the Section 106 Agreement been signed by the outstanding landowners (anticipated by December 2018)?

Council Response

65.1 Following the agreement between the site proponents, Bolsover District Council and Derbyshire County Council on the wording of the S106 Agreement in June 2017, the prepared S106 Agreement has been circulated for signing.

65.2 This process began with the 16 private landowners and at the time of Submission of the Local Plan for Bolsover District 10 landowners had signed and a further 6 remained. This fact was recorded in the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and this paper advised that the remaining 6 landowners were expected to have signed up by December 2018.

65.3 The Council can now report that it was notified on 19th December 2018 that all of the outstanding private landowners had signed the S106 Agreement. Based on this progress, Derbyshire County Council is next in line to sign the S106 Agreement and this is scheduled to take place in early January 2019. Following this, the S106 Agreement will be signed and completed by Bolsover District Council and the Old Bolsover Town Council before the end of January 2019.

Q66. Has a Reserved Matters application been submitted (expected late autumn 2018)?

Council Response

66.1 PB Planning submitted the reserved matters application for the first phase of the development on behalf of Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire) and Strata Homes on 4th January 2019 (application reference 19/00005/REM). This application is for 238 homes, open space and associated infrastructure.
**Clowne Garden Village**: [Policy SS5] [1000 dwellings]

**Q67. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?**

**Council Response**

67.1 Yes, the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation is justified and appropriate and this is demonstrated by clear appraisal and evidence.

67.2 In relation to the allocation being justified as the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3] found that the Clowne Garden Village option was the best performing option available to the Council for consideration. This finding followed a rigorous appraisal of the potential social, environmental and economic effects of the Clowne Garden Village option and of several other alternatives for broad strategic directions for growth in Clowne. This is set out in detail in Section 5.4 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3].

67.3 The Council used the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal process to inform its plan-making. Based on this, together with the findings of the Council’s proportionate evidence base, the Council is clear that the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation is justified.

67.4 In relation to the allocation being appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development, the Council’s Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] concluded for the Clowne Garden Village site that “the site is available, possibly suitable and achievable. From testing, it is expected to deliver approximately 1000 dwellings between 2020 and 2033.” The Council’s Employment Land Availability Assessment [EB17] concluded that “the site is available, suitable and achievable, and could be considered for allocation within the Local Plan.”

67.5 In addition to this evidence, the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation was identified as a potential strategic site within the Local Plan for Bolsover District: Identified Strategic Options [BD4] in October 2015 (identified at that time as Clowne North). Following careful consideration of the representations received at this time, together with the findings of its evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, the Council decided in February 2016 to support the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation for further testing. Based on this testing providing confirmation that the potential strategic site allocation would be appear to be justified and appropriate, the Council included the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation within its Consultation Draft Local Plan for Bolsover District (October 2016) [BD1]. Again, following careful consideration of the representations received, together with the findings of its evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, the Council approved the allocation of the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation in April 2018 and set out its policy for this allocation in its Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District [SD2] in May 2018. The proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation has therefore been subjected to three rounds of consultation and tested against objections at each stage. This is discussed in greater depth within the Council’s
In parallel to the plan-making process, Waystone Limited submitted an outline planning application for the proposed Clowne Garden Village site in December 2017. The Council resolved to approve the outline planning permission for the Clowne Garden Village site and refer the application to the Secretary of State subject to a number of conditions and signing of a S106 Agreement on 26th June 2018 (application reference 17/00640/OUT) following careful assessment of the benefits and any adverse impacts of the proposed development. In accordance with this resolution, the application was referred to the Secretary of State on 2nd July 2018. On 19th July 2018, the Government wrote back to the Council to advise that the Secretary of state had decided to not call in the application and to leave the decision to the Council.

Therefore, the Council is clear that the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation is appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development based on the following:

a. the findings of the Council’s evidence base, in particular the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the Employment Land Availability Assessment [EB17];

b. the findings of the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3];

c. the outcome of the consultation exercises during the Council’s plan-making work as set out in the Council’s Statement of Consultation [SD4];

d. the Council’s careful consideration of the submitted outline planning application (application reference 17/00640/OUT) and resolution to grant outline planning permission for the development of the site; and

e. the decision of the Secretary of State to not call in the application.

Q68. Is the proposed housing allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it?

d. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

e. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

f. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Council Response

68.1 Yes, the site is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory set out in the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and this is demonstrated by clear evidence.

68.2 In overview, the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] advises that the updated housing trajectory for the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation is based on discussions with the master developer bringing the site forward, Waystone Limited. To help provide clear and substantial evidence
of these discussions and the milestones underpinning the planned build out trajectory, the Council has entered into a Statement of Common Ground with Waystone Limited [ED26]. This Statement of Common Ground takes account of the latest site deliverability information, given Waystone Limited have developed their business plans in light of the Council’s resolution to grant their outline planning application, the Secretary of State’s decision to not call in the application and the Council’s decision to submit the Local Plan for Bolsover District for Examination. Based on this evidence, the Council believes that the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory and may come forward in an accelerated timeframe.

68.3 In relation to question a., Waystone Limited have confirmed they have controlling interests over the land and that the site is available for residential and employment development. This is clearly demonstrated within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27], the Employment Land Availability Assessment [EB17] and the outline planning application documents (application reference 17/00640/OUT).

68.4 In relation to question b., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27], the Employment Land Availability Assessment [EB17] and the outline planning application documents (application reference 17/00640/OUT) clearly demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided. Furthermore, the Council’s decisions to allocate the Clowne Garden Village site and to grant outline planning permission for the proposed development of the site underline this position.

68.5 In relation to question c., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27], the Employment Land Availability Assessment [EB17] and the outline planning application documents (application reference 17/00640/OUT) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain. Furthermore, the Council’s decisions to allocate the Clowne Garden Village site and to grant outline planning permission for the proposed development of the site underline this position. In addition to this, in relation to off-site highway infrastructure the Council has entered into a Statement of Common Ground with Highways England, Derbyshire County Council, North East Derbyshire District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council and Bassetlaw District Council regarding the cumulative impact of Local Plan allocations across the North Derbyshire area on the operation of M1 Junction 30 and the A616 / A619 Treble Bob roundabout (the Treble Bob junction) [ED12]. This Statement of Common Ground sets out the organisations’ common position on the impacts of planned development and the proposed mitigation.

Q69. Are there any constraints to development?

Council Response

69.1 As stated in relation to Q67, the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27], the Employment Land Availability Assessment [EB17] and the outline planning application documents (application reference
17/00640/OUT) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain. Furthermore, the Council’s decisions to allocate the Clowne Garden Village site and to grant outline planning permission for the proposed development of the site underline this position.

Q70. Is Policy SS5 sound given that it refers to an ‘indicative masterplan for the site or any subsequent approved document’? Should the policy clearly set out the requirements for the development of this site?

Council Response

70.1 Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village was prepared to clearly set out the requirements for the development of the site and these are listed in criteria a) to p) (as amended via the Council’s Proposed Modifications [ED5]). These criteria set out both the key development requirements, such as the quantum of development and the key infrastructure requirement, but also the policy requirements such as minimising the need to travel by private car and contributing towards conserving and enhancing biodiversity.

70.2 The purpose of the reference within the policy text to “the development being guided by the indicative masterplan for the site” is to ensure that the overall form and layout of the development is specified within the Local Plan so that the spatial requirements of the strategic site allocation are not lost or undermined by later phases of the development. However, given the long period for the construction of the development it was judged that a degree of flexibility was required to enable the masterplan to evolve to respond to future trends or events should developers choose or need to depart from the outline planning permission. To achieve this degree of flexibility, the text of the policy also includes “or any subsequent approved document” so that any changes to the agreed masterplan can be achieved. The expected route to agreeing changes to the masterplan is through subsequent reviews or revisions to the proposed Supplementary Planning Document.

70.3 Based on this background to the preparation of policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village, it is the Council’s contention that policy SS5 as written meets the tests of soundness within the NPPF.

Q71. Should Policy SS5 include reference to the proposed SPD or would this be better located in the supporting text?

Council Response

71.1 The purpose of the reference within the policy text to the proposed Supplementary Planning Document is to support the approach explained above in relation to Q70.

71.2 Based on this background to the preparation of policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village, it is the Council’s contention that policy SS5 as written meets the tests of soundness within the NPPF.
Q72. Has the Council considered the development of a smaller site in this location as a Reasonable Alternative?

Council Response

72.1 During the detailed site testing stage that took place between February 2016 and October 2016, several other forms for the Clowne Garden Village site, including a smaller version of the site, were considered by the Council as part of its plan-making work. This is discussed in greater depth within the Council's Position Paper relating to the Green Belt within Bolsover District [PP4] and Position Paper relating to the Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation [PP5].

72.2 However, critically within this plan-making work the Council judged that none of the several other forms of the Clowne Garden Village site represented a Reasonable Alternative that warranted further Sustainable Appraisal. This was due to these other forms of the site being judged to be not realistic or deliverable alternatives.

72.3 In reaching this judgement, the Council noted that the Planning Practice Guidance advises within paragraph 38 that:

“Reasonable alternatives are the different realistic options considered by the plan-maker in developing the policies in its plan. They must be sufficiently distinct to highlight the different sustainability implications of each so that meaningful comparisons can be made. The alternatives must be realistic and deliverable.”

Paragraph: 038 Reference ID: 11-038-20150209

72.4 Therefore, whilst the Council did seek to identify Reasonable Alternatives for the broad strategic directions for growth to the south and east of Clowne (as discussed in the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3]), the Council did not consider the development of a smaller site in this location as a Reasonable Alternative.

Q73. What are the ‘exceptional circumstances’ for removing an area of land from the Green Belt to create a new western employment gateway to Clowne?

Council Response

73.1 As set out within the Council’s Position Paper relating to the Green Belt within Bolsover District [PP4], the ‘exceptional circumstances’ for removing an area of land from the Green Belt to create a new western employment gateway to Clowne can be summarised as follows:

a) the objectively assessed need of 92 hectares of employment land provides a high and acute challenge to deliver and this justifies consideration of land within the Green Belt;

b) the identified available, suitable and achievable sites for employment development that are outside the Green Belt acts as a constraint on the supply / availability of land suitable for sustainable development and this justifies consideration of land within the Green Belt;
c) that releasing a small amount of Green Belt land would achieve the most sustainable form of development for the District, and that without impinging on the Green Belt the Local Plan would have consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development and the most appropriate strategy as required by the NPPF;

d) that the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt through the release of parcels CLOW/GB/04b and CLOW/GB/05b would be minimal given the limited contribution they make to the strategic and local purposes of the North east Derbyshire Green Belt;

e) the form of development being supported in the Local Plan will reduce the consequent impacts of removing the parcels of land in question on the purposes of the Green Belt to the lowest reasonably practicable extent.

73.2 Based on this examination of whether exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green Belt boundary, it is the Council’s contention that there are exceptional circumstances to justify this release of Green Belt land and this is set out in full within the Council’s Position Paper relating to the Green Belt within Bolsover District [PP4]. Furthermore, it is considered that whilst not central to the tests facing the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District, the case outlined above also meets the additional considerations outlined in the new NPPF.

**Q74. Would this proposal lead to the coalescence of Clowne and Barlborough?**

**Council Response**

74.1 No, the changes proposed to the Green Belt would not lead to Clowne and Barlborough coalescing or being closer together than they currently are.

74.2 The narrowest gap of the Green Belt between Barlborough and Clowne is approximately 0.3km and is situated between properties on Clay Pit Way in Barlborough and properties on Monnies End in Clowne. This strategic gap broadens out to 0.6km along the A616 Clowne Road / Barlborough Road.

74.3 During the work on the Bolsover Partial Green Belt Review [EB33 and EB34] carried out by Lichfields, interim findings were produced in September 2016 which advised that the strategic gap between Clowne and Barlborough would be reduced if the Clowne Garden Village site was developed on its originally proposed western boundary. In light of these interim findings, the site promoter made revisions to their original proposal in order to:

a) reduce further the extent of the development within the Green Belt; and

b) strengthen the proposed future Green Belt boundary.

74.4 This is discussed in the Council’s Position Paper relating to the Green Belt within Bolsover District [PP4] and Position Paper relating to the Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation [PP5].

74.5 As a result of the changes made by the site promoter mentioned above, the strategic gap between Barlborough and Clowne will remain 0.6km along the A616
Clowne Road / Barlborough Road. On this basis, the Council is clear that the changes proposed to the Green Belt would not lead to Clowne and Barlborough coalescing or being closer together than they currently are and would ensure the strategic gap has permanence in the long term.

Q75. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on highway safety; flood risk; wildlife, woodland and hedgerows; heritage assets, including the Southgate House Conservation Area (part of which is included within the northern section of the site boundary on the indicative masterplan – Figure 4C); landscape and village character; agricultural land; local services and facilities; and sewage infrastructure?

Council Response

75.1 Yes, full consideration has been given to the impact of this development on the factors outlined.

75.2 These issues were fully considered during the Council’s plan-making work during the assessment of the suitability and achievability of the site within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27], the Employment Land Availability Assessment [EB17] and during the infrastructure planning work recorded within the Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan [EB38]. In addition, these issues were fully considered during the Council’s careful assessment and consideration of the outline planning permission for the Clowne Garden Village site which the Council resolved to approve on 26th June 2018 (application reference 17/00640/OUT).

Q76. Is the site in the right location?

Council Response

76.1 Yes, based on the Council’s plan-making work it is the Council’s view that the site is in the right location. The considerations and history to the Council’s selection of the Clowne Garden Village proposal arose during, and were then progressed through, the plan-making process. The consideration and history are set out in the Council’s Position Paper relating to the Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site Allocation [PP5].

76.2 As set out above, the Council did seek to identify Reasonable Alternatives for the broad strategic directions for growth to the south and east of Clowne (as discussed in the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3]). Based on a rigorous appraisal of the potential social, environmental and economic effects of these Reasonable Alternatives, the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3] found that the Clowne Garden Village option was the best performing option available to the Council for consideration.
**Former Whitwell Colliery Site**: [Policy SS7] [200 dwellings]

**Q77. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?**

**Council Response**

77.1 Yes, the proposed Former Whitwell Colliery site Strategic Site Allocation is justified and appropriate and this is demonstrated by clear appraisal and evidence.

