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Introduction

This document responds to Question 2 of the Inspector’s Initial Questions for the Council, which requests a copy of the responses made to the Local Plan pursuant to Regulation 20 in policy order.

To achieve this, the Council has utilised information added into its online consultation system. This draws upon information that respondents have put into their representation forms, whether they submitted them online, by email or on paper. Where no representation form was filled in, the provided summary of the representation was drawn from the submitted documents. The full submissions and any attachments are not repeated in this document but can be viewed via the online consultation system.

For the avoidance of doubt, every representation received during the Regulation 19 consultation has been submitted in full as part of the submission of the Publication Local Plan to the Secretary of State for examination on 31st August 2018. As such, this document only repeats information from the database of the online consultation system in a format requested by the Inspector.

In addition, in order to make this document as easy to use as possible, in cases where many representations have been submitted using a standardised template; for example in a petition like manner, the submission is not repeated for each respondent. Instead, the document makes clear that multiple submissions exist and the individual representation numbers of these submissions are listed in the appendix at the end of the document. Where such standardised submissions have been amended or additional comments have been added by individual respondents, within this document they have been grouped within the multiple submission entry.

Finally, in some instances a single submission covers several parts of the Local Plan. Due to the way these instances have been entered into the database, the full submission would appear at every relevant point in this document. Therefore, to avoid confusion, where it has been simple to do so the parts of the submission that are not relevant to the section of the Local Plan have been removed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep ID</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8378 (Support) | **What is a Local Plan and what does it cover? - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** High Speed Two (HS2) Limited (Mr Reiss Graham) [10134]
**Received:** 11/5/2018 via Email
I can confirm that HS2 Ltd have no objection to the proposals or contents contained in the document.

| 8380 (Support) | **What is a Local Plan and what does it cover? - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Canal & River Trust (Mr Ian Dickinson) [8125]
**Received:** 11/5/2018 via Email
I can advise that the Trust has no comments to make.

| 8381 (Support) | **What is a Local Plan and what does it cover? - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Mr Daniel Sellers [4492]
**Received:** 11/5/2018 via Email
I have read the new Bolsover District Local Plan and consider it to be sound. It is also important that the local plan in in line with the NPPF.

| 8392 (Support) | **What is a Local Plan and what does it cover? - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** National Grid (Mr Spencer Jefferies) [11092]
**Received:** 4/5/2018 via Email
We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

| 8393 (Support) | **What is a Local Plan and what does it cover? - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** A & S Hewitt [9838]
**Received:** 16/5/2018 via Paper
I fully support the local plan.
General Comment:

The Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (‘CST’) is a major landowner within the district, managing a diverse portfolio of land and property, encompassing agricultural holdings and associated traditional and modern farm buildings and other infrastructure as well as residential properties and previously developed sites. CST and its forebears has played a significant role in the development of the district and it seeks to maintain its positive role across the district and within its communities.

To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of its assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. Land managed by CST offers opportunities across a number of sectors to help meet the development needs of the district. These include: residential development in and adjacent to settlements; employment development in urban and rural locations; agriculture and other rural sector opportunities; renewable energy.

Across the farmed estate, there is an ongoing need to modernise and take advantage of scale economies. Many existing farmsteads do not meet the needs of modern agriculture. Modern agricultural infrastructure no longer needs to be located in or near a village. Villages often provide constraints and conflicts with modern agricultural machinery, to the detriment of local amenity. There is therefore a strategic need for CST to rationalise/amalgamate farms (as tenancies expire), move farmsteads out of villages where necessary, and secure viable, deliverable redevelopment opportunities of vacated assets (including residential conversion of redundant barns).

CST therefore welcomes the Publication Draft Local Plan and progress towards its ultimate adoption. It has concerns regarding some aspects of the emerging document, which are set out within its other representations.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Written representation

The approach to the duty to co-operate appears to be more technical in nature. There appears to be little evidence, beyond high level engagement outlined in the most recent Annual Monitoring Report, of robust engagement with the duty to cooperate process. As such the document is at risk of being unsound and potentially not compliant with the duty to co-operate, and as such also unsound on the basis of a lack of compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). On that basis, an objection is raised.

More evidence is required detailing how any potential or actual housing shortfall across the Housing Market Area (HMA) could, or would, be addressed. Although a broad paper across the Sheffield City Region has been produced, appropriately detailed evidence is currently lacking, with no duty to co-operate joint report on housing across the HMA.

The HMA is the critical sub-regional level for addressing housing need and distributing any subsequent shortfall in associated land supply. This is given the clear functional geography between the relevant HMA local authorities and the joint SHMAA/OAN assessments carried out to date.

It is important to note that the emerging NPPF is placing an increasing emphasis on the duty to co-operate in the interests of working strategically to deliver infrastructure and development needs. In particular the requirement to demonstrate transparency and produce a ‘statement of common ground’ between relevant local authorities through the strategic planning process. Such levels of evidence and transparency are not currently apparent within the Local Plan or its evidence base.

For example, although North East Derbyshire District Council and Chesterfield Borough Council both currently claim to evidence a five-year housing land supply, as each local authority moves towards consultation on and
submission of respectively new Local Plans, Bassetlaw District Council cannot evidence such as supply, with only 3.7 years' worth of relevant land identified. As an integral member of the HMA Bassetlaw is therefore an example of a neighbouring local authority which is currently struggling to deliver an adequate supply of housing land, with a Local Plan review at an early stage. Subsequently, any unmet housing need in an area adjacent to Bolsover has not been fully explored through the preparation of the Local Plan with possible implications on housing targets ignored. Paragraph 1.27 of the Local Plan states 'it is worth noting that no neighbouring / nearby authority has formally requested that Bolsover District help deliver part of their objectively assessed housing needs', but this is not the same as confirmation that no cross boundary need exists.

Finally, the wider aspiration for economic growth across the HMA has not been fully addressed, or aligned, through the duty to co-operate process. The Local Plan as drafted and, for example, BDC's Growth Strategy Action Plan (2015) seek to significantly enhance the business operation of the District and enhance employment opportunities. This is also within the context of highly aspirational Local Enterprise Partnerships of which BDC is a part. A context of significant employment generation is therefore created without a full assessment across the HMA, and wider neighbouring areas, of what impact this will have on the relative levels of housing need.

In light of this, housing targets should be established as a minimum baseline with flexibility to account for additional economic growth across the HMA, including in Bolsover. Furthermore, the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN Update (2017) clearly states that higher economic growth scenarios should provide 'a basis for considering through the plan making process how planning for higher housing provision and economic growth could be mutually supportive', also stressing the n...

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** The duty to so-operate underpins the Local Plan making process and is fundamental to the setting of key objectives, including meeting OAN for housing. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees ('CST') offer the opportunity to play a significant role in helping the District to achieve a range of the Local Plan's objectives, including meeting OAN. CST’s interests also extend into adjoining districts, where it also has experience of engaging in Local Plan processes. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

**Object** Policy Framework for the Local Plan - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

There is further concern about the Duty to Cooperate and that unmet need from the surrounding boroughs, especially Sheffield, has not been considered in depth with a defined outcome. The housing markets overlap and this needs to be further considered in the Duty to Cooperate statement and subsequently reflected in the allocations and housing requirement. This has become increasingly important with the new draft NPPF/NPPG out for consultation which has a continued focus on the duty and its importance. This includes the use of Statements of Common Grounds which should be done in conjunction with the Local Plan.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly ‘NPPF’, which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

**Object** Policy Framework for the Local Plan - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Object** Policy Framework for the Local Plan - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Under S110 of the Localism Act 2011 which introduced S33A into the 2004 Act the Council must co-operate with other prescribed bodies to maximise the effectiveness of plan making. The Duty to Co-operate requires the Council to “engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis”. The high level principles associated with the Duty are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paras 156, 178 - 181) and in 23 paragraphs of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). In considering if the Duty has been satisfied it is important to consider the outcomes arising from the process and the influence of these outcomes on the Plan. A fundamental outcome is the delivery of full Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) for market and affordable housing in a Housing Market Area (HMA) as set out by the NPPF (para 47) including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with sustainable development (para 182).

The NPPG states that a key element of examination is ensuring that there is sufficient certainty through formal agreements that an effective strategy will be in place to deal with strategic matters such as unmet housing needs when Local Plans are adopted (ID 9-017).

The NPPG defines a HMA as a geographical area reflecting the key functional linkages between places where people live and work. It has been determined that Bolsover District Council is a constituent part of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA together with North East Derbyshire, Chesterfield and Bassetlaw District Councils. It is understood that Bolsover received a request from North East Derbyshire to accommodate unmet housing needs but no assistance was available. As a consequence each HMA authority will meet its own housing needs in full within its own respective administrative boundary. However there is also an identified overlap between the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA and the Sheffield City HMA where interconnecting economic relationships and commuting patterns have been identified. At this time it is not known if Sheffield can fully meet the city’s OAHN within its own boundaries and therefore whether or not unmet needs will have to be accommodated elsewhere. It is important that these wider interrelationships are taken into account in both defining the relevant HMA and the OAHN. It is not unreasonable to expect that the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA authorities consider their relationship with the Sheffield City Region and any unmet needs therein. Whilst the linkages between Sheffield and Bolsover are the weakest of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA authorities Bolsover may encounter a “ripple effect” as authorities closest to the city such as Bassetlaw assist in meeting unmet needs. This unresolved strategic matter should be addressed sooner rather than later.

It is understood that Bolsover is a member of the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and there are future proposals for a North Midlands Combined Authority which may prepare a strategic spatial plan. It is important that the Local Plan sets out its relationship with any future sub regional spatial plan and its associated growth agenda which may be prepared by the proposed Combined Authority.