77.2 In relation to the allocation being justified as the most appropriate strategy, the Council commissioned a Sustainability Appraisal at the Identified Strategic Options stage, which was subsequently updated at the Consultation Draft stage and for the Publication Local Plan. This means that the site has been subject to numerous detailed assessments consisting of rigorous appraisals of the potential social, environmental and economic effects. This is set out in detail in each respective Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3, BD2, BD5].

77.3 The Council used the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal process to inform its plan-making. Based on this, together with the findings of the Council’s proportionate evidence base, the Council is clear that the proposed Former Whitwell Colliery site Strategic Site Allocation is justified.

77.4 In relation to the allocation being appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development, the Council’s Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] concluded for the former Whitwell Colliery site that, “the site is available and possibly suitable, although there are a large number of possible constraints. From testing, following extensive land reclamation and engineering work, the site is expected to deliver at least 200 dwellings between 2026 and 2033, depending on the Important Open Area review.”

77.5 In addition to this evidence, the proposed Former Whitwell Colliery site, Strategic Site Allocation, was identified as a potential strategic site within the Local Plan for Bolsover District: Identified Strategic Options [BD4] in October 2015. Following careful consideration of the representations received at this time, together with the findings of its evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, the Council decided in February 2016 to support the proposed former Whitwell Colliery site Strategic Site Allocation for further testing. Based on this testing providing confirmation that the potential strategic site allocation would appear to be justified and appropriate, the Council included the proposed former Whitwell Colliery site Strategic Site Allocation within its Consultation Draft Local Plan for Bolsover District (October 2016) [BD1].

77.6 Again, following careful consideration of the representations received, together with the findings of its evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, the Council approved the allocation of the proposed Former Whitwell Colliery site Strategic Site Allocation in April 2018 and set out its policy for this allocation in its Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District [SD2] in May 2018. The proposed Former Whitwell Colliery site Strategic Site Allocation has therefore been subjected to three rounds of consultation and tested against objections at each stage. This is discussed in greater depth within the Council’s Statement of Consultation [SD4].
Therefore, the Council is clear that the proposed Former Whitwell Colliery Strategic Site Allocation is appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development based on the following:

- the findings of the Council’s evidence base, in particular the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27];
- the findings of the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3];
- the outcome of the consultation exercises during the Council’s plan-making work as set out in the Council’s Statement of Consultation [SD4];

Q78. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it:

- confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
- supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
- deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Council Response

78.1 Yes, the site is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory set out in the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and this is demonstrated by clear evidence.

78.2 In overview, the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] advises that the updated housing trajectory for the proposed Former Whitwell Colliery site Strategic Site Allocation is based on Land Availability Assessment work and the detailed testing undertaken by the Council. To help provide further clear and substantial evidence of the site’s availability, and the milestones underpinning the expected delivery of the site, the Council is currently in discussions with the agent to enable both parties to enter into a Statement of Common Ground. Should this be achieved, the Statement of Common Ground will be added to the Examination Library. Based on this evidence, the Council believes that the proposed Former Whitwell Colliery site Strategic Site Allocation is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory.

78.3 In relation to question a., Planning and Design Group have confirmed that Welbeck Estate has a controlling interest over the land and that the site is available for the proposed development. This is clearly demonstrated within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27].

78.4 In relation to question b., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] satisfactorily demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians should be achievable. Whilst this is yet to be proven through the submitted outline planning application (18/00452/OUT), based on dialogue between the Council, the local highway authority and the agent, the
Council is satisfied that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be satisfactorily achieved.

78.5 In relation to question c., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and planning application documents (application reference 08/00452/OUT) satisfactorily demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain which haven’t been considered or dealt with.

Q79. Are there any constraints to development?

Council Response

79.1 As stated in relation to Q78, the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and planning application documents (application reference 08/00452/OUT) satisfactorily demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain which haven’t been considered or dealt with.

Q80. Is Policy SS6 sound given that it refers to an ‘indicative masterplan for the site’? Should the policy clearly set out the requirements for the development of this site?

Council Response

80.1 Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation – Former Whitwell Colliery site was prepared to clearly set out the requirements for the development of the site and these are listed in criteria a) to n) (as amended via the Council’s Proposed Modifications [ED5]). These criteria set out both the key development requirements, such as the quantum of development and the key infrastructure requirement, but also the policy requirements such as minimising the need to travel by private car and contributing towards conserving and enhancing biodiversity.

80.2 The purpose of the reference within the policy text to the development being guided by the indicative masterplan for the site is to ensure that the overall form and layout of the development is specified within the Local Plan so that the spatial requirements of the strategic site allocation are not lost or undermined by later phases of the development. However, given the long period for the construction of the development it was judged that a degree of flexibility was required to enable the masterplan to evolve to respond to future trends or events should developers choose or need to depart from it. To achieve this degree of flexibility, the text of the policy explains that the expected route to agreeing changes, including to the masterplan, is through subsequent reviews or revisions to the proposed Supplementary Planning Document.
Based on this background to the preparation of policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation – Former Whitwell Colliery site, it is the Council’s contention that policy SS6 as written meets the tests of soundness within the NPPF.

**Q81. Should Policy SS6 include reference to the proposed SPD or would this be better located in the supporting text?**

**Council Response**

81.1 The purpose of the reference within the policy text to the proposed Supplementary Planning Document is to support the approach explained above in relation to Q80.

81.2 Based on this background to the preparation of policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation – Former Whitwell Colliery site, it is the Council’s contention that policy SS6 as written meets the tests of soundness within the NPPF.

**Q82. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on flood risk, landscape and biodiversity?**

**Council Response**

82.1 Yes, full consideration has been given to the impact of this development on flood risk, landscape and biodiversity.

82.2 These issues were fully considered during the Council’s plan-making work during the assessment of the suitability and achievability of the site within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and during the infrastructure planning work recorded within the Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan [EB38].

**Q83. Does the proposal retain a break between the parishes of Whitwell and Hodthorpe?**

**Council Response**

83.1 The actual Parishes are contiguous, but in respect of the built up areas of those parishes the proposal will retain an Important Open Break (IOB) between the parishes of Whitwell and Hodthorpe.

83.2 An appropriate break has been agreed between the Council and Welbeck Estate, along with proposed modifications to the wording of policy SS6, minor amendments to the Open break and a revised Indicative Masterplan for the site. The overall scheme will maintain a meaningful Open Break that accords with the purpose as set out in the Important Open Break document [EB35], while allowing for a viable development that accords with policy SS5.

83.3 This agreement has resulted in the withdrawal of Planning and Design Group’s objections on behalf of Welbeck Estate to both policy SS6 (Strategic Site Allocation
– Former Whitwell Colliery site) and SS11 (Development in Important Open Breaks). This is confirmed in a Statement of Common Ground between the parties which is being finalised.
Housing Allocations: [Policy LC1]

Q84. Should more clarity be provided in the policy with regards to the capacity of each site?

Council Response

84.1 It is the Council’s view that policy LC1: Housing Allocations, when taken together with the text preceding policy LC1 in paragraphs 5.16 to 5.40 and Appendix 5.1 – Housing Trajectory of the Local Plan, is sufficiently clear with regard to the capacity of each housing allocation site. As a result, the Council does not propose any modification in this area.

Land at Brookvale, Shirebrook [560 dwellings]

Q85. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

Council Response

85.1 Yes, the proposed land at Brookvale, Shirebrook residential site allocation is justified and appropriate and this is demonstrated by clear appraisal and evidence.

85.2 In relation to the allocation being justified, Section 5.5 of the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3] advises that “all proposed plan allocations and reasonable alternatives have been subject to SA as part of the preparation of this report using the tailored appraisal criteria and associated thresholds of significance.” This Sustainability Appraisal work drew upon the available sites within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27]. Within this appraisal, the results for the land at Brookvale, Shirebrook residential site allocation are largely positive when compared to the relevant Reasonable Alternatives, with the only potentially negative impact highlighted relating to accessibility to public transport.

85.3 The Council used the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal process to inform its plan-making. Based on this, together with the findings of the Council’s proportionate evidence base, the Council is clear that the proposed land at Brookvale, Shirebrook residential site allocation is justified.

85.4 In relation to the allocation being appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development, the Council’s Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] concluded for the land at Brookvale, Shirebrook site that “the site is available, suitable and achievable. Development has commenced on the site and from testing, the site is expected to deliver around 650 dwellings between 2016 and 2029”. In addition to this evidence, the Council granted outline planning permission for the land at Brookvale, Shirebrook site on 10th July 2015 (application reference 14/00594/OUT) following careful assessment of the benefits and any adverse impacts of the proposed development. Furthermore, the Council has subsequently approved the reserved matters for the first two phases of the development.
In parallel to this, to address / mitigate the potentially negative impact highlighted relating to accessibility to public transport within the Sustainability Appraisal Report, the Council has through its plan-making work proposed the redirection of bus routes to service Brookvale and Brook Park allocations in Shirebrook under policy ITCR9: Local Transport Improvement Schemes. This proposal is a result of the Council’s infrastructure planning work with Derbyshire County Council and the relevant bus companies.

Furthermore, in addition to this evidence, the proposed land at Brookvale, Shirebrook residential site allocation has been subjected to two rounds of consultation and tested against objections at each stage. This is discussed in greater depth within the Council’s Statement of Consultation [SD4].

Therefore, the Council is clear that the proposed land at Brookvale, Shirebrook residential site allocation is appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development.

Q86. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it?
g. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
h. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
i. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Council Response

Yes, the site is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory set out in the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and this is demonstrated by clear evidence.

In overview, the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] advises that the updated housing trajectory for the proposed land at Brookvale, Shirebrook residential site allocation is based on discussions with the house builder bringing the site forward, Keepmoat Homes. To help provide clear and substantial evidence of these discussions and the milestones underpinning the planned build out trajectory, the Council has entered into a Statement of Common Ground with Keepmoat Homes and Homes England [ED23]. This Statement of Common Ground takes account of the latest site deliverability information, given Keepmoat Homes have significantly accelerated their build out rate over the current monitoring year, i.e. 1st April 2018 to 31st March 2019, and Homes England are accelerating the marketing of the final phase of the development. Since the signing of the Statement of Common Ground, the Council has undertook a focussed Residential Land Assessment site based survey of the site on 20th December 2018 to double check
the reported progress on site. This survey has recorded that since the 1\textsuperscript{st} April 2018 the remaining 80 dwellings on Phase 1A have been completed.

86.3 In relation to question a., Keepmoat Homes and Homes England have confirmed they have controlling interests over the land and that the site is available for residential development. This is clearly demonstrated within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 14/00594/OUT, 15/00316/REM and 18/00304/REM).

86.4 In relation to question b., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 14/00594/OUT, 15/00316/REM and 18/00304/REM) clearly demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided.

86.5 In relation to question c., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 14/00594/OUT, 15/00316/REM and 18/00304/REM) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain.

Q87. Are there any constraints to development?

Council Response

87.1 As stated in relation to Q86, the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 14/00594/OUT, 15/00316/REM and 18/00304/REM) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain.

Q88. Has the application for reserved matters for the second phase of this development been approved?

Council Response

88.1 The Council has approved the reserved matters for the second phase (known as Phase 1B) under application reference 18/00304/REM. The Decision Notice was issued on 23\textsuperscript{rd} October 2018 and this is appended to the Statement of Common Ground [ED26]. Construction on this part of the allocated site will start shortly as part of Keepmoat Homes and Homes England’s accelerated delivery.
Q89. **What percentage of the dwellings would be expected to be provided as affordable housing?**

**Council Response**

89.1 Whilst the Council’s proposed policy LC2: Affordable Housing through Market Housing requires applications for residential development comprising of 25 or more dwellings to provide 10% as affordable housing on site, this allocation covers a site that already has planning permission. None of the dwellings under the implemented permissions are required to be affordable. However, this is principally due to the site also having a previously implemented permission under which the off-site affordable housing financial contribution had already been discharged and therefore could not reasonably be asked for again as part of the recent planning application.

**Land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, Alfreton Road, South Normanton [145 dwellings]**

Q90. **Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?**

**Council Response**

90.1 Yes, the proposed land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is justified and appropriate and this is demonstrated by clear appraisal and evidence.

90.2 In relation to the allocation being justified, Section 5.5 of the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3] advises that “all proposed plan allocations and reasonable alternatives have been subject to SA as part of the preparation of this report using the tailored appraisal criteria and associated thresholds of significance.” This Sustainability Appraisal work drew upon the available sites within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27]. Within this appraisal, the results for the land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation are largely positive when compared to the relevant Reasonable Alternatives.

90.3 The Council used the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal process to inform its plan-making. Based on this, together with the findings of the Council’s proportionate evidence base, the Council is clear that the proposed Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is justified.

90.4 In relation to the allocation being appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development, the Council’s Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] concluded for the land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton site that “the site is available, suitable and achievable (subject to reserved matters satisfactorily addressing constraints). Development could commence within 5 years and finish within 6-15 years, and, therefore, the site could be considered for allocation within the emerging Local Plan.” In addition to this evidence, the Council granted outline planning permission for the land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton site on 23rd June 2017 (application reference 14/00531/OUT) following careful assessment of the benefits and any adverse impacts of the proposed development.
The Council has subsequently approved the reserved matters for the development (application references 18/00206/REM and works have started on site.

90.5 In addition to this evidence, the proposed land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation has been subjected to two rounds of consultation and tested against objections at each stage. This is discussed in greater depth within the Council’s Statement of Consultation [SD4].

90.6 Therefore, the Council is clear that the proposed land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development.

Q91. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it?
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Council Response

91.1 Yes, the site is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory set out in the Council's Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and this is demonstrated by clear evidence.

91.2 In overview, the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] advises that the updated housing trajectory for the proposed land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is based on discussions with the house builder bringing the site forward, Avant Homes. To help provide clear and substantial evidence of these discussions and the milestones underpinning the planned build out trajectory, the Council has entered into a Statement of Common Ground with Avant Homes [ED24]. This Statement of Common Ground takes account of the latest site deliverability information, given Avant Homes have developed their business plans since approval of the reserved matters for the development. Based on this evidence, the Council believes that the proposed land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory.

91.3 In relation to question a., Avant Homes has confirmed it has a controlling interest over the land and that the site is available for residential development. This is clearly demonstrated within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 14/00531/OUT and 18/00206/REM).

91.4 In relation to question b., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application
references 14/00531/OUT and 18/00206/REM) clearly demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided.

91.5 In relation to question c., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 14/00531/OUT and 18/00206/REM) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain.

Q92. Are there any constraints to development?

Council Response

92.1 As stated in relation to Q91, the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 14/00531/OUT and 18/00206/REM) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain.

Q93. Has the impact of the proposed housing allocation on the setting of the listed building, Carnfield Hall [Grade II*], and the Carnfield Hall Conservation Area been adequately assessed? Has a Heritage Impact Assessment been undertaken?

Council Response

93.1 Yes, the methodology underpinning the Council’s Land Availability Assessment work includes an assessment of the impact of potential developments on heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, for the land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation, the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] identified that the site adjoins the Carnfield Hall Conservation Area at the south and west and that this was a possible constraint.

93.2 Related to this assessment was the careful consideration of the proposed development on the setting of the listed building, Carnfield Hall [Grade II*] and the Carnfield Hall Conservation Area during the determination of the outline planning application (application reference 14/00531/OUT). This detailed consideration was based on the case officer’s careful consideration of the information within the applicant’s Heritage Impact Assessment (as updated and revised), the consultation responses from Historic England, the Council’s own specialist conservation and archaeological advisers and wider public consultation.

93.3 Since this stage, the Council has also now fully considered the reserved matters for this residential development and these have now been approved (application reference 18/00206/REM) and the Council is satisfied that the heritage assets and their settings have been adequately assessed and preserved.
Q94. Has the application for the approval of reserved matters been determined [expected Autumn 2018]?

Council Response

94.1 The Council has approved the reserved matters for the development under application reference 18/00206/REM. The Decision Notice was issued on 18th September 2018 and this is appended to the Statement of Common Ground [ED24].

Q95. What percentage of the dwellings would be expected to be provided as affordable housing?

Council Response

95.1 Whilst the Council’s proposed policy LC2: Affordable Housing through Market Housing requires applications for residential development comprising of 25 or more dwellings to provide 10% as affordable housing on site, this allocation covers a site that was granted outline planning permission at a time when the Council had put in place a waiver to its adopted affordable housing policy in order to encourage early delivery of the housing. This housing delivery condition requires that 10% of the dwellings are built and made ready for occupation within 3 years from the date of the permission and that 50% of the dwellings are built and made ready for occupation within 5 years from the date of the permission.

95.2 As such, based on the updated housing trajectory none of the dwellings are expected to be affordable unless the housing delivery condition is not met.

Land at Town End Farm, Lees Lane, South Normanton [40 dwellings]

Q96. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

Council Response

96.1 Yes, the proposed land at Town End Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is justified and appropriate and this is demonstrated by clear appraisal and evidence.

96.2 In relation to the allocation being justified, Section 5.5 of the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3] advises that “all proposed plan allocations and reasonable alternatives have been subject to SA as part of the preparation of this report using the tailored appraisal criteria and associated thresholds of significance.” This Sustainability Appraisal work drew upon the available sites within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27]. Within this appraisal, the results for the land at Town End Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation are largely positive when compared to the relevant Reasonable Alternatives.
96.3 The Council used the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal process to inform its plan-making. Based on this, together with the findings of the Council’s proportionate evidence base, the Council is clear that the proposed land at Town End Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is justified.

96.4 In relation to the allocation being appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development, the Council’s Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] concluded for the land at Town End Farm, South Normanton site that “the site is available, possibly suitable, with a reasonable prospect of development within 6-15 years. Therefore, the site could be considered for allocation within the emerging Local Plan”.

96.5 Furthermore, in addition to this evidence, the proposed land at Town End Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation has been subjected to one round of consultation and tested against objections at that stage. This is discussed in greater depth within the Council’s Statement of Consultation [SD4].

96.6 Therefore, the Council is clear that the proposed land at Town End Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development.

Q97. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it?
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Council Response

78.6 Yes, the site is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory set out in the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and this is demonstrated by clear evidence.

78.7 In overview, the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] advises that the updated housing trajectory for the proposed land at Town End Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is based on discussions with Leith Planning on behalf of their client, EPC-United Kingdom Plc. To help provide clear and substantial evidence of these discussions and the milestones underpinning the expected delivery of the site, the Council is currently in discussions with the agent to enable both parties to enter into a Statement of Common Ground. Should this be achieved, the Statement of Common Ground will be added to the Examination Library. Based on this evidence, the Council believes that the proposed land at Town End Farm, South Normanton residential site allocation is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory.
78.8 In relation to question a., Leith Planning have confirmed that EPC-United Kingdom Plc has a controlling interest over the land and that the site is available for residential development. This is clearly demonstrated within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27].

78.9 In relation to question b., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] satisfactorily demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians should be achievable. Whilst this is yet to be proven through a planning permission and due to the existing narrow width of Lees Lane will not be straightforward, based on dialogue between the Council, the local highway authority and the agent, the Council is satisfied that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be satisfactorily achieved.

78.10 In relation to question c., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] satisfactorily demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain.

Q98. Are there any constraints to development?

Council Response

79.2 As stated in relation to Q97, the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] satisfactorily demonstrates that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain.

Q99. What percentage of the dwellings would be expected to be provided as affordable housing?

Council Response

99.1 It is expected that an outline planning application will be submitted for this allocation following the adoption of the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District. Therefore, it is expected that the percentage of the dwellings to be provided as affordable housing will be 10% on site in accordance with the Council’s proposed policy LC2: Affordable Housing through Market Housing.

Q100. Is the housing capacity on this site appropriate? Should it be increased from ‘approximately 40’ to 50 dwellings?

Council Response

100.1 The housing capacity set out in the text preceding policy LC1 in paragraph 5.25 and Appendix 5.1 – Housing Trajectory of the Local Plan (as updated) of approximately 40 dwellings is considered by the Council as appropriate.
100.2 Within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27], the land at Town End Farm, South Normanton site’s approximate size has been calculated as 1.96 hectares, although the area of the site was stated as being 1.8 hectares by the site promoter within their submission to the Council informing the Assessment. Based on this stated area, the standard applied density within the Assessment of 30 dwellings per hectare has been applied suggesting the site could yield 54 dwellings.

100.3 However, in light of the need to address the narrowness of Lees Lane at the entrance of the site to create safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians, a slightly reduced yield of approximately 40 dwellings has been assumed and used within the Local Plan. Despite this, it is noted that the eventual appropriate housing yield for this site will be derived during the consideration and approval of the detailed site layout within a reserved matters application. The Council would not wish to assume a higher yield where achieving it may give rise to design and layout difficulties.

100.4 The Council could envisage that a yield slightly higher than 40 dwellings could come forward through the application process. However, the Council considers that this minor difference in yield would not undermine the appropriateness of the stated requirement of ‘approximately 40 dwellings’ within the Local Plan for Bolsover District.

Q101. Does the housing trajectory accurately reflect the likely delivery of this site? Could it be delivered in the first 5 years rather than in Years 6 – 10?

Council Response

101.1 The housing trajectory set out in the text preceding policy LC1 in paragraph 5.25 and Appendix 5.1 – Housing Trajectory of the Local Plan (as updated) of being delivered between 2023 and 2025 is considered by the Council as appropriate.

101.2 Based on the work and discussions with the site promoter underpinning the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27], the Council considers that the delivery of the first units on the site by 2023 is a cautious but realistic assessment taking into account the stages necessary to get to that point. However, it is noted that the site promoter has sought and secured expressions of interest from house builders and that this could see the site come forward earlier. It is also noted that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain, meaning the site technically could come forward earlier.

101.3 As stated in the answer to Q97, to help provide clear and substantial evidence of these discussions and the milestones underpinning the expected delivery of the site, the Council is currently in discussions with the agent to enable both parties to enter into a Statement of Common Ground. Should this be achieved, the Statement of Common Ground will be added to the Examination Library.

101.4 The Council accept that the site could come forward more quickly and within the first five years, although there is not yet clear evidence that this would be the case.
101.5 The 2012 NPPF requires Local Plans to plan “over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon” and in relation to housing “identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15”. Based on this, it is clear that not all residential site allocations need to be delivered within the first five years. Furthermore, should any minor difference in the time frame for this allocation occur, either forward or back, it is the Council’s view that this would not undermine the housing trajectory within the Local Plan for Bolsover District.

**Land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton [50 dwellings]**

Q102. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

**Council Response**

102.1 Yes, the proposed land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton residential site allocation is justified and appropriate and this is demonstrated by clear appraisal and evidence.

102.2 In relation to the allocation being justified, Section 5.5 of the Council’s Sustainability Appraisal Report [SD3] advises that “all proposed plan allocations and reasonable alternatives have been subject to SA as part of the preparation of this report using the tailored appraisal criteria and associated thresholds of significance.” This Sustainability Appraisal work drew upon the available sites within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27]. Within this appraisal, the results for the land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton residential site allocation are largely positive when compared to the relevant Reasonable Alternatives.

102.3 The Council used the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal process to inform its plan-making. Based on this, together with the findings of the Council’s proportionate evidence base, the Council is clear that the proposed land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton residential site allocation is justified.

102.4 In relation to the allocation being appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development, the Council’s Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] concluded for the land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton site that “the site is available, possibly suitable, with a reasonable prospect of development within 6-15 years. Therefore, the site could be considered for allocation within the emerging Local Plan, depending on the Important Open Area review”.

102.5 In addition to this evidence, the Council resolved to approve an outline planning permission for the land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton site on 21st November 2018 (application reference 17/00396/OUT) following careful assessment of the benefits and any adverse impacts of the proposed development. For information, the approved layout enables an extended Important Open Break (formerly known as Important Open Areas) to be secured following the Council’s Important Open Break review.
102.6 Furthermore, in addition to this evidence, the proposed land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton residential site allocation has been subjected to one round of consultation and tested against objections at that stage. This is discussed in greater depth within the Council’s Statement of Consultation [SD4].

102.7 Therefore, the Council is clear that the proposed land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton residential site allocation is appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development.

Q103. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it?
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Council Response

103.1 Yes, the site is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory set out in the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] and this is demonstrated by clear evidence.

103.2 In overview, the Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] advises that the updated housing trajectory for the proposed land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton residential site allocation is based on discussions with Ben Hunt Planning on behalf of their client, Hardwick Trustees Ltd. To help provide clear and substantial evidence of these discussions and the milestones underpinning the planned build out trajectory, the Council has entered into a Statement of Common Ground with Hardwick Trustees Ltd [ED27]. This Statement of Common Ground takes account of the latest site deliverability information, given Hardwick Trustees have developed their marketing plans since the Council resolved to grant outline planning permission for the development. Based on this evidence, the Council believes that the proposed land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton residential site allocation is deliverable and developable in accordance with the updated housing trajectory.

103.3 In relation to question a., Ben Hunt Planning have confirmed that Hardwick Trustees Ltd. has a controlling interest over the land and that the site is available for residential development. This is clearly demonstrated within the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 17/00396/OUT).

103.4 In relation to question b., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 17/00396/OUT) clearly demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided.
103.5 In relation to question c., the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 17/00396/OUT) clearly demonstrate that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain.

Q104. Are there any constraints to development?

Council Response

104.1 As stated in relation to Q103, the background documents to the Residential Land Availability Assessment [EB27] and the planning application documents (application references 17/00396/OUT) clearly demonstrates that the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services can be provided and that no outstanding environmental or other constraints remain.

Q105. Has the application for outline planning permission submitted in August 2017 been determined yet [expected in Autumn 2018]?

Council Response

105.1 The Council has resolved to approve the received outline planning permission for the land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton site on 21st November 2018 (application reference 17/00396/OUT). Based on the milestones underpinning the expected delivery of the site, it is expected that the S106 Agreement will be signed and application determined by March 2019.

Q106. What percentage of the dwellings would be expected to be provided as affordable housing?

Council Response

106.1 The Council’s resolution to approve the received outline planning permission for the land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton site on 21st November 2018 (application reference 17/00396/OUT) includes a requirement for 10% of the approved dwellings to be provided as affordable housing and this will be secured through the completion of the S106 Agreement.
Affordable Housing [Policy LC2]

Q107. Does the Local Plan make appropriate provision for affordable housing?

Council Response

107.1 Yes, the Council considered the evidence and the provisions in Policy LC2 - Affordable Housing, in the light of the publication of the new (2018) NPPF. The LPiBD has been submitted under transitional arrangements and will be assessed against the provisions in the 2012 NPPF. However, future planning decisions will also need to consider the requirements of the 2018 NPPF. Due to these changes, a briefing note was prepared to ensure that a relevant, robust and up to date policy framework was in place to guide the future delivery of affordable housing delivery. On the basis of this briefing note, members of the Council’s Planning Committee resolved to put forward a modification to policy LC2. This is included as PM 24 in the Council’s schedule of proposed modifications. The proposed modification is the addition of new paragraph after paragraph 5.49 to read:

“The evidence base for the Local Plan indicates that the need for entry level housing at low cost, as provided for by Paragraph 71 of the 2018 NPPF, is generally well met across the district. Where exceptional circumstances apply and a proposal can clearly show that a specific need is being met and the dwellings will provide for that need over the long term, proposals will be supported”.

107.2 The Council is also proposing to amend Policy LC2 to read:

“The Council will require applications for residential development comprising of 25 or more dwellings to provide 10% as affordable housing on site. Where this is stated to not be viable, a detailed site viability appraisal of the development proposal shall be required to inform an alternative level of provision. This should be in the form of affordable housing for rent. Where an applicant can demonstrate that this requirement would lead to issues of viability (for example where there has been a change in site circumstances since this Plan was adopted) they should justify the need for a viability assessment, and submit it with the planning application”.

107.3 The Planning Committee report of 21st November 2018 and the Briefing Note accompanying it are available on the Council’s website. For convenience they are also attached as Appendix G to this Statement.

107.4 The Council does not assume that all affordable housing coming forward will be delivered through market housing. In terms of the overall delivery of affordable housing it is worth noting that the Council’s Corporate Plan has a priority to deliver a minimum of 100 new Council properties by 2019. By March 2018, 33 new Council homes had been delivered, and a further 58 are under construction.
Q108. What evidence is there to support the requirement for an affordable housing provision of 10% in residential developments comprising 25 dwellings or more in Policy LC2?