It is noted that the proposed plan periods for the respective Local Plans of the Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA authorities are not aligned. Currently the proposed plan periods are 2014 - 2034 for North East Derbyshire, 2016 - 2033 for Chesterfield, 2019 - 2034 for Bassetlaw and 2014 - 2033 for Bolsover. The NPPG advises that plan dates should be co-ordinated. There is concern that inconsistencies in plan period start and end dates may result in identified housing needs been "missed out".

If further evidence and / or a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) are prepared before or after submission of the ...

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC's, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Document is not Legal

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To further discuss the issues raised.

(Object) Policy Framework for the Local Plan - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) - East Midlands office (Ms Caroline Richardson) [11698] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Woodall Homes [5247]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
In comments published by the HBF on this Publication Local Plan, it stated that Bolsover received a request from North East Derbyshire to accommodate their unmet housing needs but no assistance was available.

The HBF comment that although the linkages between Bolsover and Sheffield are considered to be the weakest across the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA, there remains the likelihood that a "ripple effect" could occur wherein the authorities closer to Sheffield, such as North-East Derbyshire for example, will be required to assist in meeting the unmet housing needs of the City. At the time of writing it is not known if Sheffield will be able to meet its Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) within its own boundaries and therefore whether or not unmet needs will have to be accommodated elsewhere.

The Plan has failed to be positively prepared and does not incorporate enough flexibility to meet a request from the neighbouring administrations for it to take some of their growth, particularly concerning the currently unknown strategic situation with Sheffield City Council. In this regard we consider that the plan would be positively prepared if the Council were to take account of any undersupply of housing arising to meet the growth objectives of the Sheffield City Region.

The plan fails to comply with the Framework in respect of lack of flexibility and ability to respond rapidly to change; paragraphs 14 and 153. This is particularly evident in terms of an inability to deliver any (as yet unknown) unmet growth from adjoining areas including the Sheffield City Region and in particular Sheffield City.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to attachment and representations.

Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: It is important that we are able to participate in the Hearing Sessions. We welcome the opportunity to discuss the merits of the site subject to this representation in relation to the future growth of Clowne and the obvious housing opportunities available. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for additional allocations and future reserve sites to allow for a suitable buffer in the context of the housing requirements for the District.

(9003)

(Object) Policy Framework for the Local Plan - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) - East Midlands office (Mr Ian Long) [12322] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Keepmoat Homes [11415]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

In comments raised by the Home Builders Federation (HBF) in regards to this Publication Version Local Plan consultation, it was understood that Bolsover received a request from North East Derbyshire to accommodate unmet housing needs but no assistance was available.

Although the linkages between Bolsover and Sheffield are considered to be the weakest across the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA, there remains the likelihood that a "ripple effect" could occur wherein the authorities closer to Sheffield, such as North-East Derbyshire for example, will be required to assist in meeting the unmet housing needs of the City. At the time of writing it is not known if Sheffield will be able to meet its Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) within its own boundaries and therefore whether or not unmet needs will have to be accommodated elsewhere.

The Plan has failed to be positively prepared and does not incorporate enough flexibility to meet a request from the neighbouring administrations for it to take some of their growth, particularly concerning the currently unknown strategic situation with Sheffield City Council. It is considered the plan would be more positively prepared if it were to take account of any undersupply of housing arising to meet the growth objectives of the Sheffield City Region.

The plan fails to comply with the Framework in respect of lack of flexibility and ability to respond rapidly to change; paragraphs 14 and 153. This is particularly evident in terms of an inability to deliver any (as yet unknown) unmet growth from adjoining areas including the Sheffield City Region and in particular Sheffield City.

It is also considered that the spatial strategy for the District is as yet not justified until it is known if Sheffield City will meet the city’s OAHN in full within its own administrative boundaries or whether unmet needs will have to be met elsewhere.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to attachment and representations.

Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: It is important that we are able to participate in the Hearing Sessions. We welcome the opportunity to discuss the merits of the site subject to this representation in relation to the future
growth of Tibshelf and the obvious housing opportunities available. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for additional allocations and future reserve sites to allow for a suitable buffer in the context of the housing requirements for the District.

9047 (Object) Policy Framework for the Local Plan - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) - East Midlands office (Mr Ian Long) [12322] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Woodall Homes [5247]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

In comments raised by the Home Builders Federation (HBF) in regards to this Publication Version Local Plan consultation, it was understood that Bolsover received a request from North East Derbyshire to accommodate unmet housing needs but no assistance was available.

Although the linkages between Bolsover and Sheffield are considered to be the weakest across the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA, there remains the likelihood that a “ripple effect” could occur wherein the authorities closer to Sheffield, such as North-East Derbyshire for example, will be required to assist in meeting the unmet housing needs of the City. At the time of writing it is not known if Sheffield will be able to meet its Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) within its own boundaries and therefore whether or not unmet needs will have to be accommodated elsewhere.

The Plan has failed to be positively prepared and does not incorporate enough flexibility to meet a request from the neighbouring administrations for it to take some of their growth, particularly concerning the currently unknown strategic situation with Sheffield City Council. It is considered the plan would be more positively prepared if it were to take account of any undersupply of housing arising to meet the growth objectives of the Sheffield City Region.

The plan fails to comply with the Framework in respect of lack of flexibility and ability to respond rapidly to change; paragraphs 14 and 153. This is particularly evident in terms of an inability to deliver any (as yet unknown) unmet growth from adjoining areas including the Sheffield City Region and in particular Sheffield City.

It is also considered that the spatial strategy for the District is as yet not justified until it is known if Sheffield City will meet the city's OAHN in full within its own administrative boundaries or whether unmet needs will have to be met elsewhere.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)

Please refer to attachments and representations.

Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

Reason for appearance: It is important that we are able to participate in the Hearing Sessions. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the merits of the site subject to this representation in relation to the future growth of Bolsover and the obvious housing opportunities available. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for additional allocations and future reserve sites to allow for a suitable buffer in the context of the housing requirements for the District.

9104 (Object) Policy Framework for the Local Plan - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Andrew Grayson) [12388]
Respondent: Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The approach to the duty to co-operate appears to be more technical in nature. There appears to be little evidence, beyond high level engagement outlined in the most recent Annual Monitoring Report, of robust engagement with the duty to co-operate process. As such the document is at risk of being unsound and potentially not compliant with the duty to co-operate, and as such also unsound on the basis of a lack of compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Therefore, objection is raised.

More evidence is required detailing how any potential or actual housing shortfall across the Housing Market Area (HMA) could, or would, be addressed. Although a broad paper across the Sheffield City Region has been produced, appropriately detailed evidence is currently lacking, with no duty to co-operate joint report on housing across the HMA.

The HMA is the critical sub-regional level for addressing housing need and distributing any subsequent shortfall in associated land supply. This is given the clear functional geography between the relevant HMA local authorities and the joint SHMAA/OAN assessments carried out to date.
It is important to note that the emerging NPPF is placing an increasing emphasis on the duty to co-operate in the interests of working strategically to deliver infrastructure and development needs. In particular the requirement to demonstrate transparency and produce a ‘statement of common ground’ between relevant local authorities through the strategic planning process. Such levels of evidence and transparency are not currently apparent.

For instance, although both North East Derbyshire District Council and Chesterfield Borough Council both currently claim to evidence a five-year housing land supply, as each local authority prepares to submit a Local Plan, Bassetlaw District Council cannot evidence such as supply with 3.7 years' worth of relevant land. As an integral member of the HMA Bassetlaw is therefore an example of a neighbouring local authority which is currently struggling to deliver an adequate supply of housing land, with a Local Plan review at an early stage. Subsequently, any unmet housing need in an area adjacent to Bolsover has not been fully explored through the preparation of the Local Plan with possible implications on housing targets ignored.

Finally, the wider aspiration for economic growth across the HMA has not been fully addressed, or aligned, through the duty to co-operate process. The Local Plan as drafted and, for example, BDC's Growth Strategy Action Plan (2015) seek to significantly enhance the business operation of the District and enhance employment opportunities. This is also within the context of highly aspirational Local Enterprise Partnerships of which BDC is a part. Therefore, a context of significant employment generation is created without a full assessment across the HMA, and wider neighbouring areas, of what impact this will have on the relative levels of housing need.

There is no evidence, subsequent to the 2017 OAN update report, of how any discussions relating to the match-up of housing targets and economic aspiration have taken place across the HMA through the duty to co-operate. This raises concern that there may be latent unmet housing need in Bolsover and the wider HMA which needs to be fully addressed through the Local Plan before adoption.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
Housing targets should be established as a minimum baseline with flexibility to account for additional economic growth across the HMA, including in Bolsover. Furthermore, the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw OAN Update (2017) clearly states that higher economic growth scenarios should provide ‘a basis for considering through the plan making process how planning for higher housing provision and economic growth could be mutually supportive’. Also, stressing the need to address any unmet housing need as a result of economic growth aspirations across the HMA and explicitly relating housing and economic strategies together.

We would suggest that there is greater transparency provided from the Council of how the procedure of the Duty to cooperate has been carried out. More evidence is required detailing how any potential or actual housing shortfall across the Housing Market Area (HMA) could, or would, be addressed. Although a broad paper across the Sheffield City Region has been produced, appropriately detailed evidence is currently lacking, with no duty to co-operate joint report on housing across the HMA.

Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

Reason for appearance: Appearance at the Examination

This is a fundamental aspect of the Local Plan and as a major landowner within the District, Welbeck manages a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities.

(Object) Policy Framework for the Local Plan - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Dawn Shakespeare [12389]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Bolsover District Council has missed a key opportunity to work with Amber Valley Borough Council to deliver housing. The evidence provided on compliance with the Duty to Cooperate is lacking which would make the plan unsound.

I have very recently been contacted by the owner of a site to the south east of Alfreton and immediately to the north of the A38. The wider land ownership is shown hatched on the attached location plan. The owner, Dawn Shakespeare, is keen to make the Council aware that this site is available for residential development and it was previously submitted to the Council as part of the SHLAA (by Peter Johnson of Geldards LLP)

The area to the north west of this land parcel, falls within Amber Valley Borough and is currently being developed by Wheeldon Homes under the following planning permission:
AVA/2012/0084 - outline permission for 500 homes and
AVA/2015/0977 - reserved matters approval for 317 dwellings.

The site shown on the attached plan is a logical extension to the approved scheme, that is currently under construction.

The total site area for the hatched land is approximately 10 acres (4 hectares). The eastern part (1.16 hectares) of which falls within Bolsover District Council.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See individual representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
This site should be included as a housing allocation together with a statement of intent that this site be delivered in association with land within Amber Valley Borough.

Inclusion of this site as a housing allocation and the associated joint working with Amber Valley Borough Council would enable Bolsover DC to demonstrate compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** To explain the opportunity for the delivery of this site as an example of Duty to Cooperate with Amber Valley Borough Council
**Chapter 2 – Spatial Portrait**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8280</th>
<th><strong>(Support) Physical Setting - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: <strong>Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath)</strong> [2475]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: <strong>13/6/2018 via Web</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creswell Crags is home to the most northerly known cave art in the world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creswell Crags is home to the most northerly known cave art in the world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8281</th>
<th><strong>(Support) Physical Connections - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: <strong>Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath)</strong> [2475]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: <strong>13/6/2018 via Web</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2A shows the KCN but doesn't differentiate between completed and proposed sections of the cycling network. The map also excludes the NCN, this would be a useful addition as it shows the District's connection to the National Cycle Network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2A shows the KCN but doesn't differentiate between completed and proposed sections of the cycling network. The map also excludes the NCN, this would be a useful addition as it shows the District's connection to the National Cycle Network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8282</th>
<th><strong>(Support) Environmental and Cultural Heritage - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: <strong>Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath)</strong> [2475]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: <strong>13/6/2018 via Web</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure the second sentence in 2.14 means anything 'The District has done especially well in retaining the local Sites of Special Scientific Interest' - out of 7 sites 5 1/2 are in unfavourable condition! Also sentence 4, I'd prefer 'The District contains a network of multi-user trails, bridleways, footpaths and tracks which link to greenspaces (Green Infrastructure).'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure the second sentence in 2.14 means anything 'The District has done especially well in retaining the local Sites of Special Scientific Interest' - out of 7 sites 5 1/2 are in unfavourable condition! Also sentence 4, I'd prefer 'The District contains a network of multi-user trails, bridleways, footpaths and tracks which link to greenspaces (Green Infrastructure).'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8234</th>
<th><strong>(Support) Key Issues for Bolsover District - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: <strong>Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield)</strong> [4531]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: <strong>8/6/2018 via Web</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waystone strongly supports <strong>Paragraph 2.41</strong> which clearly identifies the issues that the Local Plan is seeking to address. The preceding text to this paragraph has set out a spatial portrait of Bolsover District and the key issues is a sound starting point for the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waystone strongly supports Paragraph 2.41 which clearly identifies the issues that the Local Plan is seeking to address. The preceding text to this paragraph has set out a spatial portrait of Bolsover District and the key issues is a sound starting point for the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.
Para 2.4.1 - We welcome heritage assets being identified as a key issue. It is recommended that the setting of heritage assets is also referenced in line with NPPF requirements and in line with other sections of the Plan e.g. Objective D of the Local Plan (Section 3.3).

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

Changes to Plan:
It is recommended that the setting of heritage assets is also referenced in line with NPPF requirements and in line with other sections of the Plan e.g. Objective D of the Local Plan (Section 3.3).
### Chapter 3 – vision and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>The Local Plan Vision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]</td>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 8/6/2018 via Web</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waystone strongly supports the **local plan Vision and Objectives** which are consistent with the identified issues and in the main, relate specifically to Bolsover District. The Objectives provide a link between the Vision and the Policies.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Waystone strongly supports the local plan Vision and Objectives which are consistent with the identified issues and in the main, relate specifically to Bolsover District. The Objectives provide a link between the Vision and the Policies.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>The Local Plan Vision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]</td>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 14/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Trust strongly **supports the Council's objective of remediating the district's remaining brownfield sites** and bringing them back into productive use to benefit both communities and the natural environment.

We support the aim of providing access to outdoor recreation space and a network of footpaths, allowing people to enjoy the natural environment while supporting health and wellbeing.

We also support the goal of protecting, enhancing and extending environmental and historic assets including the green infrastructure network.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Please refer to representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>The Local Plan Vision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Miss Megan Pashley [9623]</td>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vision for Bolsover in 2033 is set out in chapter 3 of the publication version of the Local Plan. Gladman are pleased to note that the vision continues in a positive manner and seeks to provide for economic growth and housing to meet the full needs of the district.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Having considered the submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development policies. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination.

Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate success.

Please see attachment and representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>The Local Plan Vision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Received:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to representations.
We support the proposed vision and objectives set out in chapter 3. We consider that the strategy is sound as it has been positively prepared.

See attachment for further details.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

**Reason for appearance:** undefined

### 8382  
**Support** Objective A: Sustainable Growth - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Severn Trent Water Ltd - Derby Office (Mr Chris Bramley) [11926]  
**Received:** 5/6/2018 via Email

Local Plan Objective A, Severn Trent are **supportive of the inclusion of bullet point C ”The Protection and Enhancement of the quality of the District’s water sources.”** This is because for development to be carried out sustainably in line with the principle objectives of NPPF, it is essential that the water resources and systems within the local area are protected to deliver housing growth and maintain current standards of living for future generations. Severn Trent are also supportive of the inclusion of bullet point D ”Recognising the multiple benefits of Blue and Green infrastructure in new development.” We would encourage the use of blue / green infrastructure to manage surface water at source, in accordance with SuDS principles and ultimately help to protect properties from flood risk and limit the impact of development on water quality.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
Thank you for consulting Severn Trent Water regarding the publication of your Draft Local Plan, Please find attached a copy of our response.

### 8385  
**Support** Objective B: Climate Change - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Severn Trent Water Ltd - Derby Office (Mr Chris Bramley) [11926]  
**Received:** 5/6/2018 via Email

Local Plan Objective B, Severn Trent are **supportive of the inclusion of Bullet Points D ”Promoting sustainable design that takes account of more extreme weather patterns and reduces the demands placed upon Ecosystem Services”, E ”Avoiding Inappropriate development in flood risk areas.” and F ”Promoting the efficient use of water resources, and water efficiency measure in new development to reduce the demand placed on water resources.”** As detailed above for Objective A, Severn Trent are supportive of sustainable development that considers the water environment as part of development. Building outside of flood risk areas, where possible and incorporating SuDS and water efficient techniques to minimise the impact of the development on the surrounding water systems, thereby resulting in a more sustainable and long term solution to providing housing growth, maintaining resources and levels of service, protecting ecosystems and preventing increase in risk of flooding. Further guidance on water efficiency can be found in our generic guidance.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
Thank you for consulting Severn Trent Water regarding the publication of your Draft Local Plan, Please find attached a copy of our response.

### 8335  
**Object** Objective C: Countryside, Landscape Character and Wildlife - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Web

**Objective C** makes reference to b.protecting and enhancing the character and quality of local landscapes, including sites designated for their geological interest, and local landscape character  
c.protecting, enhancing and extending habitats and ecological networks and the wildlife they support. Although it references sites designated for their geological interest and the protecting and enhancing of habitats and ecological networks, no reference has been made to the protecting and enhancing of sites designated for their biodiversity interests, in particular SSSIs. These are nationally designated sites and should be referenced when considering the Local Plan Objectives to strengthen all environmental policies.
Objective C makes reference to b. protecting and enhancing the character and quality of local landscapes, including sites designated for their geological interest, and local landscape character. c. protecting, enhancing and extending habitats and ecological networks and the wildlife they support. Although it references sites designated for their geological interest and the protecting and enhancing of habitats and ecological networks, no reference has been made to the protecting and enhancing of sites designated for their biodiversity interests, in particular SSSIs. These are nationally designated sites and should be referenced when considering the Local Plan Objectives to strengthen all environmental policies.

Changes to Plan:
Your authority should consider making a specific reference to different distinctions between international, national and local sites within the objective to ensure the subsequent Policies within the Plan are strengthened.

Representation at Examination: Written representation

8386 (Support) Objective C: Countryside, Landscape Character and Wildlife - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Severn Trent Water Ltd - Derby Office (Mr Chris Bramley) [11926]
Received: 5/6/2018 via Email

Local Plan Objective C: Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of bullet point D “Protecting and improving the water quality of rivers and streams in the district.”. We would highlight the benefits of ensuring that appropriate water efficiency are incorporated into new development and the need to ensure that the drainage systems are considered early in the planning process to deliver a good design that can be connected appropriately incorporating good SuDS principles to manage surface water and return surface water naturally into the water environment.

8555 (Object) Objective D: Historic Environment - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

The overall intent of Objective D is supported. The ability to make informed decisions as to how to 'conserve, enhance, and where possible regenerate the District's distinctive historic environment, and cultural heritage assets' (etc) must however be underpinned by an up-to-date understanding of that historic environment.