Council Response

108.1. The key evidence in relation to this issue is set out in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVS) (submitted with the LPfBD as document EB54). The Assessment notes that viability in the district is challenging. In terms of need, it explains that the level of need arises not so much from the high level of house prices (Bolsover is one of the UK’s least expensive housing markets), but rather a result of extremely low incomes.

108.2. The Council recognises as a key issue the delivery of new housing in a district where deliverability has been challenging (LPfBD paragraph 2.41 (g). In its framing Policy LC2 the Council has been mindful of the need to balance affordable housing need with a recognition that, if the affordable housing requirement is set too high, market housing might become unviable, affecting the delivery of both forms of housing.

108.3. The proposed threshold of 25 dwellings or more for affordable housing reflects the Council’s acceptance that the low values and increased costs make for a challenging picture from the point of view of development viability, and the ability of developers to fund affordable housing.

108.4. Paragraphs 1.26 & 1.27 of the WPVA state that ‘The report findings recommend that the Council may wish to consider the continuation of an affordable housing policy which seeks to deliver up to 10% affordable housing across the vast majority of the geographic area of the District. The exceptions being Shirebrook, Hodthorpe, Tibshelf and Bolsover. In the latter two settlements, our modelling suggests that only the largest sites are likely to be able to sustain the full cost of delivering 10% affordable housing but we would suggest that the policy is extended to cover the other allocations made for these settlements. These developments may, or may not be capable of delivering the affordable homes proposed but, if they are not, the requirement to submit a viability assessment is not an onerous one in the context of a large, allocated site, whereas, if they are indeed capable of delivering at least an element of affordable housing, their exclusion from the policy altogether would result in a loss of much needed affordable homes’.

108.5. In short the evidence is that although there is some variation in the levels of viability in housing development within the district, it remains challenging. Policy LC2 reflects both this local evidence; and, the requirement at paragraph 173 of the 2012 NPPF that Plans should be deliverable and not subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed is threatened.
**Type and Mix of Housing [Policy LC3]**

Q109. Should the Local Plan make provision for Starter Homes?

**Council Response**

109.1. It is considered that Policy LC3 seeks to ensure that new housing provision will provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of people in the district, this may include the provision of starter homes.

109.2. However, this is different from the question as to whether or not the Local Plan should require the provision of Starter homes as part of, or instead of, Affordable rental housing. This issue was considered in the Briefing Note on Affordable Housing and the 2018 NPPF. As noted above, although the policy will not be examined against the provisions of the 2018 NPPF, the 2018 NPPF shows the government’s direction of travel on this issue. The Council therefore considers there is a need to consider this issue to ensure that this policy remains robust and ensures that affordable housing can be delivered after the LPfBD is adopted.

109.3. Paragraph 64 of the 2018 NPPF states ‘Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups’.

109.4. As noted above, viability in relation to housing development in the district is challenging. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment found that the Council could assume a 10% affordable housing delivery requirement on the majority of sites, based on a threshold of 25. However, if the requirement in paragraph 64 was followed, and the 10% of affordable housing was in the form of affordable home ownership, it would mean that this would be the only type of affordable housing built in the district through the delivery of market housing.

109.5. The WPVA notes that the 10% of affordable housing set out in the new NPPF sits uneasily with the Government’s localism agenda. Moreover, it would be far easier to deliver in higher value areas where development is capable of supporting a high percentage of affordable housing from most development.

109.6. The demographic evidence in the SHMA, OAN update and elsewhere points to a district with an aging population, together with long term health problems or disabilities. Whilst the Government’s aspiration is for young people to be able to get on the property ladder and purchase their own homes is shared by the Council, there is also a need to plan for the type of affordable housing needed in the district. The local housing needs assessment in the OAN update notes that people with long term health issues are more likely to live in social rented accommodation. The other group that will see a high increase in growth over the Plan period, are older people (65+), who are less likely to work or have a limited income. As such they are less likely to be able to obtain or pay a mortgage, even for products such as affordable home ownership.
109.7. The provision of starter homes as part of the LPfBD’s affordable housing requirement would not fit with the economic reality of the housing market in Bolsover, nor provide for the needs of the existing and projected future population of the district. If the needs of the district change, the provisions of Policy LC3 would allow for such developments to be brought forward.

**Custom and Self Build Dwellings [Policy LC4]**

Q110. Is the provision of at least 5% of the dwelling plots on sites for 10 or more dwellings or with a gross area of 0.3ha or above to be set aside as serviced plots for sale to custom or self builders appropriate and justified?

Q111. What evidence does the Council have which shows the level of interest in Custom and Self Build dwellings?

Q112. What evidence does the Council have of the type of serviced plots being sought by custom or self builders and in which locations?

Council Response

110.1. Due to the proposed modifications that the Council are bringing forward, it is considered to be better to deal with the three questions together.

110.2. Policy LC4 was developed in the earlier iterations of the LPfBD in line with the requirement at paragraph 50 of the 2012 NPPF that local planning authorities should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, and widen opportunities for home ownership. This approach was lent additional support with the requirement under the Self-build & Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 in respect of the part of the duty under planning.

110.3. The NPPG says that the SHMA should use the information in the Council’s Custom and Self Build Register to understand and consider the future need for this type of housing in the district. Paragraphs 8.3 – 8.26 and table 86 of the OAN update considered this and noted that the overall interest in this type of housebuilding was low across the HMA. Nevertheless, as the Register is a relatively new initiative, it was considered prudent to retain the policy.

110.4. However, the entries on the Register at the end of the third base period to 31st October 2018 show that there were just 17 entries over the 3 year period.

110.5. The Council have employed an officer to promote this form of provision and they are working with prospective self builders, developers and Council departments to promote land for this use.

110.6. The Council is therefore of the view that there is insufficient evidence of the demand for this type of housebuilding to justify a separate policy on this.
110.7. The Council is therefore proposing to modify the LPfBD by removing policy LC4; revising paragraph 5.58 and adding a new paragraph to policy LC3: Type and Mix of Housing.

110.8. The proposed modification to paragraph 5.58 to read:

“The Government is keen to enable more people to build or commission their own homes, and the Council wants to encourage this. The Council has set up a register of individuals and associations who are looking for serviced plots of land on which to build their own homes. However, at 30th October 2018 only 17 people had expressed an interest in this type of house building in Bolsover district. The Council granted planning permission for 48 units on small sites of one or two plots in the year April 2017 – March 2018 that would be suitable for this type of housing development. The Council’s evidence base shows that whilst at the present time it is difficult to demonstrate concrete evidence of demand at a local level, there is some potential to encourage developers of larger schemes to designate parts of these as plots available for custom build”.

110.9. The modification proposed to Policy LC3 – Type and Mix of Housing is:

“The Council will encourage the inclusion of plots suitable for self and custom build dwellings in areas where the Council’s Self and Custom Build Register shows that there is a demand”.

**Gypsy and Traveller Provision** [Policies LC5 and LC6]

Q113. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment [GTAA] 2015 identifies an additional need for 17 residential pitches for gypsies and travellers; 7 bricks and mortar units; and 13 plots for travelling showpeople. However, although the Local Plan allocates 14 plots for travelling showpeople, only 5 pitches are allocated for gypsies and travellers. A single pitch has been granted planning permission at Pinxton which, along with the allocated pitches, would reduce the unmet need for gypsy and traveller provision to 11 pitches. Does the Local Plan make appropriate provision for gypsy and traveller sites, having regard to evidence of need?

**Council Response**

113.1 Yes the Local Plan does make appropriate provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites. The Council’s Position Paper on Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling show people (PP6) sets out the approach that we have taken to this issue. The Plan seeks not only to allocate new pitches, but has an enabling policy to support new sites coming forward and also a policy to protect sites from alternative uses.

113.2 Whilst the level of provision within the Plan falls below that forecast within the modelled approach, it is considered that it does reflect the low actual demand for pitches in the district. The Council has allocated all of the sites suggested to it for small family sites. Earlier in the plan process the Council had received Land
Availability Assessment forms for other sites where both housing and Gypsy and Traveller sites were being proposed. They were considered in the Gypsy and Traveller Land Availability Assessment (EB 30). However, after approaching them in relation to only the Gypsy and Traveller proposals (as the housing proposals were not considered suitable), there has been no communication from the landowner's or agents about bringing the sites forward, and as such the Council could not consider the sites to be available.

113.3 The District Council's landholdings have been looked at and sites not required for other Council initiatives have been assessed and were not considered to be suitable as detailed in the Gypsy and Traveller Position Paper (PP6). Derbyshire County Council have not made any land available for the District Council to consider.

113.4 Since the GTAA period started the Council has granted permission for 5 pitches on three separate sites. There have been no applications refused. There have been no unauthorised encampments for travellers who wanted to live in the district, since the start of the GTAA period, which is another sign of low actual demand.

113.5 In November 2018, the Council received details of an additional pitch at a site that already has planning permission, at land to the rear of 3-5 Brookhill Lane, Pinxton. Subject to the formal agreement of the Council, a modification is proposed to the plan to allocate an additional pitch in this location. With the formal agreement of the Council, this would reduce the unmet need to 10 pitches.

113.6 In the circumstances, given the limited demand, the support for sites that have come forward and all that the Council has done in relation to this issue, the Council's provision is considered to be appropriate.

Q114. Is it sound to rely upon unallocated sites coming forward during the plan period to meet the unmet need for gypsy and traveller pitches?

Council Response

114.1 To be clear, it is not a choice to rely on unallocated sites coming forward in order to meet a demand which is based on modelling and not proven need. Given the Council's record of supporting the provision of such sites and the positive wording of the policy allowing such sites to come forward, this approach is considered to be more sound, than allocating sites in locations where there may not be a demand, but using this to avoid providing for an enabling policy to support site provision where the Gypsy and traveller communities actually want to be.

114.2 Also, given the lack of suitable sites being proposed, our approach is considered to be the only reasonable option open to the Council. If further sites were suggested the Council would, undoubtedly meet the entire need through site allocations. Not allocating sites actually does allow Gypsies and Travellers greater flexibility in finding a site that is suitable in their view.
114.3 In answering this question the Inspector is referred to the North East Lincolnshire District Council (NELDC) examination, where in seeking to meet an identified need of 12 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches, NELDC allocated a site for 5 permanent pitches that had planning permission. Leaving an unmet need of 7 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches. The NELDC plan was found to be sound, and in respect of the Gypsy and Traveller issue, attention is drawn towards paragraph 73 of that Inspector’s report.

“Even with these modifications, the plan would not seek to allocate all of the pitches which the GTAA identified as being needed. However, given the limited level of need involved here, it would be disproportionate to demand a new assessment or to require that land for pitches be found. In the specific context of this Borough and the evidence presented to this examination, it is acceptable to deal with the provision of accommodation for gypsies and travellers through a criteria-based policy. Indeed, the recent grant of permission suggests that sites are likely to come forward in response to need.”

114.4 Bolsover District is also an area of low demand, and similar to the recent planning permissions granted for small numbers of pitches in the district, sites will come forward in response to need. NELDC had a similar level of under-allocation and now relies on sites coming forward during the plan period. Such an approach has been found to be sound, and therefore can be sound here also.

Q115. Is Policy LC6 overly restrictive given the under allocation of residential pitches for gypsies and travellers in the Local Plan?

Council Response

115.1 It is considered that the Policy was not overly restrictive, but a lack of clarity raised concerns that that may be the case. To overcome this the Council has proposed modifications to make it clearer (see PM 25 in ED5). The Council has a Statement of Common Ground with the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups [ED20]. This includes a change to criterion c) whereby a site would need to be within 1 km of Public Transport. 86% of the District’s land area is within 1 km of a bus stop. Subject to meeting all of the other criteria in the policy, the policy allows a high degree of flexibility and choice whilst also being within reasonable distance to services and amenities. Therefore far from being overly restrictive, the policy is encouragingly permissive given the under allocation.
Q116. Is Policy LC8 justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings in the countryside?

Council Response

116.1 Policy LC8 covers Agricultural, Forestry and other Occupation dwellings in the countryside. The aim of the policy is clearly to allow for development within the Countryside where there is a justifiable need for the development in such a location.

116.2 Para 17 of the NPPF lists core planning principles and these recognise the importance of “the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it”. Para 55 of the NPPF also states that Local Authorities should avoid isolated new homes within the countryside unless there are special circumstances.” This policy specifically addresses the first of the bullet points, notably, “the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside”.

116.3 It is considered that this Policy strikes the right balance between protecting the countryside from continual ad hoc development proposals, especially for large executive dwellings, that would adversely affect its character and beauty and be contrary to the aims of sustainability, whilst allowing for dwellings they are necessary to support a thriving rural community.

116.4 However, in considering the Inspectors question on this issue it was recognised that whilst the title of the Policy provides for Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupation Dwellings in the countryside, as referred to in the preceding text, the introductory paragraph of the policy does not.

116.5 Therefore the Council is proposing to modify the Plan so that the first paragraph of the Policy provides for, “the essential needs of agriculture and, forestry or other rural business...”

Q117. Are the criteria included in Policy LC9 justified and effective in respect of the removal of agricultural and other occupancy conditions?

Council Response

117.1 On the basis that the Policy above provides justification for residential development within the Countryside, where there is a specific need, it is reasonable to set out, in similar fashion, how to deal with proposals when the original need no longer exists.

117.2 It is considered that generally the criteria of the policy are justified and would be effective in restraining the release of such dwellings onto the open market and thereby preventing a proliferation of such uses.

117.3 Criteria a) prevents release from the restriction if there is a continued need for such a dwelling, on the holding or for the business, and criteria b) seeks to maintain the requirement if there is a need for such a dwelling in the area.
117.4 If both criteria are met, criteria c) requires that the property be marketed for an appropriate period at an appropriate price and evidence of the marketing be demonstrated. The purpose of this is also to ensure that the potential of the property to continue to provide for a special need is maintained if at all possible.

117.5 In relation to this the Council have accepted that a shorter period of marketing, than the 18 months minimum originally proposed would be reasonable. However, the suggestion that it should be for a maximum of 12 months would clearly allow for only one days marketing to be sufficient, and this would not ensure an adequate period.