A number of the Conservation Areas ('CAs') within the district were designated some time ago (before the adopted plan period). Despite this, there is incomplete coverage of Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans across the district; a number of the CAs do not have such a Plan. The reasons for the designation of some of the CAs, and their special value as heritage assets, is in some cases therefore unclear. Since their designation, the current use and options for the future use and development of some buildings and other assets within the CAs has changed, creating an actual or potential tension between the CAs heritage value (as was when designated) and the heritage value of the CA today and in the future.

Some CAs are unrelated to any towns or other settlements and designate very limited areas, for example the Elmton-with-Creswell Farmsteads CA. This was designated on the 10th July 1991 but no Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan has been prepared for it. In effect the CA has led to the 'spot designation' of a number of farmhouses and adjacent buildings. The justification for such spot designation is unclear. It is a relic of a past period of policy making that would appear, in the absence of any up-to-date evidence on the CAs special character, unjustified.

CST seeks to positively manage heritage assets within its care. The new Local Plan must provide a framework which will enable and allow CST to fulfil these responsibilities having regard to social and economic considerations, as well as environmental (heritage) criteria, as sought by national guidance. Whilst Objective D sets out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, as required by the NPPF (para. 126), without up-to-date assessments of the special value of heritage assets, it will be difficult for CST to best understand and respond to those special values, or for the Council to make informed decisions in response to any development proposals that may affect those assets. The NPPF (para 137) specifically advises that 'Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas...to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably'.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
CST would therefore urge the Council to ensure all CAs benefit from up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans. The process of evidence gathering to support those Plans may well confirm that a number of currently designated CAs no longer fulfil a useful or effective purpose and should be 'dedesignated' or reclassified as 'non-designated assets of local heritage interest' or similar.

In its 'Statement of Consultation - Consultation Draft Local Plan' (September 2017), the Council states that the 'Review of Conservation Areas was completed in May 2017'. Despite this, there would still appear to be no up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan available for the Eliton-with Creswell Farmsteads CA. Consequently, any controls or limitations imposed through the Local Plan within that Conservation Area, including decisions that may be made on planning applications made within the Conservation Area, can not be fully justified nor effective.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:
The Council should be required as a matter of urgency to undertake and complete a review of the District's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans and ensure complete coverage across all Conservation Areas is achieved forthwith. Where no longer justified, Conservation Areas should be 'de-designated' or otherwise amended to better reflect their current special character and appearance.

Document is not Sound

8521 (Support) Objective F: Tourism - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

National Trust considers that the Local Plan objectives are sound, and particularly supports the aspiration to increase the appeal of Bolsover District as a tourist attraction. As the owner of Hardwick Hall, the National Trust is well placed to support this aspiration.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

8283 (Support) Objective H: Sustainable Transport - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath) [2475]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Web

Objective H - d. 'Encouraging provision for walking and cycling to help develop accessible settlements which encourage healthier lifestyles'

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Objective H - d. 'Encouraging provision for walking and cycling to help develop accessible settlements which encourage healthier lifestyles'

8556 (Support) Objective J: Rural Areas - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Specific recognition of 'supporting the diversification of rural businesses' is welcome. CST's rural estate hosts a diversity of businesses, not only or solely linked to the agricultural or primary production sector. Taking advantage of opportunities to diversify existing businesses and to exploit new opportunities is critical to maintaining rural vitality, enhancing the long term sustainability of rural communities.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

8982 (Object) Objective K: Health and Wellbeing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The County Council’s Public Health Officers have considered how the PLP aligns with the agreed Strategic Statement - Planning and Health across Derbyshire and Derby City (see attached) and have collated comments accordingly where Officers consider that it supports the priorities, where it can be strengthened, or where it may need to be more explicit.

Officer consider that this Plan demonstrates an extensive and significant commitment to support and enhance the health and wellbeing of local residents, through a positive local planning policy.

The PLP makes numerous references to health and wellbeing throughout the document, demonstrating the joined up partnership approach to supporting healthy communities across Bolsover District. It makes reference to the connection between health, social and cultural wellbeing and the interconnectivity with the wider determinants of health that underpin health and wellbeing including housing, employment, economy, social connectedness, access to green space and environment.

Although the PLP makes reference to Health Impact Assessments (HIA) in the glossary, this could be improved.

The additional comments in the attachment outline the degree to which the PLP meets the health priorities outlined within the shared Strategic Statement.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

Changes to Plan:
Although the PLP makes reference to Health Impact Assessments (HIA) in the glossary, Officers suggest the following statement is added to the plan:

"Planning applications for major residential developments of 100 dwellings or more should ideally be accompanied by a Health Impact Assessment (HIA), where there is likely to be a negative impact on population health as a consequence of the development."

The PLP also makes no specific reference to Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and 'population and human health' as one of the EIA considerations. The District Council may wish to consider adding this to the Plan, to complement the other impact assessments cited in the PLP.

8557 (Support) Objective L: Economic Prosperity - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Specific recognition that 'rural diversification initiatives' are important to the promotion of economic prosperity is particularly welcome. CST’s rural estate includes a wide range of agricultural buildings that are no longer suited to modern agricultural purposes. Alternative uses of those properties could enable their long term retention as well as generation of important local employment opportunities.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations
### Chapter 4 – The Spatial Strategy

#### 8800 (Object) Introduction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

**Climate Change:** Omission - not legally compliant

**Taken together, SS1, the strategic development site policies (SS4, SS5 and SS6), and the regeneration sites (WC6, WC7 and WC8) should contribute towards the efforts to tackle climate change through its approach to sustainable construction, renewable energy and energy conservation within the site’s general layout, design and orientation; but this does not go nearly far enough.**

Given the scale of the challenges posed by climate change, and local authorities' obligations under the Climate Change Act 2008, we believe a high-level climate change policy should be included in the Plan, rather referenced as a general objective without specific targets. Otherwise, significant progress towards a low-carbon built environment will not be achieved, which will in turn hinder Bolsover District in meeting its obligations under the Climate Change Act 2008.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
A high level climate change policy should be included in the plan.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

#### 8835 (Object) Introduction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

**Figure 4F Key Diagram - comment**

This illustrates that the bulk of proposed housing growth is in Bolsover and Clowne, which is unsustainable due to their poor public transport accessibility - though this may be partially offset by the regeneration priority for Bolsover. It also clearly shows that there are no exceptional circumstances at the strategic scale for the proposed Green Belt change at Clowne, since the vast majority of the District is outside the Green Belt and, indeed, the Green Belt is helping to prevent Clowne and Barlborough from coalescing.

We note that the Whitwell Colliery strategic site allocation shown on the policies map is not marked as such on the key diagram.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

#### 8814 (Object) Policy SS1 Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email
Each of the sub-objectives should be associated with measurable targets and indicators, if the District's progress towards its vision is to be adequately monitored. Policy SS1 will be ineffective unless it can be measured against meaningful indicators and monitoring responses.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

---

### Support Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
**Received:** 8/6/2018 via Web

Waystone supports Policy SS1 as a positive policy which helps to deliver national policy objectives central to the fundamental aim and vision of the Plan. This 'headline' policy, which clearly sets out how decisions are to be made against sustainability criteria, sets the tone for the Local Plan and demonstrates clear compliance with national policy to enable the delivery of sustainable development.

Policy SS1 seeks to ensure that development is sustainable through a range of methods and approaches so as to provide for growth with minimal impacts and greater environmental and socio-economic benefits, so conserving resources for future generations.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Waystone supports Policy SS1 as a positive policy which helps to deliver national policy objectives central to the fundamental aim and vision of the Plan. This 'headline' policy, which clearly sets out how decisions are to be made against sustainability criteria, sets the tone for the Local Plan and demonstrates clear compliance with national policy to enable the delivery of sustainable development.

Policy SS1 seeks to ensure that development is sustainable through a range of methods and approaches so as to provide for growth with minimal impacts and greater environmental and socio-economic benefits, so conserving resources for future generations.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

---

### Support Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Web

Natural England supports the objectives of this policy, in particularly section b, I, J, L and N which relates to development proposals considering a range of environmental issues.

Natural England recommends that any Planning Applications as well as addressing all points in Policy SS1 should also provide suitable mitigation measures along with evidence to ensure no significant impact, particularly on statutorily designated sites and protected species.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Natural England supports the objectives of this policy, in particularly section b, I, J, L and N which relates to development proposals considering a range of environmental issues.

Natural England recommends that any Planning Applications as well as addressing all points in Policy SS1 should also provide suitable mitigation measures along with evidence to ensure no significant impact, particularly on statutorily designated sites and protected species.

---

### Object Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
**Respondent:** Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
**Received:** 13/6/2018 via Email

The statement at the end of the policy that 'All major planning applications shall be accompanied by a Planning / Sustainability Statement which addresses all of the above points' is unnecessary and not appropriate for inclusion within the policy.
All planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan, of which the Local Plan will form part. The Council must therefore determine whether or not any proposal complies with the requirements of policy, including all criteria specified in Policy SS1. Should the Council consider that a specific type or form of documentation is required to be submitted as part of any specific type of planning application, then it should be included within the Local (Validation) List, as may be adopted from time to time as supplementary requirements to the National (Validation) List.

It is unnecessary to impose such a requirement - targeting only a specific type of application (i.e. ‘major planning applications’) - within the policy. Furthermore, it is potentially confusing, as the Local Plan could be interpreted such that any application that was not ‘major’ did not require a ‘Planning / Sustainability Statement’, which may conflict with an express requirement within the National or Local validation requirement to provide one.

Within its ‘Statement of Consultation - Consultation Draft Local Plan’ (September 2017), in response to previous comments made by CST on this matter, the Council states that ‘The purpose of the requirement for a statement is so that developers are able to show how the developments they are promoting meets the sustainable criteria listed, or not. The Council will consider separately if there is a need to add the requirement for such a statement to the Validation checklist’. Applicants seeking planning permission will be aware that they must demonstrate compliance with all relevant provisions of the Local Plan - but other policies of the Local Plan do not as a rule state a requirement for a specific type of document to be submitted so as to ‘show’ that.

**Full Text:**

Please refer to representations

**Changes to Plan:**

The text ‘All major planning applications shall be accompanied by a Planning / Sustainability Statement which addresses all of the above points’ should be deleted from the Local Plan.

Document is not Sound

---

**8607 (Object) Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]

Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

This is the Local Plan's overarching policy to guide development and to establish the key principles that form the rest of the plan's policy. The efficient use of land is supported as a principle as this will ensure the impact from development elsewhere is reduced. The policy should go further and reference updated national planning policy (NPPF) to ensure that the key principles nationally are reflected locally. The implementation of this policy is critical to ensure viable and deliverable development.

**Full Text:**

Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

**Changes to Plan:**

The policy should go further and reference updated national planning policy (NPPF) to ensure that the key principles nationally are reflected locally. The implementation of this policy is critical to ensure viable and deliverable development.

Document is not Sound

---

**8816 (Object) Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]

Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Each of the sub-objectives should be associated with measurable targets and indicators, if the District’s progress towards its vision is to be adequately monitored. Policy SS1 will be ineffective unless it can be measured against meaningful indicators and monitoring responses.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

**Document is not Legal**
**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector’s questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

**8889 (Support) Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The Coal Authority supports this policy and the inclusion of criteria (m) which requires consideration of coal mining legacy related land instability.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**9091 (Object) Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Agent:** Kember Loudon Williams LLP (Ms Canan Clatworthy) [12386]
**Respondent:** William Maude Developments Ltd (Planning Advisor) [9545]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The Publication Plan relies heavily on larger sites in delivering sustainable development. More emphasis should be given to the delivery of smaller sites, including land at north of Rotherham Road (Site Ref. New Houghton/03). The development of this site will not require large infrastructure delivery, will well relate to the existing village in the form of its sustainable extension and will assist the District in delivering the needed housing.

Majority of the sustainable settlements are constrained by various factors (infrastructure, highway network, delivery of affordable housing) which have the risk of deteriorating with further development of these sites as planned by the Council during the Plan period. All the more reason that the Council should investigate suitable land within and around the village settlements that will assist in meeting the District's housing need in a sustainable manner and ensuring there is an appropriate mix of housing and employment. Thus, bringing forward a larger number of smaller sites, which are located well related to villages, would speed up the delivery of new homes.

Dispersed rural growth would represent a more balanced approach to the housing distribution across the District with minimal impact upon the environmental designations. In addition to main urban areas and/or main settlements, such releases of land would contribute towards the delivery of a high percentage of growth. The growth of suitable villages will also enable them sustain and enhance their vitality and function their role more sufficiently.

Significant weight should be given to the delivery of homes across England through the Housing White Paper (February 2017) which recognise the importance of sites within villages where housing needs can be met in ways that are sensitive to their setting while allowing villages to thrive. The paper also clearly refers to the proposed changes to NPPF to expect local planning authorities to identify opportunities for villages to thrive, especially where this would support services and provide homes to meet the need.

The Publication Plan is therefore considered unsound as opportunities for sustainable development within the District through reasonable alternatives have not been taken forward.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
The Council should include suitable land for development within and around the village settlements that will
assist in meeting the District’s housing need in a sustainable manner and ensuring there is an appropriate mix of housing and employment.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

**Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Andrew Grayson) [12388]
Respondent: Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

This policy is considered sound on the basis that it helps unpack the ‘golden thread’ of sustainable development that forms the grounding principle of the NPPF. Policy SS1 is therefore considered to be consistent with the national policy approach. In particular the need to encompass the economic, social and environmental objectives of the planning system.

It is important to stress that the current development proposal to the south of Colliery Road, Creswell (ref: 18/00087/OUT) would address successfully the criteria of Policy SS1, and therefore act to complement the emerging strategy and core principles of the emerging Local Plan.

Specifically, the proposal will:

* Deliver 0.8 ha of employment land, therefore generating local employment opportunities and business expansion opportunities;
* Deliver around 300 much needed new homes in Creswell;
* Promote the efficient re-use of previously developed land in a sustainable location through the regeneration of the former Creswell colliery;
* Offer excellent design and built-form integration into Creswell;
* Reduce and minimise trip generation being located within reasonable walking distance of a range of local services and public transport options; and
* Support the spatial strategy and socio-economic context of Creswell through the provision of new infrastructure and investment in the community.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
Received: 8/6/2018 via Web

Waystone support this policy with the scale of housing provision well informed (SHMA 2013/OAN Update 2017) taking account of the latest data which is a sound approach. Waystone support the additional 10% buffer which will boost housing land supply and ensure choice, competition and flexibility. Waystone supports employment land provision at the higher end of the identified range. Waystone consider that the scale of development is appropriate and justified and the plan has been positively prepared in updating evidence and checking housing and employment land provision. This policy meets identified needs with built-in flexibility it is effective and deliverable.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Waystone strongly support this policy given that the scale of housing provision is informed by a SHMA (2013) which has been subject to sensitivity testing (2014) and an OAN Update (2017) to take account of the latest data which we consider to be a sound approach. The OAN update sets out how consideration is given to market signals of potential economic growth together with an updated assessment of affordable housing which is in accordance with NPPF guidance. We consider this policy to be based on robust and credible up-to-date evidence. Waystone support the Council’s approach in providing an additional 10% buffer for flexibility given that meeting the OAN is the minimum requirement set out in the NPPF and we consider the housing target will boost housing land supply and ensure choice, competition and flexibility in the market area.
Waystone also support the employment land provision at the higher end of the identified range and consider that
this is justified by the range of Local Plan Supporting Evidence.

Overall Waystone consider that the scale of development is appropriate and justified and the plan has been positively prepared in updating evidence and checking housing and employment land provision. This policy meets identified needs and has built in flexibility to allow for the need to overcome potential barriers. This policy is effective as it is deliverable and flexible.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Support</strong> Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are pleased to note that the council is meeting its objectively assessed need for housing and SUPPORTS policy SS2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the draft Bolsover District Local Plan and related documents.

Detailed comments and observations are set out below. Wherever possible, comments have been related to a specific policy or paragraph of the Local Plan publication draft.

Subject to the detailed comments set out below, overall the council is of the view that the plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with national policy as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework.

I can confirm that the borough council has worked proactively with Bolsover, North East Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Districts, and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils in preparing a Statement of Common Ground to address Duty to Co-operate issues.

**SPATIAL STRATEGY**
**SS2 Scale of Development**
We are pleased to note that the council is meeting its objectively assessed need for housing and SUPPORTS policy SS2.

Should you have any queries about the above comments or require clarification on any points, please do not hesitate to contact me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Object</strong> Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Mr John Whapplington [11922]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 18/6/2018 via Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having read about the local plan in In Touch, I wondered if you could tell me exactly why 272 homes are needed to be built in this area each year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do the powers that be not want to preserve the countryside and agriculture, which feeds us. Obviously I accept that there is a need for a small number of homes to be built but surely it is better to build these in tiny plots, or on brownfield sites which will be far less invasive than the suggested 1,404 at Clowne and 1,769 at Bolsover.

The infrastructure of the area can perhaps cope with small developments but the proposals for Clowne and Bolsover increase the sizes of the settlements to much cope with, and the areas to be devastated are too valuable as countryside and farmland.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Having read about the local plan in In Touch, I wondered if you could tell me exactly why 272 homes are needed to be built in this area each year.

Do the powers that be not want to preserve the countryside and agriculture, which feeds us. Obviously I accept that there is a need for a small number of homes to be built but surely it is better to build these in tiny plots, or on brownfield sites which will be far less invasive than the suggested 1,404 at Clowne and 1,769 at Bolsover.

The infrastructure of the area can perhaps cope with small developments but the proposals for Clowne and Bolsover increase the sizes of the settlements to much cope with, and the areas to be devastated are too valuable as countryside and farmland.

Document is not Sound
The housing requirement set within policy SS2 represents the consultants' recommended OAN for Bolsover. This is based upon a 10% uplift, to take account of affordable housing need, to the 10-year migration led demographic scenario. This is not considered to represent the full OAN for the area for two reasons. Firstly, it does not apply an uplift to account for worsening market signals and secondly it does not take account of the economic potential of the area.

Given our analysis a minimum requirement for the OAN is 301 dpa. However, taking account of past economic trends and the ambitions of the two LEP areas an OAN of 389dpa is justified and realistic.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
This representation questions the soundness of the Bolsover Local Plan Publication Draft and recommends the inclusion of an additional housing allocation at Pinxton to ensure that the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The inclusion of an additional deliverable housing allocation would assist with boosting significantly the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF and contribute towards the Local Plan being positively prepared. In its absence, we consider that the Plan would be unsound and lack a reliable, deliverable housing supply for Pinxton, consistent with the overall strategy.

Changes to Plan:
To ensure that the policy is phrased in such a manner as to meet the requirements of the NPPF it is recommended that the housing requirement be referred to as a minimum.