117.6 The Council have therefore in proposed modification PM26, recommended that the policy be amended to “The property has been marketed locally for an appropriate period (minimum 18 12 months) at an appropriate price and evidence of marketing is demonstrated.”
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D2N2 COMMENTS ON LPFBD

From: Sajeeda Rose [mailto:Sajeeda.Rose@d2n2lep.org]
Sent: 11 July 2018 15:52
To: Adele Rhodes <Adele.Rhodes@bolsover.gov.uk>
Cc: Routledge, Rob <Rob.Routledge@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Local Plan for Bolsover District

Dear Adele,

Thank you for your email with regards to your local plan development process. I saw your chief executive Dan Swaine yesterday and he also happened to mention it so I am aware of the work underway to develop the plan.

I can confirm that having reviewed the draft local plan its overarching objective to provide an evidence led approach to delivering jobs and homes for the Bolsover area is consistent with supporting the aims and objectives of the current and emerging D2N2 Strategic Economic Plan.

A clear plan identifying how homes and jobs will be delivered including the necessary infrastructure required to deliver them sustainably is welcomed by the LEP.

We can confirm that as part of the Duty to Co-operate you have actively sought input and engagement from us as the LEP along with other key strategic partners.

Should you require anything further then please do not hesitate to contact me again.

Kind regards, Sajeeda

Sajeeda Rose
Interim Deputy Chief Executive
D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership
Nottingham Commerce Centre
8 Experian Way
Nottingham
NG2 1EP
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Sheffield City Region
11 Broad Street West
Sheffield
S1 2BQ

Adele Rhodes
Principal Planner
Planning Policy
Bolsover District Council
The Arc, Clowne
S43 4JY

26 July 2018

Dear Adele

I am responding to the Local Plan for Bolsover (Publication Local Plan), and its imminent submission to the Secretary of State, on behalf of the Sheffield City Region (SCR) Local Enterprise Partnership and the SCR Mayoral Combined Authority. In particularly, I am commenting in regard to both the headline economic growth ambitions of the LEP and the linked ambitions for housing in the city region.

The SCR LEPs Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) published in 2014 sets out the economic ambitions and headline targets to deliver growth across the SCR area, seeking to create new jobs and attractive places to work, reside and spend leisure time. The SEP has a key headline target to create 70,000 new jobs over the 10 years of the plan (2014-24), increasing Gross Value Added (GVA) in the region by 3% (or £3bn) and creating an additional 6,000 businesses. Linked to this, the SEP also emphasises the important role that housing plays in creating the right conditions for growth, with a continued focus of the LEP being to increase housing delivery by unlocking housing sites through SCR infrastructure funding and a dedicated Housing Fund.

The Local Plan for Bolsover provides for an employment land requirement of 92ha over the plan period. This is towards the higher end of the economic development needs assessment calculated for the district, of between 65-100ha, and intended to help deliver the Oxford Economics growth forecast of 2.9% GVA per annum (to 2030) for Bolsover. I acknowledge the limitations faced in translating land requirements into absolute job figures, but recognise the important contribution that the plan is making to the wider economic ambitions set by the LEP and the support this will give to the jobs targets set in the SCR SEP. In particular, the identification of two larger sites for logistics developments is likely to attract regional and national operations which can add to the offer of the city region and ensure a stronger and more competitive economy.
The Local Plan also identifies sufficient land to accommodate 5,168 new homes, based on the assessed need of 272 homes per year, plus an additional 10% to allow for site flexibility across the plan period. I note that this housing requirement is above and beyond the previous draft of the local plan and above the indicative assessment of housing need for Bolsover published in the Government consultation (September 2017). As such, the Local Plan for Bolsover is considered to be planning for an appropriate contribution to the creation of new homes, and will support the delivery of the ambitions set out in the SCR SEP.

Bolsover District Council continues to play an active and participatory role in strategic cross boundary policy and project delivery at the SCR scale. This includes collaborating on issues relating to housing, planning, transport, infrastructure, skills and business investment and promotion. Importantly, officers from the Council have worked closely with colleagues in the other districts through the SCR Heads of Planning Group, which focuses on strategic planning matters and the sharing of evidence and best practice in planning more generally.

The Heads of Planning group comprises senior planning officers from each local planning authority responsible for plan making, supporting the development of cross boundary work as well as the commissioning of joint strategic research and evidence at the city regional scale. The Group reports to the SCR Housing and Infrastructure Executive Board, which oversees housing, infrastructure and spatial planning matters under the auspices of the SCR LEP.

It is therefore considered that the Council has engaged constructively and actively with the SCR LEP as part of the process of developing the Local Plan, ensuring that the plan aligns with and provides for an appropriate contribution to delivering ambitions set out in the SCR SEP.

The continued participation of the Council through these mechanisms will also help to ensure that positive collaboration is maintained as the Local Plan moves through its Examination and Adoption stages to implementation. This will be particularly important as the SCR LEP and Combined Authority work on a review of the SEP over the next few months. I look forward to Bolsover District Council playing an important role in this review process and continuing to build on the relationships that officers and elected members have made with counterparts in the LEP and Combined Authority.

Should you require any further information or have any queries please contact Colin Blackburn, Assistant Director for Housing, Infrastructure and Planning (colin.blackburn@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk) in the first instance.

Yours sincerely

Mark Lynam
Director of Programme Commissioning
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Title: Implications of 2016-based Demographic Projections on Bolsover’s OAN

Date: January 2019

1. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) released new, 2016-based, household projections on 20th September 2018. These are based on applying household representative rates (‘headship rates’) to the ONS 2016-based Sub-National Population Projections, which were released by ONS on 24th May 2018.

2. This note has been prepared by Iceni to inform the Bolsover Local Plan Examination. It considers the above 2016-based demographic projections, together with other more recent demographic data and addresses whether this points to a ‘meaningful change’ in the scale of housing need from that in the evidence base submitted alongside the Local Plan (principally EB23). It also updates the modelling of the economic-led housing need taking account of this latest demographic data, and the latest economic participation rate assumptions published by the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR).

3. The analysis addresses projections as they relate to Bolsover District, with figures relating to the plan period within the Local Plan which is 2014-33.

Projected Population Growth

4. The 2016-based Sub-National Population Projections (SNPP) provide estimates of the future population of local authorities assuming a continuation of recent local trends in fertility, mortality and migration which are constrained to the assumptions made for the 2016-based national population projections. A number of assumptions within the SNPP differ from those in the 2014-based version, with key differences being:

- ONS’ long-term international migration assumptions at a national level have been revised downwards to 165,000 per annum (beyond mid-2022) compared to 185,000 in the 2014-based projections. This is based on a 25-year average;

- The latest projections assume that women will have fewer children, with the average number of children per woman expected to be 1.84 compared to 1.89 in the 2014-based projections; and

- ONS is no longer assuming a faster rate of increase in life expectancy of those born between 1923 and 1938, based essentially on more recent evidence. Life expectancy still increases, just not as fast as previously projected.

5. The 2016-based SNPP project population growth of 8.3% in Bolsover over the plan period, which is relatively consistent to that projected in the 2014-based SNPP.
Table 1: Projected Population Growth in Bolsover in the 2014- and 2016-based SNPP, 2014-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population 2014</th>
<th>Population 2033</th>
<th>Change in Population</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-based</td>
<td>77,155</td>
<td>83,626</td>
<td>6,471</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-based</td>
<td>77,231</td>
<td>83,656</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS

6. Since publication of the SNPP, ONS has released Mid-Year Population Estimates (MYEs) for mid 2017. The PPG outlines that these should be taken into account. A simple rebasing of the projections to take account of the estimated population growth between 2016-17, with the projected growth in the 2016-based SNPP applied thereafter, results in slightly higher population growth of 9.1% over the plan period (See Table 2).

7. The 2017 OAN Update (EB23) drew conclusions on the demographic need for housing based on 10 year migration trends. If an updated 10 year migration projection is run, using a consistent methodology but the latest data for the 2007-17 period, population growth of 8.9% is shown over the plan period.

Table 2: Alternative Scenarios for Population Growth in Bolsover, 2014-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population 2014</th>
<th>Population 2033</th>
<th>Change in Population</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-based SNPP</td>
<td>77,231</td>
<td>83,656</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebased SNPP</td>
<td>77,231</td>
<td>84,258</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year migration</td>
<td>77,231</td>
<td>84,070</td>
<td>6,839</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB23 10-year migration</td>
<td>77,155</td>
<td>84,399</td>
<td>7,244</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household Representative Rates

8. Household projections are based on applying household representative rates (by age and sex) to projected population growth. The 2016-based Household Projections are the first set of household projections which have been published by ONS which has taken on responsibility for producing household projections from the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG).

9. The household projections are derived by applying household representative rates (HRRs) to projected population growth. A household representative is chosen for statistical reasons by virtue of economic activity, age and/or sex as the representative of a household. The 2016-based household projections define the household reference person (HRP) as the eldest economically active person in the household.

10. Table 3 shows the results of applying the latest HRRs to the population growth scenarios.

Table 3: Projected Household Growth – 2016-based HRRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Household s 2014</th>
<th>Household s 2033</th>
<th>Change in households</th>
<th>Per annum</th>
<th>Dwellings (per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-based SNPP</td>
<td>33,387</td>
<td>37,857</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebased SNPP</td>
<td>33,387</td>
<td>38,110</td>
<td>4,723</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year migration</td>
<td>33,387</td>
<td>38,066</td>
<td>4,679</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. In the latest projections, the HRR is projected for different age/sex cohorts based on trends seen between 2001 and 2011. Trends over this period are projected forwards to 2021, with the HRR then held constant at the 2021 level thereafter.

12. The methodology used is different to that in previous sets of household projections, which had projected trends in household formation (by age/sex) based on trends arising since the 1971 Census. ONS have set out that the change of HRP definition means it is no longer possible to use the 1971, 1981 and 1991 Census data used in the previous methodology in the production of the 2016-based household projections. Household data from these previous censuses used the eldest male definition of HRP, therefore to include data from them in the methodology would require making complex adjustments to be made to derive projections.

13. This change in ONS’ methodology for projecting household formation has resulted in a fall in the projected household growth across England by 23,500 households over the next decade. Alongside this the lower projected population growth results in 29,000 fewer households.

14. The 2016-based Household Projections have come under some criticism, is largely because they are based only on data in the 2001-11 Census period and arguably build in the suppression of household formation experienced in that time. The previous (2014-based) projections used a longer time-series (based all Census points back to 1971). Against this context, Government consulted in Autumn 2018 on the continuing use of 2014-based Household Projections for planning purposes.

15. Figure 1 below assesses the HRRs in the 2014- and 2016-based Household Projections for Bolsover. The charts are essentially the proportion of a particular age group that is considered to be the ‘head of household’ (HRP as described above). The analysis shows that for many age groups the two projections are really quite different.

16. When looking at some of the younger age groups (particularly 25-34) it is notable that the HRRs in the 2014-based projections are somewhat higher (certainly in moving through to 2033) – this does suggest in Bolsover (as nationally) that there may be some degree of suppression being built into the 2016-based projections, or certainly not a positive improvement in the formation rates of younger people. This does suggest that a more positive approach to household formation based on the 2014-based projections would be justified.

17. The 2016-based projections are also notable for showing an increasing formation rate in the 75-84 age group, and a fairly flat profile for people aged 85+. Given improvements to life expectancy, it might be expected in reality that these rates would go down (as people live together as couples for longer). A decreasing rate was projected in the 2014-based projections and this is a further reason why the 2014-based figures could be considered as more robust.

18. A sensitivity analysis has been carried out showing the level of household growth and housing need arising by applying the headship rates from both the 2014- and 2016-based Household Projections as published; and applying the ‘part return to trend’ adjustment to household formation amongst younger households to the 2014-based projections. This latter scenario formed the basis of the conclusions on the demographic need in EB23.

19. A consistent uplift of 4.0% for vacant homes to that in EB23 has been used in relating household growth to housing need. Data on vacant dwellings indicates a downward trend in vacancy levels in the District, these having fallen from 5.0% in 2011 to 4.0% in 2016 and 3.8% in 2017.

Figure 1: Projected Household Representative Rates – Bolsover District (overleaf)
20. The results of the sensitivity analysis are shown in Table 4 below. The 2016-based HRRs result in higher levels of housing need than those from the 2014-based Household Projections as published, but result in lower housing need than found using the approach adopted in EB23 of adjusting household formation for younger households in the 2014-based Household Projections.

Table 4: Housing Need in Bolsover using alternative demographic assumptions, 2013-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwellings per annum</th>
<th>2016-based HRRs</th>
<th>2014-based HRRs</th>
<th>2014-based with Part Return to Trend Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-based SNPP</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebased SNPP</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year migration</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Drawing the analysis together, Iceni consider that there are particular methodological criticisms which can be levelled at the 2016-based Household Projections which are projections based on just two data points and therefore susceptible to a high error margin. They show lower projected growth in the youngest two age groups, and trends for some older age groups which do not look particularly realistic. For these reasons we consider that greater weight should be given to projections which use the household formation assumptions in the 2014-based Household Projections.

22. In drawing this conclusion, Iceni has taken into account that the Government has expressed significant reservations regarding the 2016-based Household Projections in its Technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance (MHCLG, Oct 2018) and the Statement released from ONS on the latest projections which outlined that:

“They [the 2016-based Household Projections] do not take account of how many people may want to form new households, but for whatever reason aren’t able to, such as young adults wanting to move out of their parents’ house, or people wanting to live on their own instead of in a house share. Therefore, household projections are not a measure of how many houses would need to be built to meet housing demand; they show what would happen if past trends in actual household formation continue.”

“Although the latest household projections are lower than the previously published projections, this does not directly mean that fewer houses are needed in the future than thought. This is because the projections are based on recent actual numbers of households and are not adjusted to take account of where homes have been needed in recent years but have not been available. Therefore, if more homes are built, the increased availability of homes may result in more households forming. The opposite is also true – if fewer homes are built then fewer households are able to form.”

23. For these reasons we consider that the use of the HRRs in the 2014-based Household Projections with the ‘part return to trend’ adjustment, consistent with EB23, should be used in drawing conclusions on the demographic need for housing. For consistency with EB23, we also consider that the 10 year migration scenario should be used. On this basis, the latest data would point to a demographic need for 260 dpa. This is an increase of 5% on the figure of 247 dpa in EB23, which is of a scale which we consider does not point to a meaningful change in the level of demographic need.