Document is not Sound

The policy as drafted is confusing as it seemingly incorporates two varied housing targets, also targets are not expressed as a minimum. In its current form the policy is therefore unsound as it fails to fully evidence that is has been positively prepared in the interests of meeting objectively assessed needs. Therefore, objection is raised.

The revised target to deliver 272 dwellings per annum is recognised and has been drafted to incorporate the recommendations of the revised 2017 OAN assessment. The additional 10% housing buffer is welcomed in principle to allow for housing market contingency across the District. With the addition of the buffer the housing target is increased to 5,700 dwellings over the 19 years of the Local Plan period. This equates to a revised housing target of 300 dwellings per annum.

Policy SS2 should therefore be amended to accommodate a clear target of 300 dwellings per annum, fully incorporating the 10% buffer, and expressed as a minimum. This is an absolutely critical point if market contingency and economic aspirations are to be reflected in the housing target. This target should also form the basis of the housing delivery test that will be expected as a part of the emerging NPPF.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:
Amend Policy SS2 to express a clear target of 300 dwellings per annum, fully incorporating the 10% buffer, and expressed as a minimum. This will help ensure the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified and effective.

Document is not Sound

Representative at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: The scale of development that will be targeted by the Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees ('CST') offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth. To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.
**Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

This policy broadly outlines the scale of development required in the borough in terms of number of houses required. It is considered that the requisite number of homes (272) should be identified as a minimum. It is also noted that 272 is likely not enough to meet the latent affordable need. Of 272 is deemed to be an annual need (OAHN), then this should be recognised and going beyond this to ensure further housing choice in the market.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy’s that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

**Changes to Plan:**

In our view, a more sustainable approach to the scale of development would:

a) Allow for the possibility of the 7 ha of Employment land granted planning permission at the Coalite regeneration area (SS7) coming forward within the plan period, should the plans for HS2 be confirmed. This site has been discounted from the Employment land site allocations, even as a windfall site. However, it acknowledges that HS2 plans impact only a small part of the area, most remediation work has been carried out, and that the owner wishes to progress with development of the site.

b) Assess the possibility of more sustainable patterns of development of employment in the district, which do not rely on a continued, increased and sustained need for logistics infrastructure at a national level and road networks for facilitate this employment pattern. The competition across local authority areas for the same type of business through development of use-class B warehousing is unsustainable. The proposed western employment gateway at Clowne may reduce out-commuting by a degree, but will increase local traffic.

c) Address the problem that link-road and motorway-based development corridor models do not deliver
significant economic benefits (principally due to low employment density and lack of support for town centres), and have many shortcomings in terms of poor place-making, wide-scale landscape impact, traffic generation and associated air and noise pollution and carbon emissions. We would therefore expect Local Plans to move away from allocating land for development based on link roads and motorway junctions.

d) Make a windfall employment land allowance to help promote the development of vacant brownfield sites becoming available during the plan period.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

### (Object) Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

In conclusion, the Plan is unsound in respect of:

* an under-estimation of housing need due to misalignment of housing and economic strategies, insufficient uplift to deliver affordable housing need given viability constraints, unmet needs from elsewhere or arising from inconsistencies in plan periods across the HMA. Furthermore any proposed housing requirement should be expressed as a minimum figure.

See attachment for full discussion.

**Full Text:**  
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC’s, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Document is not Sound  
**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** To further discuss matters raised.

### (Support) Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

**Housing Provision Requirement**

The proposed housing requirement for the district is supported as it is based on more up-to-date evidence in the SHMA update, particularly up-to-date population and household projections and it will also ensure that the district council will meet its OAHN in full over the plan period and will not need to rely on any of its HMA partners to make up any potential shortfall of housing provision in the district. The approach is fully compliant with the requirements of the NPPF.

It is noted from Policy SS2 that the District Council also proposes to identify housing land supply sufficient to accommodate 5,700 homes based on a buffer of 10% above the OAHN figure to allow flexibility in the land supply. This is considered to be an appropriate and justified approach and again is compliant with the requirements of the NPPF and should ensure that there is sufficient flexibility in the land supply to ensure that the full housing requirement of 5,168 is met over the plan period.

**Employment Land Provision Requirement**

The ISO consultation set out three options for the potential employment land provision requirements for the District including 65h, 80 ha and 100 ha respectively. DCC’s Officer comments dated 21 December 2015 indicated a preference for the 80ha target as this appeared to be the most realistic option in terms of deliverability and that this target should be a minimum land requirement. DCC’s comments indicated that a
higher target of 100 ha may be ambitious and may need to be justified by supporting evidence.

Following subsequent discussions with BDC’s Officers, DCC’s Officers were made aware of BDC’s Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) (October 2015). The EDNA indicated that there was significant market demand for large-scale logistics development in Bolsover and that if Bolsover District Council were to plan for an industrial land requirement of circa 100 ha then the availability of large sites will be of critical importance. In this context, paragraph 4.11 of the PLP indicates that the target of 100 ha has been reviewed in the light of the District Council’s employment land availability assessment. The existence of two sites with sufficient flexibility to accommodate up to two large logistics developments, provides sufficient justification for an employment land target to be include in the PLP at the higher end of the range.

Consequently, it is considered that an employment land provision target of 92 ha as set out in Policy SS2: Scale of Development is justified by the range of supporting evidence.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8987</th>
<th>(Support) Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Mansfield District Council (Ms Katie Mills) [9744]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraphs 47 and 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to assess their fully objectively assessed housing needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield District Council fully supports Bolsover District Councils proposal to adopt its Objectively Assessed Need of 5168 dwellings over the plan period 2014-33. This figure has been derived from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 and OAN Update Report 2017. Through the adoption of the OAN as a minimum housing target Mansfield and Bolsover District Councils can meet their own housing needs under the Duty to Cooperate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Text: (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see representations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9012</th>
<th>(Object) Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Miss Megan Pashley [9623]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan sets out a minimum provision of 5,168 additional dwellings between 2014 and 2033. The 2017 SHMA update increases the OAN to 272 dwellings per annum. Gladman suggest that this figure is expressed as a minimum within both the policy and the supporting text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladman wish to express some concerns regarding the possible under-estimation of housing needs and are not sufficiently satisfied that the 2017 updated SHMA demonstrates that the economic and housing strategies set out in the Local Plan are aligned to support the ambitious economic growth aspirations of the LEP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further, we consider it essential that Local Plans ensure that there is sufficient headroom within their housing requirements and allocations in order to avoid the likelihood of circumstances where a five-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Text: (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having considered the submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development policies. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see attachment and representations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to Plan:
We suggest that the proposed 10% uplift is increased to 20%, ensuring that a robust supply is more likely to be maintained and increasing the delivery of the identified affordable housing need.

Beyond the above points, Gladman are also concerned that insufficient account has been taken of any unmet
needs arising from elsewhere in the HMA, and in particular Sheffield City, which under the standardised methodology for calculating OAN, is anticipated to see a steep increase in housing requirement.

9031

(Object) Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Pickrell) [12342]
Respondent: Mr Basil Hill [2524]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Representations have been made in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan (December 2016) and Strategic Options (2015). These set out concerns that the proposed housing figure is substantially below the requirement of the 2011 household projections and fails to provide sufficient flexibility, competition and choice.

We advised that Bolsover District has stagnated in terms of housing delivery for most of the last decade and has failed to provide an adequate supply of housing within the district. This has resulted in out migration and the creation of concealed households (those forced to stay in inadequate accommodation, share and/or move away) and significantly underestimates the true housing requirement. The housing requirement of 3600 dwellings over the plan period of 2018 - 2033 (240 dwellings per annum) would not meet local need based on the history of under supply.

The Publication Local Plan includes a revised housing trajectory which takes into account the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Housing Market OAN Update Report (October 2017). This identifies that the OAN is 272 dwellings per annum. The NPPF states that the Local Plan should ensure that the full OAN for the area is met. The council plans to provide 5,700 dwellings over the plan period, including an additional 10% for flexibility purposes (which falls short of the 20% recommended by the Local Plans Expert Group in their Report to the Communities Secretary and to the Minister of Housing and Planning dated March 2016).

The council have a history of undersupply of housing and of relying on strategic development sites which are unavailable and which have failed to deliver the anticipated level of housing. In order to ensure that the OAN is met, the housing requirement should be increased to at least 8,000 dwellings to ensure choice, competition and flexibility in the market area.

It is important to recognise that additional housing growth can also assist and support the delivery of employment land opportunities and growth. Constraining housing numbers will therefore stifle the employment growth forecast in the Bolsover Economic Development Assessment Report (2015) and counter the Plan's objectives to seek residential and employment growth.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)

Further to the above consultation, please find enclosed representations concerning the emerging Plan's draft Policy SS2: Scale of Development, Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development and Policy SS11: Important Open Breaks. You will note that the issues raised in these representations reflect those submitted during the earlier rounds of consultation regarding the emerging Local Plan's Identified Strategic Options and Draft Local Plan, as well as those in relation to the now withdrawn Core Strategy. Ultimately, our concerns and objections remain.

Please see attached letter, site plans and individual representations.

Changes to Plan:

Due to the history of undersupply of housing and failure to meet demand, it is necessary to provide additional housing over the plan period to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility, competition and choice within the market so that the OAN is achieved.

The NPPF states that Local Plans should plan to meet housing need. Given the historic failure to meet housing need within Bolsover, it is necessary for the Local Plan to incorporate provision for further housing, in addition to the 10% for site flexibility set out in SS2. This will ensure that there is adequate capacity within the district for housing to be provided through viable and deliverable sites where there is market demand for new housing.

It appears that the LPA plans to restrict development outside of strategic sites on the basis that the deliverability of strategic allocations will be improved. Evidence will be provided through the examination process to demonstrate that the strategic housing development sites allocated in the Local Plan are flawed and that the local housing market renders these sites as being undeliverable.

Additional housing should be provided within the district to ensure that housing is available in locations where there is market demand and where it is viable to deliver new housing.

In order to achieve this the provision should be made to deliver 8,000 new dwellings within the district along with increased flexibility of 20% as recommended by the Local Plans Expert Group.

Document is not Sound
**9066**  
(Support) Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: ID Planning (Mrs Rachael Martin) [12369]
Respondent: Avant Homes [11765]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

We support the proposed scale of Development which derives from The North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Objectively Assessed Needs Update Report (October 2017). The application of a 10% buffer for site flexibility is supported. It is considered the scale of development is sound and has been positively prepared.

See attached document for further information and representations.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

**9092**  
(Object) Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Kember Loudon Williams LLP (Ms Canan Clatworthy) [12386]
Respondent: William Maude Developments Ltd (Planning Advisor) [9545]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

It is noted that the Publication Local Plan has been prepared on the basis of the identified 272 dwellings per annum derives from the Objectively Assessed Needs (Updated in October 2017) in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment that was prepared for four authorities. Whilst this figure is higher than the figures suggested in the previous consultation stages of the Local Plan. The OAN update states that 2014-based Household Projections inform the figures and proposals set out in the report. It then highlights that the next set of official household projections will be issued in Summer 2018 with new data on affordability ratio likely to be issued in the Spring.

Taking into account the potential changes to the methodology in line with the proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and release of new household projections in due course, it is considered that the Council's current approach in identifying the housing delivery target represents a risk to the soundness of the Plan. The Council should delay the Local Plan process until more updated and realistic household projections are available and the proposed methodology is clearer in light of the consultation results associated with the NPPF. This is particularly relevant as acknowledged both in the OAN and Publication Local Plan that Bolsover's population is expected to grow more strongly than the other three authorities. Furthermore, employment growth in Bolsover is also expected to be the strongest.

It has been evident from the very early stages of the Local Plan process that the starting point for housing targets are much higher and is likely to rise further with the updated household projections. The Council should take into account the increased demand for a variety of house sizes and the need to increase and speed up the delivery of new homes. Large sites will take longer before they can full deliver housing and the associated infrastructure. A larger number of smaller sites with good links to towns should be brought forward to assist with the delivery of the needed housing.

Evidence on more realistic household projections and population is important to ensure that there is sufficient accommodation in the District as well as job and economic growth to support it.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
The Council should delay the Local Plan process until more updated and realistic household projections are available and the proposed methodology is clearer in light of the consultation results associated with the NPPF.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation
**Object** Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Andrew Grayson) [12388]
Respondent: Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy as drafted is confusing as it seemingly incorporates two varied housing targets, also targets are not expressed as a minimum. In its current form the policy is therefore unsound as it fails to fully evidence that is has been positively prepared in the interests of meeting objectively assessed needs. Therefore, objection is raised.

The revised target to deliver 272 dwellings per annum is recognised and has been drafted to incorporate the recommendations of the revised 2017 OAN assessment. Also, the additional 10% housing buffer is welcomed in principle to allow for housing market contingency across the District. With the addition of the buffer the housing target is increased to 5,700 dwellings over the 19 years of the Local Plan period. This equates to a revised housing target of 300 dwelling per annum.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Policy SS2 should be amended to accommodate a clear target of 300 dwellings per annum, fully incorporating the 10% buffer, and expressed as a minimum. This is an absolutely critical point if market contingency and economic aspirations are to be reflected in the housing target. This target should also form the basis of the housing delivery test that will be expected as a part of the emerging NPPF.

Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** As a major landowner within the District, Welbeck manages a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities.

**Object** Policy SS2: Scale of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Ms Claire Hutt) [12390]
Respondent: Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy as drafted is confusing as it seemingly incorporates two varied housing targets, also targets are not expressed as a minimum. In its current form the policy is therefore unsound as it fails to fully evidence that is has been positively prepared in the interests of meeting objectively assessed needs. Therefore, objection is raised.

The revised target to deliver 272 dwellings per annum is recognised and has been drafted to incorporate the recommendations of the revised 2017 OAN assessment. Also, the additional 10% housing buffer is welcomed in principle to allow for housing market contingency across the District. With the addition of the buffer the housing target is increased to 5,700 dwellings over the 19 years of the Local Plan period. This equates to a revised housing target of 300 dwelling per annum.

The employment target is misleading as it states 92 hectares of land will be accommodated across the plan period, however this figure relies on 4 already delivered sites (details contained in WC1).

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Therefore, Policy SS2 should be amended to accommodate a clear target of 300 dwellings per annum, fully incorporating the 10% buffer, and expressed as a minimum. This is an absolutely critical point if market contingency and economic aspirations are to be reflected in the housing target. This target should also form the basis of the housing delivery test that will be expected as a part of the emerging NPPF. The employment target should be amended to 71.95 hectares which accurately reflect the planned delivery of employment land. Furthermore, the revised figure should be expressed as a minimum, in order for the plan to be positively prepared in accordance with the NPPF.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** The scale of development that will be targeted by the Local Plan is central to
achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan.

### 9170 (Object) Settlement Hierarchy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
**Received:** 4/6/2018 via Email

Para 4.22 - Appears to be incomplete at the end

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

### 8238 (Support) Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
**Received:** 8/6/2018 via Web

Waystone supports this positive and sound policy to distribute development in sustainable locations. The Settlement Hierarchy is positively prepared and justified and the spatial strategy is an appropriate strategy for Bolsover District ensuring that there will be a good distribution of housing growth across the District consistent with the size and infrastructure of the respective settlements and improvements that can be made to them. Waystone strongly supports the designation of Clowne as an Emerging Town in the Settlement Hierarchy.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Waystone supports this policy and consider it to be a positive and sound policy in ensuring that the distribution of new development is focussed on sustainable locations which have been tested in the updated Settlement Hierarchy Study March 2018. The Settlement Hierarchy is positively prepared and justified, based on an analysis of the range of services and facilities available within each settlement, which can support growth. The proposed spatial strategy is an appropriate strategy for Bolsover District ensuring that there will be a good distribution of housing growth across the District consistent with the size and infrastructure of the respective settlements and improvements that can be made.

Waystone strongly supports the designation of Clowne as an Emerging Town in the Settlement Hierarchy and believe that Clowne can accommodate the growth envisaged and will undergo transformational change and improved economic fortune. The supporting documents to the Clowne Garden Village Planning Application, demonstrate that the scale of growth allocated for Clowne in the Spatial Strategy can be sustainably and viably delivered at Clowne Garden Village over the plan period.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

### 8370 (Object) Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** New Houghton Allotment Holders Association (Mr I E Allen) [1542]
**Received:** 2/5/2018 via Email

Having looked at the new proposed local plan it would appear that 50 - 60 % of the one originally produced is no longer valid and its main aim is towards enhancing already more affluent areas within Bolsover District with smaller villages being left out yet again or being forced to feed into a strategy that no one has been given the opportunity to have an input into.

I find this most disturbing.

If what took 4 years of consultations and local involvement to come to is to be discarded with such blatant disregard then why bother asking communities at all or is that merely tick boxes to say that the plan now being considered (which is by far different to the one originally agreed) was with consultation of the communities.
Having looked at the new proposed local plan it would appear that 50 - 60% of the one originally produced is no longer valid and its main aim is towards enhancing already more affluent areas within Bolsover District with smaller villages being left out yet again or being forced to feed into a strategy that no one has been given the opportunity to have an input into.

I find this most disturbing.

If what took 4 years of consultations and local involvement to come to is to be discarded with such blatant disregard then why bother asking communities at all or is that merely tick boxes to say that the plan now being considered (which is by far different to the one originally agreed) was with consultation of the communities.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Written representation

(8394) **Object** Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: National Farmers Union (Mr P Tame) [3615]
Received: 18/5/2018 via Paper

The penultimate paragraph on page 40 in the box on Policy SS3 states that only the conversion of agricultural buildings to employment uses will be supported, but this is contrary to the NPPG and government policy which allows for conversion to residential use too.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
please refer to individual representations

Changes to Plan:
Remove the words 'to employment uses where appropriate' from the end of the penultimate paragraph of page 40.

Document is not Sound

(8542) **Object** Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Mr Richard Cobb [11878] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Mr James Wild [4393]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

Whitwell is defined as rural large village in the settlement hierarchy and the proposed Spatial Strategy Policy SS3 directs sustainable development to small and emerging towns and then to large villages including Whitwell.

Provision is made in the emerging new Local Plan for an additional 218 houses in the Whitwell, of which over 200 are proposed on the former colliery site south of the village. Redevelopment of that site along the lines of the masterplan shown in the Local Plan is likely to take many years to produce housing to meet the short and medium needs of the village for affordable housing. That is large site which, while supported cannot deliver housing in the short term.

Both the 2017 Housing White Paper and recently published proposed revisions to the NPPF emphasise the importance of small and medium sized housing sites where housing can be delivered much quicker.

The Policies Map defines a settlement boundary for Whitwell on its eastern side which excludes two strips of land north and south of Welbeck Street which are both unused and are separately owned from any agricultural land in more open countryside to the east.

The Objector's interest here is in respect of land at the rear of an existing row of ex-colliery cottages served off the Parkway, south of Welbeck Street, which back onto the village boundary. That strip of land amounting to around 0.2 hectares - a more detailed site plan of which is attached - was allotments many years ago but has deteriorated in recent years such that it is now a derelict site subject to fly tipping.