Labour Supply

24. The level of growth in labour supply supported by the population projections is influenced by how the population structure changes, and assumptions on economic participation. Since the preparation of EB23, the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) has released updated assumptions on changes in economic participation within its July 2018 Fiscal Sustainability Report. The updated OBR analysis reflects slightly
accelerated State Pension Age increases, as well as new data on age-specific entry and exit rates, where it use averages for the 21-year period up to 2017. It assumes in particular greater participation amongst those in their 60s than it did previously.

25. Iceni note that as set out in EB23 Para 3.49, there are clear reasons why economic participation could be stronger than projected by OBR given the effects of improved longevity and health, changing patterns of work and a shift in the economy towards services which are not specifically considered within OBR’s approach. We consider that it remains appropriate therefore to adopt a midpoint between the OBR assumptions and those of Experian. We have however included a sensitivity analysis showing the implications of applying the latest OBR data as published.

26. Applying economic participation assumptions to the 10 year migration projection indicates a growth of 3,112 economically active residents in the District over the plan period. In addition, Annual Population Survey data indicates that unemployment has fallen by 500 over the 2014-17 period. Including an allowance for double jobbing, the evidence suggests that the demographic need figure would support around 3,738 jobs.

27. EB23 drew conclusions on OAN based on the baseline economic forecasts from Oxford Economics. Over the plan period (2014-33) these forecasts showed employment growth of 2,931 jobs (9.0% growth). If this scenario is re-run with the updated demographic modelling (with other assumptions held consistent), it results in a housing need for 247 dpa. A sensitivity analysis using the 2018 OBR participation rates shows a need for 260 dpa. In both cases, this can be accommodated within the OAN within the Plan of 272 dpa.

Table 5: Updated analysis of Housing Need to support Baseline Scenario, 2014-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Households 2014</th>
<th>Households 2033</th>
<th>Change in households</th>
<th>Per annum Dwellings (per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint OBR and Experian EARs</td>
<td>33,517</td>
<td>38,030</td>
<td>4,513</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR 2018 EARs</td>
<td>33,517</td>
<td>38,319</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drawing the Evidence Together

28. The 10 year migration scenario upon which conclusions on the demographic need for housing were derived in EB23 showed population growth over the plan period of 9.4%. If this scenario is updated to take account of the latest data, the resultant population growth falls slightly to 8.9%.

29. The 10 year migration scenario would result in a need for 256 dpa using the household representative rates in the 2016-based Household Projections. Adopting consistent assumptions to those in EB23, a demographic need for 260 dpa should be shown. These are slightly higher than the figure of 247 dpa shown in EB23, but this will contribute to the delivery of additional market and affordable housing.

30. The analysis continues to show that there is not a need for increased migration relative to the 10 year migration scenario to support the baseline economic growth scenario, which informed the conclusions drawn on the OAN in EB23, using either the latest OBR economic participation data or a midpoint between this and Experian assumptions.

31. Iceni consider that on the basis of the above, the updated demographic projections do not point towards a meaningful change in the scale of the OAN, and that it remains appropriate to consider the OAN to be 272 dpa.
From: Murfin Rob [mailto:Rob.Murfin@sheffield.gov.uk]
Sent: 17 April 2018 12:55
To: Alan.Morey@chesterfield.gov.uk; Beverley.Alderton-Sambrook@bassetlaw.gov.uk; Bronwen.Knight@rotherham.gov.uk; david.armiger@bassetlaw.gov.uk; jeremy.johnson@doncaster.gov.uk; ioejenkinson@barnsley.gov.uk; mike.hase@derbyshiredales.gov.uk; neil.johnson@chesterfield.gov.uk; richard.purcell@doncaster.gov.uk; Peter.Sawdon@bolsover.gov.uk; paul.staniforth@chesterfield.gov.uk; Fairfax, Helen <Helen.Fairfax@nederbyshire.gov.uk>; Tweed, Paula <PaulaTweed@barnsley.gov.uk>; Chris.Fridlington@bolsover.gov.uk; Hanson, Karen <Karen.Hanson@nederbyshire.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Colin Blackburn' <Colin.Blackburn@SheffieldCityRegion.org.uk>; sally.gill@nottscc.gov.uk; 'David Arnold (Economy Transport and Environment)' <David.Arnold@derbyshire.gov.uk>; Duffy Maria <Maria.Duffy@sheffield.gov.uk>
Subject: Duty To Cooperate

Colleagues,

Duty to Cooperate request to Sheffield City Region Planning Authorities, County Councils and Combined Authority

I am writing to you to formally ask whether your authority would be in a position to allocate land for housing in your Local Plan that would contribute to meeting some of Sheffield’s housing needs.

When we consulted on the Sheffield Plan Citywide Options for Growth document at the end of 2015, we said that, over the period 2014 – 2034, our objective was to try to meet the city’s housing needs within the district. At that time we did not formally approach other authorities in Sheffield City Region to ask them to meet any of the housing need but we said that it might be necessary, depending on further analysis and the outcome of public consultation.

Since the 2015 consultation we have been undertaking further work to identify specific site options for new housing and intend to consult on these options in 2018. We have extended the plan end date by a year (to 2035) because the plan is now likely to be adopted later than we had originally anticipated. We have now also concluded that 2,120 additional homes per year (2,175/year gross) are needed over the period 2017-2035. This reflects the (draft) Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) recently published for Sheffield as part of the Government’s ‘Planning for the Right Homes in the
Right Places’ consultation but makes a small adjustment to take account of the forecast reduction in the number of vacant properties and housing completions since 2014. It is also consistent with the economic growth aspirations set out in the SCR Strategic Economic Plan.

The site options we have identified for consultation in 2018 could potentially provide enough land to accommodate sufficient new homes to meet the OAHN. However, they will also include options for significant Green Belt release, for which we will need to be able to demonstrate ‘exceptional circumstances’. A critical part of the case for exceptional circumstances will be to show that we have properly explored the possibility of some of Sheffield’s housing needs being met elsewhere.

In addition, we have some concerns about whether some options being considered would be deliverable in the short-medium term. Many of the potential housing sites in the existing urban areas will require very substantial investment which could make them undeliverable until the later part of the plan period or beyond. We also expect some options to be ruled out, following public consultation, because of land ownership or environmental issues. In light of these two issues, we now feel it is necessary to approach neighbouring authorities to see if they would be able to meet some of Sheffield’s housing needs.

Whilst we would anticipate that any new homes provided to meet Sheffield’s needs would best be delivered in the districts immediately neighbouring Sheffield (Barnsley, Rotherham and North East Derbyshire), we would also like to explore the potential for additional allocations in other districts in Sheffield City Region. We are particularly interested in sustainable locations in public transport corridors with good links to Sheffield.

We appreciate that this request is difficult because of the potential impact on Green Belt and greenfield sites elsewhere in Sheffield City Region. However, I would ask that consideration is given to whether there are any options within your authority for accommodating growth outside Sheffield, in the context of the current Local Plan timescale and emerging housing target. I have included County Council Planning Authorities in this DTC request as we are also keen to understand any major programmed infrastructure interventions over the plan period or any specific constraints upon such.

If you would like to discuss the issues raised in this letter, please do contact me. I would be grateful if you would reply to this request by Tuesday 8th May 2018. I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

Rob Murfin

Rob Murfin

Chief Planning Officer

Planning Service
City Growth
Sheffield City Council

(0114) 2735499 or 07557 865189
Howden House, 1 Union Street, S1 2SH

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Websites:  www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or  www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingregulations
Apply for planning permission online at:  www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply

This Email, and any attachments, may contain non-public information and is intended solely for the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this Email has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this Email may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Sheffield City Council will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail.
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Hello Adele

For the purposes of DtC I can confirm that we intend to publish a R18 Plan for consultation that sets out options for Sheffield meeting its entire housing need. I can also confirm that we finalised this step after consulting with the other SCR authorities on a DtC basis, none of whom indicated that they could accommodate any of our housing need.

Regards

Rob

Rob Murfin

Chief Planning Officer

Planning Service

City Growth

Sheffield City Council

(0114) 2735499 or 07557 865189

Howden House, 1 Union Street, S1 2SH

We offer an integrated planning and building control service

Websites:  www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning or  www.sheffield.gov.uk/buildingregulations

Apply for planning permission online at:  www.planningportal.gov.uk/apply
From: Adele Rhodes [mailto:Adele.Rhodes@bolsover.gov.uk]  
Sent: 09 August 2018 12:41  
To: Murfin Rob  
Subject: Sheffield City Local Plan

Good afternoon Rob,

As you know we are about to submit our Local Plan to the Secretary of State.

Following your letter of 17th April 2018, asking if other authorities in the Sheffield City Region could meet some of the unmet need of the City, could you confirm that following further work the City Council is due to consult on a self-contained Local Plan – i.e. that the Full Objectively Assessed Needs housing need will be met within the City, without assistance from other authorities?

Many Thanks

Adele

Adele Rhodes
Principal Planner
Planning Policy
Bolsover District Council
The Arc
Clowne
S43 4JY
Phone: 01246 242286
website: www.bolsover.gov.uk

The contents of this e-mail represent my personal, professional views and do not necessarily represent the views of the Local Planning Authority unless this is specifically stated in the e-mail.
APPENDIX F TO THIS STATEMENT

Updated Local Plan for Bolsover District Housing Trajectory

A1 As set out in the Council’s response to Q44 & Q46, to show the most up-to-date position, taking into account new information regarding the likely start dates, build out rates and completions of the allocated sites obtained since August 2018 through site monitoring and the entered into Statements of Common Ground [ED23 to ED27], the Council has updated the Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 of the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District (as amended by the updated housing trajectory within the Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2]).

A2 This update to the Housing Trajectory takes account of two changes:

1) to reflect a minor change to the number of dwellings now forecast to be built in the first year for the Bolsover North Strategic Site Allocation – this minor change sees the number of dwellings to be completed by 31st March 2020 be reduced from 70 dwellings down to 40 dwellings. The site will then continue to be built out at 70 dwellings per annum (35 dwellings per housebuilder) and the displaced 30 dwellings being added to the final year’s forecast completions, seeing this increase from 40 dwellings up to 70 dwellings. This results in the amended trajectory during the plan period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cumulative No. Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/2023</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/2024</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024/2025</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/2026</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026/2027</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027/2028</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028/2029</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029/2030</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030/2031</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031/2032</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032/2033</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) to reflect a significant acceleration in the build out rates at the land at Brookvale, Shirebrook housing site allocation in the current monitoring year, i.e. 2018/19, and the planned increase in the number of dwellings planned on Phase 1C of the development – these changes reflect the fact that Keepmoat Homes built out the remaining 84 dwellings of Phase 1A before Christmas 2018 and Homes England’s initial plans to increase the overall quantum for the site from 650 dwellings to approximately 750 dwellings. However, at this stage the accelerated build out rates recorded in 2018/19 have not been incorporated into
the housing trajectory. This results in the amended trajectory during the plan period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cumulative No. Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/2023</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/2024</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024/2025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/2026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026/2027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027/2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028/2029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029/2030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030/2031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031/2032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032/2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3 To aid understanding of these changes, the updated housing trajectory within the Council's Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2] has been updated further and this is shown below.
## RESIDENTIAL SITE ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bolsover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover North Strategic Site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Courtaulds factory site</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land between Shuttlewood Road and Oxcroft Lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Oxcroft Lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shirebrook</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Brookvale</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Station Road, Langwith Junction</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Normanton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the rear of 1 to 35 Red Lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Rosewood Lodge Fm, Alfreton Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Town End Fm, Lees Lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clowne</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to rear of 169-207 Creswell Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land west of Homelea and Tamarisk, Mansfield Road</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at High Ash Farm, Mansfield Road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barlborough</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Chesterfield Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creswell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Skinner Street</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land south of Creswell Model Village</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pintton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Croftlands Farm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tibshelf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land south of Overmoor View</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land west of Spa Croft</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bolsover District Council Local Plan Examination 2019
Council's Response to MIQs - Matter 2, Issue 5 (Q23-117) - Housing requirement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whitwell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Whitwell Colliery Strategic Site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glapwell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Glapwell Nurseries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hodthorpe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Queens Road Allotments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palterton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land between 11 and 19 Back Lane, Palterton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pleasley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Pleasley Pit, Pit Lane, Pleasley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>4688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan period 4688
APPENDIX G TO THIS STATEMENT

Bolsover District Council
Planning Committee
21st November 2018

Affordable Housing Issues

Report of the Interim Planning Policy Manager

This report is public

Purpose of the Report

- To update members in relation to the changing circumstances in relation to Affordable Housing issues
- To advise Members of the approach to be taken in relation to the changing circumstances and Local Plan Policy.

1. Report Details

Background

1.1. The 2018 NPPF, published on 24th July, came into force on the day it was published, and replaced the 2012 NPPF in its entirety. However, in relation to the Examination of Local Plans and the transitional arrangements, the Publication Local, submitted for Examination in August 2018, will be tested against the requirements in the 2012 NPPF, not the 2018 version.

1.2. Whilst it many respects the 2018 NPPF is similar to the 2012 version, there are a few areas of significant change that raise particular issues for the Council, especially in relation to affordable housing. In such circumstances it appears sensible to ensure that the policies and approach of the Plan, where possible, are not only in compliance with the 2012 NPPF but also address the new requirements of the 2018 NPPF approaches.

1.3. Attached to this report is a paper on ‘Affordable Housing and the 2018 NPPF, A Briefing note’, looking at the issues in greater depth.

2. Affordable Housing issue

2.1 The policy requirement for the delivery of affordable housing in the current Bolsover District Local Plan is set out in policy HOU 6. This states that when determining planning applications for housing the Council will seek to negotiate
the inclusion of an element of affordable housing to meet a proven local need on sites which are for 25 or more dwellings or more than 1 hectare.

2.2 The Local Plan for Bolsover District submitted for examination by an independent inspector contains Policy LC2: Affordable Housing through Market Housing. This states: ‘The Council will require applications for residential development comprising of 25 or more dwellings to provide 10% as affordable housing on site. Where this is stated not to be viable, a detailed site viability appraisal of the development proposal shall be required to inform an alternative level of provision’.

2.3 This policy was based on national guidance in the 2012 NPPF, and evidence in up to date studies.

2.4 However, within the 2018 NPPF there are a couple of fundamental changes to the Governments proposed approach to this issue. Whilst the definition of affordable housing need is almost identical in both versions, and is defined as ‘those whose needs are not met by the market’, the approach to meeting it is different.

THE MAIN CHANGES

2.5 The first main change is in the consideration of the types of housing that are considered to constitute affordable housing. The 2018 NPPF emphasises the provision of affordable market housing. The new definition has four categories. Three of these relate to home ownership products, focusing on enabling more people able to access the home ownership market, whilst the fourth category relates to affordable housing for rent. Full details are set out within the attached paper.

2.6 The second change is set out a Paragraph 64 of the Framework which states

‘Where major development involving the provision is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups’ (my emphasis)

2.7 The underlined part of the paragraph appears to set as a default situation that 10% of developments should be for the new version of affordable market housing, as part of the overall affordable housing contribution from the site. In our case, as our affordable housing requirement is set at 10% this means that the entire contribution would be for affordable Home ownership.

2.8 The second part of this (in bold), allows exceptions to this approach to be made where the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups maybe significantly prejudiced.

BOLSOVER’S AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEED
2.9 In Bolsover District the evidence base notes that house prices and private sector rents are relatively low compared with both the regional and national averages.

2.10 Within the District, 61.5% of households with a current affordable housing need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing\(^2\) without subsidy. In terms of newly forming households 47.7% will be likely to be able to afford market housing\(^3\) without subsidy.

2.11 In interpreting the affordable needs evidence the Report\(^4\) notes that:
   a. Bolsover is part of a relatively low value housing market. Low house prices impact on residential development viability, and this significantly impacts on the level of affordable housing that can be delivered through mixed-tenure developments;
   b. There are other means of delivering affordable housing besides through Section 106 Agreements, including through schemes brought forward by Registered Providers, through rural exception development and through delivery funded through the National Affordable Housing Programme. These will contribute to affordable housing delivery;
   c. The need for affordable housing is very sensitive to housing costs and incomes. Increasing overall housing delivery can be expected to support improvements in the affordability of market housing. This will contribute to reducing the affordable housing need;
   d. There is a clear need for economic regeneration. Improving employment levels and incomes will contribute to reducing the affordable housing need.

2.12 The study noted that housing in Bolsover district was 43% cheaper than the national average. This means that the role that can be played by new, ‘low cost market housing’, is very limited. It is unlikely that new housing can be provided within the District that is actually of a lower cost than existing market housing opportunities within the area.

2.13 It is important to note that the income levels likely to be required to access owner occupied housing are often lower than might be needed to rent privately. This would suggest that a key issue in the District is about access to capital (e.g. for deposits, stamp duty, legal costs) as well as other mortgage restrictions (e.g. where employment is recent, short term, temporary or zero hours). Whilst the 2018 NPPF suggests a clear policy direction to provide 10% of all new housing as affordable home ownership,(at 20% below market costs), it is clear that this does very little to help the affordable housing issues within Bolsover District.

2.14 The evidence suggests that if one can access a mortgage, there will be properties available within their price range that they can afford to buy. It is unlikely that new homes, even at a notional 20% reduction off market value, would be cheaper than existing properties currently available. Also, this approach does not help those people whose issue is the inability to access a mortgage at all.

---
\(^2\) Paragraph 5.21 and table 43 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
\(^3\) Paragraph 5.24 and table 43 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
\(^4\) Paragraph 5.42 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
2.15 In respect of the makeup of the current and future population of Bolsover District, the OAN update notes that the percentage of older people (65+) in the District at 19.6% is higher than both the East Midlands (18.8%) and National (17.7%) average. Within the district over the period between 2014–2035 the population of people over 65 is predicted to rise by 48.7%. The projected need for specialist housing for older people within the District is predicted to increase by 37 units annually between 2014–2035 (this excludes residential care housing for which the expected need is 15 units for each year over the same period).

2.16 Unless this group of the population have already bought their own homes, due to age they are unlikely to be able to access mortgages and buy a property, regardless of whether or not it is being offered at a lower price.

2.17 In 2011 24.7% of the population of the District had a long-term health problem or disability. This is predicted to increase by 4,689 between 2014-2035. The Housing Market Area has a high level of disability when compared with other areas. An aging population means that the number of people with disabilities is expected to increase substantially in the future.

2.18 People with a long term health problem are more likely to live in social rented housing or likely to be outright owners, where they have been able to purchase housing earlier in their lives. This new approach will limit affordable rented properties in such a way that people with a disability are likely to be relatively disadvantaged when compared to the rest of the population.

3. Conclusions and Reasons for Recommendation

3.1 There is a clear mismatch between the type and level of affordable housing that the new NPPF generally encourages local authorities to deliver, and the type and level of affordable housing predicted to be needed by people living within Bolsover District.

3.2 The Government's aspiration for young people to be able to get on the property ladder and purchase their own homes is supported. However, the existing and future expected population growth in the District is characterised by an increasing aging population with long term health problems rather than young people. The local housing needs assessment in the OAN update notes that people with long term health issues are more likely to live in social rented accommodation. The other group that will see a high increase in growth of the plan period, are older people (65+), who are less likely to work, or may have a limited income due to limited work opportunities. As such they are less likely to be able to obtain or pay a mortgage, even for products such as affordable home ownership.

5 Table 76 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
6 Tables 77 & 78 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
7 Table 97 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
8 Table 80 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
9 Tables 82 & 83 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
10 And within the HMA Bolsover District has the predicted highest increase between 2014 and 2035 Table 83 of the North Derbyshire and Bolsover OAN update
3.3 Low viability within the District means that if the expectation in the NPPF for 10% of new homes to be available for affordable home ownership was met, this would be the only type of affordable housing built in the District in future.

3.4 The Council’s Strategic Housing officers consider that to provide the entire affordable housing requirement as affordable home ownership would significantly prejudice the Council’s ability to meet the needs of households who cannot afford to purchase, but need social or affordable rented housing.

3.5 As market prices are low, from a strategic housing point of view, we would not want to provide Affordable Home Ownership, at the expense of social or affordable, rented housing. In relation to determining planning applications it has been recommended that applications are refused where it is proposed to meet the affordable housing requirement through affordable home ownership only, where there is an identified need for social or affordable rented housing to meet an existing shortfall in provision.

3.6 The requirement in the 2018 NPPF appears to allow flexibility to meet local needs, in so far as an exception is provided within Para 64 where such provision (10% Affordable market housing) would, ‘significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups’.

3.7 Given the demographic projections for residents in the district (i.e. that the groups that are expected to increase as a proportion of the population over the Plan period are those aged 65+, and people with long term health problems), it is considered that these are specific interest groups. In addition their needs would be prejudiced by a requirement that the only type of affordable housing sought from eligible market housing sites was in the form of affordable market housing.

3.8 Given the provisions of the 2018 NPPF and the evidence underpinning policies in the Publication version of the Local Plan for Bolsover District, it is considered essential that clarity is given to the affordable housing situation within the District.

3.9 In order to prevent concerns arising over the compatibility of the Plan with the Equalities Act 2010, and in order to ensure that the future delivery of affordable housing within the district, meets the needs of the community, it is proposed that the current policy in the Local Plan is put forward for, through the previously identified channels, as a major modification to the Plan. The modifications to be proposed will be:

### PROPOSED MODIFICATION

**Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing**

The Council will require applications for residential development comprising of 25 or more dwellings to provide 10% as affordable housing on site. **This should be in the form of affordable housing for rent. Where an applicant can demonstrate that this requirement would lead to issues of viability (for example where there has been a change in site circumstances since this Plan was adopted) they should**
justify the need for a viability assessment, and submit it with the planning application.

3.10 In relation to Para71 of the 2018 NPPF relating to rural exception sites, a paragraph should be added at the end of the section on Affordable Housing stating that:

“The evidence base for the Local Plan indicates that the need for entry level housing at low cost, as provided for by Paragraph 71 of the 2018 NPPF, is generally well met across the district. Where exceptional circumstances apply and a proposal can clearly show that a specific need is being met and the dwellings will provide for that need over the long term, proposals will be supported.”

3.11 On the basis of the above proposals it is considered that the Local Plan remains compliant with the 2012 NPPF, but will also be robust to address the issues raised in the 2018 NPPF.

3.12 Therefore it is recommended that the Planning Committee note the contents of this report and the intention to seek to modify the Plan in the manner set out above.

4. Consultation and Equality Impact

4.1. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out as part of publishing the Publication Local Plan, and will be completed in relation to the Pre-adoption version of the Plan. However, it is considered that were we to proceed with the Plan without seeking to offset the impact that the new 2018 NPPF may have, as set out above, we may have an adverse impact in relation to the Equalities Act 2010.

5. Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

5.1. The main alternative option is to take no action in relation to this issue. Such an approach would leave the issue to be addressed post the Local plan examination with uncertainty persisting in relation to the affordable housing needs of the District.

6. Implications

Finance and Risk Implications

6.1. There are no specific finance and risk implications generated by this report.

7. Legal Implications including Data Protection

6.2. No implications based on this report.
6.3. None.

7. **Recommendations**

That the Planning Committee note the contents of this report and the attached Paper, ‘Affordable Housing and the 2018 NPPF, A Briefing note’, and the intended actions to seek modifications to the Plan.

8. **Decision Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the decision a Key Decision?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Key Decision is an executive decision which has a significant impact on two or more District wards or which results in income or expenditure to the Council above the following thresholds:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDC: Revenue - £75,000</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital - £150,000</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEDDC: Revenue - £100,000</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital - £250,000</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Please indicate which threshold applies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Wards Affected</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links to Corporate Plan priorities or Policy Framework</strong></td>
<td>The new Local Plan will identify suitable areas for development to help to deliver the Council’s Growth Agenda. It will assist both developers and local residents by providing certainty about the way the district will develop over the Plan period. It therefore contributes to the following Corporate Aims and their identified priority actions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unlocking Our Growth Potential (main aim);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting Our Communities to be Healthier, Safer, Cleaner and Greener.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Document Information**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix No</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Papers** (These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when preparing the report. They must be listed in the section below. If the report is going to Cabinet (NEDDC) or Executive (BDC) you must provide copies of the background papers)

Local Plan Evidence Base Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Author</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Routledge</td>
<td>Ext 2299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affordable Housing and the 2018 NPPF

A Briefing note
1 Introduction

1.1. This note has been prepared in response to recent changes to affordable housing policy in the ‘new’ 2018 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and updated National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). It examines the differences in the requirements between the previous and new guidance in relation to the provision and types of affordable housing. It goes on to consider the impact of the changes on the affordable housing policy in the Local Plan for Bolsover District as submitted for independent examination and the current Bolsover District Local Plan.

1.2. The Local Plan for Bolsover District as submitted for examination will be considered against the 2012 NPPF, which was current throughout its development. However, future planning decisions will need to also consider the requirements in the 2018 NPPF. Due to these changes, this paper has been prepared to ensure that a relevant, robust and up to date policy framework is in place to guide the future delivery of affordable housing in the District.

2 Current and Emerging Policies in the Local Plan

2.19 The policy requirement for the delivery of affordable housing in the current Bolsover District Local Plan is set out in policy HOU 6. This states that when determining planning applications for housing the Council will seek to negotiate the inclusion of an element of affordable housing to meet a proven local need on sites which are for 25 or more dwellings or more than 1 hectare.

2.20 The Local Plan for Bolsover District submitted for examination by an independent inspector contains Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing. This states: ‘The Council will require applications for residential development comprising of 25 or more dwellings to provide 10% as affordable housing on site. Where this is stated not to be viable, a detailed site viability appraisal of the development proposal shall be required to inform an alternative level of provision’.

2.21 This policy was based on national guidance in the 2012 NPPF, and evidence in up to date studies. The 2018 NPPF, published on 24th July, came into force on the day it was published, and replaced the 2012 NPPF in its entirety. However, in relation to the Examination of Local Plans and the transitional arrangements, the Publication Local Plan will be tested against the requirements in the 2012 NPPF, not the 2018 version.

2.22 It is recognised that once the Plan is adopted and used in decision making, it will have to take account of the 2018 NPPF. Therefore, it is important that the policies in the new Local Plan, reflect the 2018 NPPF to provide robust policies for development management in the longer term.

3 A Comparison of Old and New Guidance
3.1 Both the 2012\textsuperscript{11} and 2018\textsuperscript{12} NPPF promote the Government’s objective of boosting the supply of housing. The 2018 NPPF contains a requirement to use a new standard methodology to establish the overall level of housing needed in a district. Having established the overall level of housing, Councils are then required to break this down. This involves a consideration of size, type and tenure needed by different groups in the community including: affordable housing; families with children; older people; students; people with disabilities; and service families.

3.2 It is considered in relation to this issue that the Council have chosen a robust housing figure, with a 10% buffer built into the Local Plan housing provision. The SHMA objectively assessed need is well justified and significantly higher than the figure that the Governments approach promoted in September 2017(276 compared to 244).

3.3 In relation to the Affordable Housing, where a need for affordable housing is identified, both the 2012 and 2018 NPPF expect affordable housing to be provided on site\textsuperscript{13}. The exceptions to this are where off site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu of provision, can be robustly justified, and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities.

3.4 The definition of affordable housing need is almost identical in both the 2012 and 2018 NPPF. It is defined as ‘those whose needs are not met by the market’. However proposals for how to address these needs differs.

3.5 The 2012 NPPF required that the scale of obligations (including affordable housing) should not be such that viability is threatened\textsuperscript{14}. The 2018 NPPF requires that all viability assessments conform to a nationally applied methodology, including standardised inputs\textsuperscript{15}.

3.6 The key changes between the two NPPF’s in relation to affordable housing is in the consideration of the types of housing that are considered to constitute affordable housing. The 2018 NPPF emphasises the provision of affordable market housing. The new definition has four categories. Three of these relate to home ownership products, in an effort to make more people able to access the home ownership market, whilst the fourth category relates to affordable housing for rent. (see Appendix 1 for a full definition).

3.7 Importantly in the 2018 NPPF requirements in relation to the delivery of affordable housing is set out at paragraph 64. This states

\textit{Where major development involving the provision is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10\% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership},\textsuperscript{16} unless this would exceed the level of

\textsuperscript{11} Paragraph 47 of the 2012 NPPF
\textsuperscript{12} Paragraph 59 of the 2018 NPPF
\textsuperscript{13} Paragraph 47 of the 2012 NPPF & paragraph 62 of the 2018 NPPF
\textsuperscript{14} Paragraph 173 of the 2012 NPPF
\textsuperscript{15} Paragraph 57 of the 2018 NPPF
\textsuperscript{16} As set out at paragraph d of the appendix
affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups' (Our emphasis, see appendix 3 for details).

3.8 Whilst this approach could be allowed for by the existing policy, it is clear from the evidence base that low cost market housing is not what the district requires to better meet its housing need.

3.9 The 2018 NPPF also introduces a requirement on local planning authorities to support the development of entry-level exception sites. Para 71 states:

“Local planning authorities should support the development of entry-level exception sites, suitable for first time buyers (or those looking to rent their first home), unless the need for such homes is already being met within the authority’s area. These sites should be on land which is not already allocated for housing and should:

a) comprise of entry-level homes that offer one or more types of affordable housing as defined in Annex 2 of this Framework; and
b) be adjacent to existing settlements, proportionate in size to them, not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance in this Framework, and comply with any local design policies and standards.

3.10 Once again, there is little evidence to indicate that there is a need for such sites within the District where housing values are generally low, or that such sites would provide for sustainable development in the long term.

3.11 There is also concern that this may be seen by some developers as a way of bringing forward housing sites, in relatively unsustainable locations.

3.12 It is considered that both of these issues need to be addressed in the Local Plan if it is to be robust following adoption. Therefore it is recommended that the Council propose amendments to the submitted Local Plan to address these issues.

4. Housing Needs within Bolsover District

4.1. The Council has an up to date local housing need assessment, as part of the North Derbyshire and Bolsover Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) update from October 2017. This includes assessments of:

a. The overall level of affordable housing need in the District, and wider Housing Market Area;
b. The need for different types of affordable homes;
c. The needs of older people and other groups for specific types of homes and tenures

17 As part of the joint (HMA wide) North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Objectively Assessed Need Update
4.2. In terms of overall housing needs, the model used in the OAN update is based largely on housing market conditions (particularly the relationship of housing costs and incomes) at a particular point in time. A base date of 2014\textsuperscript{18} was used for this assessment.

4.3. An important consideration is that it was noted that house prices and private sector rents in Bolsover are fairly low compared with both the regional and national averages.

4.4. Within the District, 61.5\% of households with a current affordable housing need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing\textsuperscript{19} without subsidy. In terms of newly forming households 47.7\% will be likely to be able to afford market housing\textsuperscript{20} without subsidy. The annual net affordable housing need for the District was given as 126 homes a year\textsuperscript{21}

4.5. In interpreting the affordable needs evidence the Report\textsuperscript{22} notes that:

a. Bolsover is part of a relatively low value housing market. Low house prices impact on residential development viability, and this significantly impacts on the level of affordable housing that can be delivered through mixed-tenure developments;

b. There are other means of delivering affordable housing besides through Section 106 Agreements, including through schemes brought forward by Registered Providers, through rural exception development and through delivery funded through the National Affordable Housing Programme. These will contribute to affordable housing delivery;

c. The need for affordable housing is very sensitive to housing costs and incomes. Increasing overall housing delivery can be expected to support improvements in the affordability of market housing. This will contribute to reducing the affordable housing need;

d. There is a clear need for economic regeneration. Improving employment levels and incomes will contribute to reducing the affordable housing need.

4.6. Housing in Bolsover district is 43\% cheaper than the national average. It is important to note that the income levels likely to be required to access owner occupied housing are often lower than might be needed to rent privately. This would suggest that a key issue in the District is about access to capital (e.g. for deposits, stamp duty, legal costs) as well as other mortgage restrictions (e.g. where employment is recent, short term, temporary or zero hours). Whilst the 2018 NPPF suggests a clear policy direction to provide 10\% of all new housing as affordable home ownership, (at 20\% below market costs), it is clear that this does very little to help the affordable housing issues within Bolsover District.

---

\textsuperscript{18} The 2014 projections were released in 2016 meaning that the assessment was based on the most up to date information available
\textsuperscript{19} Paragraph 5.21 and table 43 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
\textsuperscript{20} Paragraph 5.24 and table 43 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
\textsuperscript{21} Paragraph 5.33 et al and table 48 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
\textsuperscript{22} Paragraph 5.42 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
4.7. The evidence suggests that if one can access a mortgage, there will be properties available within their price range that they can afford to buy. It is unlikely that new homes, even at a notional 20% reduction off market value, would be cheaper than existing properties currently available. Also, this approach does not help those people whose issue is the inability to access a mortgage at all.

**Needs of specific groups in the district in relation to affordable housing.**

4.8. In respect of the makeup of the current and future population of the District, the OAN update notes that the percentage of older people (65+) in the District at 19.6% is higher than both the East Midlands (18.8%) and National (17.7%) average. Within the district over the period between 2014–035 the population of people over 65 is predicted to rise by 48.7%. The projected need for specialist housing for older people within the District is predicted to increase by 37 units annually between 2014–2035 (this excludes residential care housing for which the expected need is 15 units for each year over the same period).

4.9. In 2011 24.7% of the population of the District had a long-term health problem or disability. This is predicted to increase by 4,689 between 2014-2035. The Housing Market Area has a high level of disability when compared with other areas. An aging population means that the number of people with disabilities is expected to increase substantially in the future.

4.10. People with a long term health problem or disability are more likely to live in social rented housing and are also more likely to be outright owners. Given that typically the lowest incomes are found in the social rented sector, and to a lesser extent for outright owners, the analysis would suggest that the population/households with a disability are likely to be relatively disadvantaged when compared to the rest of the population.

**Viability**

4.11. In the 2018 NPPF the expected threshold for affordable housing should be 10 houses or 0.5ha. Within the submitted Local Plan for Bolsover District (LPfBD) ensuring the delivery of new housing in the District where there is marginal viability and delivery is challenging is identified as a key issue for the district. As part of the evidence base for the LPfBD a Whole Plan Viability Assessment of the Plan was carried out. This indicated that sites of less than 25 units would not be viable in providing affordable housing and that the level of affordable housing

---

23 Table 76 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
24 Tables 77 & 78 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
25 Table 97 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
26 Table 80 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
27 Tables 82 & 83 of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN update
28 And within the HMA Bolsover District has the predicted highest increase between 2014 and 2035 Table 83 of the North Derbyshire and Bolsover OAN update
29 Paragraph 2.41 of the Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District May 2018.
that can be realistically be sought before residential development becomes unviable is 10%.

4.12. If the threshold and/or requirement for affordable housing is too high, this affects viability to the point where less housing gets built in the district. Affordable housing is usually provided as a percentage of market housing. Therefore, a reduction in market housing also results in less affordable housing being built.

**Key Issues**

4.13. There is a clear mismatch between the type and level of affordable housing that the new NPPF generally encourages local authorities to deliver, and the type and level of affordable housing predicted to be needed by people living in the district.

4.14. The Government's aspiration is for young people to be able to get on the property ladder and purchase their own homes. This is shared by the Council, who also recognise that in some cases even young working people will have difficulty accessing sufficient funds to provide a necessary deposit to acquire a mortgage and will need to access rented accommodation. However, a significant part of the existing and future expected population growth in the District is characterised by an increasing aging population with long term health problems. The local housing needs assessment in the OAN update notes that people with long term health issues are more likely to live in social rented accommodation. The other group that will see a high increase in growth of the plan period, are older people (65+), who are less likely to work, or have a limited income. As such they are less likely to be able to obtain or pay a mortgage, even for products such as affordable home ownership.

4.15. Low viability within the District means that if the expectation in the NPPF for 10% of new homes to be available for affordable home ownership was met, this would be the only type of affordable housing built in the District in future.

4.16. The Council's Strategic Housing officers consider that to provide the entire affordable housing requirement as affordable home ownership would significantly prejudice the Council's ability to meet the needs of households who cannot afford to purchase, but need social or affordable rented housing. As market prices are low, they would not want to provide Affordable Home Ownership at the expense of social or affordable rented housing. In relation to determining planning applications they would recommend that applications are refused where it is proposed to meet the affordable housing requirement through affordable home ownership where there is an identified need for social or affordable rented housing to meet an existing shortfall in provision.

4.17. The requirement in the 2018 NPPF appears to allow flexibility to meet local needs, in so far as an exception is provided within Para 64 where such provision (10% Affordable market housing) would, ‘significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups’.
4.18. Given the demographic projections for residents in the district (i.e. that the groups that are expected to increase as a proportion of the population over the Plan period are those aged 65+, and people with long term health problems), it is considered that these are specific interest groups; and their needs would be prejudiced by the delivery of all of the District’s affordable housing in the form of affordable home ownership.

Equalities and Human rights

4.19. Not only would the NPPF proposed approach appear to mitigate more against groups in society that for a variety of reasons may not be able to access mortgages, but within this District, but also within this district the identified groups, being mostly older people and people with a disability, are groups who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act 2010.

4.20. A housing policy that would reduce the availability of rental property in favour of market housing, clearly has a disproportional impact on those elements in society that need to access rented rather than market housing.

4.21. The NPPF is not fully prescriptive on this issue as it allows local council’s not to follow the 10% Affordable Market housing scenario where it would, ‘significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups’. This seems to have been included specifically to avoid such charges being levelled at the government in terms of this issue.

4.22. The Council can seek to make changes to affordable housing policies in the Local Plan for Bolsover District to reflect the requirements of the 2018 NPPF. The level and type of affordable housing most suitable to meet local circumstances could be included as one of the major modifications to the submitted Local Plan before the Hearing Sessions.

4.23. In relation to the determination of planning applications, Annex 1: Implementation, of the 2018 NPPF states that the policies in the Framework are material considerations, which should be taken into account in dealing with applications from the day of its publication, and that planning policy documents may need to be revised as quickly as possible to reflect the changes in the Framework. However, it then goes on to say that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the Framework. Due weight should be given to existing policies, according to their degree of consistency with the Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

4.24. Based on this, the key material considerations in determining the level and type of affordable housing on major sites in Bolsover District are:
a. The existing Bolsover Local Plan;
b. The provisions of the 2018 NPPF;
c. The robust evidence base in respect of the type of affordable housing required to meet the needs of people in the district;
d. The affordable housing policies in the emerging Local Plan.

4.25. Given the recent publication date of the 2018 NPPF, there is not yet any case law or appeal decisions to indicate what weight is likely to be given to each of the material considerations above. However, given the evidence outlined above it is considered that the Council would be found to be reasonable if they sought affordable housing based on the existing and future needs of the population of the District.

5. Suggested changes to the affordable housing policies in the Local Plan for Bolsover District.

5.1. Given the provisions of the 2018 NPPF and the evidence underpinning policies in the Publication version of the Local Plan for Bolsover District, it is considered essential that clarity is given to the affordable housing situation within the District.

5.2. In order to prevent concerns arising over the compatibility of the Plan with the Equalities Act 2010, and in order to ensure that the future delivery of affordable housing within the district, meets the needs of the community, it is proposed that the current policy in the Local Plan is put forward for amendment as a major modification to read:

PROPOSED MODIFICATION

Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing

The Council will require applications for residential development comprising of 25 or more dwellings to provide 10% as affordable housing on site. This should be in the form of affordable housing for rent. Where an applicant can demonstrate that this requirement would lead to issues of viability (for example where there has been a change in site circumstances since this Plan was adopted) they should justify the need for a viability assessment, and submit it with the planning application.

5.3. In relation to Para71 of the 2018 NPPF relating to Entry level exception sites, a paragraph should be added at the end of the section on Affordable Housing stating that:
“The evidence base for the Local Plan indicates that the need for entry level housing at low cost, as provided for by Paragraph 71 of the 2018 NPPF, is generally well met across the district. Where exceptional circumstances apply and a proposal can clearly show that a specific need is being met and the dwellings will provide for that need over the long term, proposals will be supported.”

5.4. On the basis of the above proposals it is considered that the Local Plan remains compliant with the 2012 NPPF, but is also robust to address the issues raised in the 2018 NPPF.
APPENDIX 1 – DEFINITION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE 2018 NPPF

Affordable housing: housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers); and which complies with one or more of the following definitions:

a) Affordable housing for rent: meets all of the following conditions: (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government’s rent policy for Social Rent or Affordable Rent, or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable); (b) the landlord is a registered provider, except where it is included as part of a Build to Rent scheme (in which case the landlord need not be a registered provider); and (c) it includes provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. For Build to Rent schemes affordable housing for rent is expected to be the normal form of affordable housing provision (and, in this context, is known as Affordable Private Rent).

b) Starter homes: is as specified in Sections 2 and 3 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and any secondary legislation made under these sections. The definition of a starter home should reflect the meaning set out in statute and any such secondary legislation at the time of plan-preparation or decision-making. Where secondary legislation has the effect of limiting a household’s eligibility to purchase a starter home to those with a particular maximum level of household income, those restrictions should be used.

c) Discounted market sales housing: is that sold at a discount of at least 20% below local market value. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Provisions should be in place to ensure housing remains at a discount for future eligible households.

d) Other affordable routes to home ownership: is housing provided for sale that provides a route to ownership for those who could not achieve home ownership through the market. It includes shared ownership, relevant equity loans, other low cost homes for sale (at a price equivalent to at least 20% below local market value) and rent to buy (which includes a period of intermediate rent). Where public grant funding is provided, there should be provisions for the homes to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for any receipts to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision, or refunded to Government or the relevant authority specified in the funding agreement.
APPENDIX 2: REQUIREMENT IN 2018 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK TO SUPPORT ENTRY-LEVEL EXCEPTION SITES

71. Local planning authorities should support the development of entry-level exception sites, suitable for first time buyers (or those looking to rent their first home), unless the need for such homes is already being met within the authority’s area. These sites should be on land which is not already allocated for housing and should:

a) comprise of entry-level homes that offer one or more types of affordable housing as defined in Annex 2 of this Framework; and

b) be adjacent to existing settlements, proportionate in size to them, not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance in this Framework, and comply with any local design policies and standards.
APPENDIX 3: TYPE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING, AND EXEMPTIONS TO THIS PROVISION IN THE 2018 NPPF

64. Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups. Exemptions to this 10% requirement should also be made where the site or proposed development:

a) provides solely for Build to Rent homes;

b) provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for the elderly or students);

c) is proposed to be developed by people who wish to build or commission their own homes; or

d) is exclusively for affordable housing, an entry-level exception site or a rural exception site.