Representation by the Objector in the past as part of the evolving new Local Plan process have urged the Council to consider designation the land for housing purposes.
The objection is thus that the new Local Plan fails to identify adequate small housing sites such as the example given to meet local housing needs especially for affordable housing or to take positive steps to enhance the important gap between Whitwell and Hodthorpe, policy for which is set out in SS11.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representation.

**Changes to Plan:**
The Council should designate these redundant fringe sites on the east edge of Whitwell for affordable housing, where well designed schemes would

* enhance the approach to the village
* introduce new housing with quality landscaping and tree planting
* remove eyesore sites subject to fly tipping
* make effective use of otherwise unused land and
* properly protect the important gap for the future giving it a firm defensible boundary.

Document is not Sound

**Reason for appearance:** To bring the Inspector’s attention to to these fringe areas of Whitwell which have not received proper consideration by the LPA despite repeated representations.

8561

**Support** Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

A settlement hierarchy as set out in Policy SS3 can provide a useful guide and a level of certainty as to where development will be acceptable. Settlement frameworks contribute to this clarity and certainty. CST controls land at /around the Small Towns of Bolsover and Shirebrook, and the Large Villages of Creswell and Whitwell, in addition to land in and around many of the Small Villages, which could contribute to the sustainable growth of those settlements in terms of both residential and employment development. To that effect, Policy SS3 is supported. CST does have some concerns with respect of other aspects of Policy SS3, which are set out in an accompanying representation.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

8570

**Object** Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Some other aspects of Policy SS3 are also not positively prepared and as such do not reflect the requirements of the NPPF, in supporting in full development opportunities in rural areas and related economic development. In particular the assertion that ‘the Local Plan will not support urban forms of development beyond infill development on single plots and conversion of agricultural buildings to employment uses’ in Small Settlements in the Countryside is unnecessarily restrictive and inconsistent with national policy.

The Local Plan does not define ‘infill development’ but it is typically regarded to include development of small parcels of land within an otherwise continuous frontage. Limiting development to ‘single plots’ is unnecessarily restrictive. Within a good number of the ‘Small Villages’, there are opportunities for the redevelopment of redundant farmsteads and other areas of currently undeveloped land, that could include both conversion of agricultural buildings and new build. These sites may not be considered to fall within the definition of ‘single plots’. As drafted, the policy would not offer the fullest support to the re-use or efficient use of such land.

Policy SS3 seeks to limit the conversion of agricultural buildings to employment uses alone. This is also unnecessary and runs counter to the thrust of national policy, which supports the re-use of otherwise redundant buildings. Residential conversion of such buildings can contribute to the social, economic and environmental sustainability of rural areas. The acceptability of the principle of residential conversion is reflected in the government’s relatively recent changes to permitted development rights that allow, subject to some provisos,
the conversion of agricultural buildings to residential use. The Local Plan should not therefore seek to
express a preference for employment re-use over other possible re-uses of agricultural buildings, including
residential.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:

Amend ‘...beyond infill development on single plots and…’ to read ‘...beyond infill development and’.

Amend ‘...and conversion of agricultural buildings to employment uses where appropriate' to '...and conversion
of agricultural buildings'.

Document is not Legal

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: The spatial strategy and distribution of development that will be supported by the
Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the
Chatsworth Settlement Trustees ('CST') offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the
objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated,
additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management,
development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore
appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further
detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

8821 (Object) Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of
Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May
2018)

Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution - not justified

This policy - and the plan as a whole - appears to be written around the pre-conceived inclusion of Clowne
Garden Village. In our view this proposal is unsustainable, and its effect on the plan is therefore inappropriate
and not justified by the available evidence.

Changing the settlement hierarchy for a district should be predicated on the sustainability of any such
development, however the detail of the plan itself acknowledges that South Normanton is the most sustainable
option for development, but Clowne the more viable. It acknowledges that the spatial strategy is a balance
between achieving more difficult regeneration aims and securing immediately viable developments in order to
contribute to the delivery of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives regarding sustainable growth (4.17). CPRE
believe that any spatial strategy should be led by sustainable development, and that by choosing development
on a scale to change the settlement hierarchy in a built area where there is no viable sustainable infrastructure
such as a train station is not appropriate.

The plan appears to trade short-term viability against long-term sustainability; South Normanton is identified as
one of the District's most sustainable settlements, but the Plan lists the 'significant constraints' of EPC Explosives
works at Rough Close and the strategic highway network, as a reason to focus development elsewhere, to
'settlements such as Clowne where viability is better’ (para 4.18). This undermines the long-term sustainability
of the plan's outcomes.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our
representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's
questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

8951 (Support) Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of
Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May
2018)
The definition of a Settlement Hierarchy in Policy SS3 and the supporting justification in paragraphs 4.13 to 4.22 is well conceived, justified and based on analysis of the range of services and facilities available within each settlement, which could support potential growth and particularly up-to-date evidence set out in the District Council’s Settlement Hierarchy Study of 2015 and update of 2018. Four tiers are identified in the hierarchy, which includes Urban Small Towns; Transitional Emerging Towns; Rural Large Villages; and Rural Small Villages. It is noted and considered to be fully justified that Clowne and South Normanton have been defined as Transitional Emerging Towns based on the fact that South Normanton has seen a significant increase in its population in recent years and Clowne has been identified to accommodate significant amount of new growth, particularly associated with the Clowne Garden Village allocation.

The Settlement Hierarchy is fully supported as it should ensure that an appropriate scale of new development, will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in the District, which should help to reduce the need to travel and be accommodated by existing infrastructure as far as possible.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

---


**Respondent:** Miss Megan Pashley [9623]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

As stated in our previous comments submitted as part of the pre-submission consultation on the Local Plan, it is noted that Policy SS3 seeks to promote development in the district’s small towns, emerging towns and large villages. Additionally, it is proposed that in a small number of small villages there will be limited development.

Whilst we support the intention for the bulk of development to focus on the large settlements in the District, Gladman suggest that through the Local Plan, there is an opportunity to improve the sustainability of a wide range of settlements by allocating a meaningful amount of land for development of housing and associated services.

In allocating sites, the Council should be mindful that to give itself a suitable baseline on which to maintain housing land supply, the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets across a wide range of local markets. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets, but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand.

Paragraph 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing sustainability, vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

It is important to consider existing services and facilities in a settlement when assessing their suitability for accommodating new development. Daily needs are particularly important with a primary school, shop and access to public transport being the key considerations. It must be recognised that there may be an ability, through new development, to improve some of these services and facilities, particularly access to public transport, that should be considered in any settlement hierarchy exercise as well as the role that new development can play in ensuring these facilities are maintained and are not lost because of a lack of support.

Gladman note that Policy SS3 states that each of the settlements in the hierarchy set out within the policy, a defined development envelope has been identified. Within the defined envelope, proposals for development will generally be acceptable in principle. We do not consider the use of settlement envelopes to be an effective response to future development proposals if they would act to preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable development opportunities, as indicated in the policy. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements does not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Having considered the submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development policies. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination.
Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate success.

Please see attachment and representations.

Changes to Plan:
We suggest that the Council should re-consider the settlement hierarchy and the assessment of settlement limits to development in order to provide the additional flexibility required.

Finally, in respect of Policy SS3, and in line with our comments made above, we recommend that the table included within Policy SS3 sets out all residential and employment targets as a minimum figure.

Document is not Sound

**Object** Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Pickrell) [12342]
Respondent: Mr Basil Hill [2524]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Representations have been made in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan (December 2016) and Strategic Options (2015). These set out concerns that the Local Plan continued a failed approach to the distribution of housing to settlements where viability renders the scale of development proposed unachievable.

In short we advised that by concentrating the majority of development in settlements where viability renders the scale of development proposed unachievable, the Council was repeating the mistakes of previous Local Plans. A thorough review of the strategy's viability needs to be undertaken and the settlements and scale of development in them critically appraised for its deliverability. There was no meaningful assessment of viability in the evidence base to the plan and there was no credible delivery strategy that demonstrated it would deliver the scale of housing proposed and certainly not the scale of housing needed in the district over the plan period.

The latest Settlement Hierarchy Study (March 2018) follows a similar standard used in the 2015 study and principles in the Local Plan (2000) and although some settlements may be attributed a score that is better than others, this should not be the sole factor in determining the District’s delivery strategy. As raised in our earlier CS submissions, as well as those relating to the emerging plan’s Identified Strategic Options and Consultation Draft (2016), the delivery strategy should be fully justified, taking full account of site desirability, demand, viability and its subsequent deliverability.

The Settlement Hierarchy Study (March 2018) states that Bolsover was the settlement with the highest population in 2015 but has now dropped to the third highest. It has seen far less development than the other towns such as Shirebrook, South Normanton and Clowne. Despite the stagnation of growth in Bolsover, the Local Plan continues to pursue development of 1,769 dwellings (the largest growth in any of the settlements) over the plan period.

Glapwell, New Houghton and Scarcliffe are highly desirable, viable and deliverable locations that largely coalesce and collectively function with the other neighbouring settlements such as Doe Lea / Bramley Vale and Pleasley, constituting sustainable locations for growth. Whilst these settlements individually score below those set out to be the 'most sustainable settlements', these should not be discounted as cumulatively they provide a range of services, facilities, leisure and employment opportunities to support sustainable housing growth in this locality and are well connected by public transport routes along the A617.

Further to the above consultation, please find enclosed representations concerning the emerging Plan's draft Policy SS2: Scale of Development, Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development and Policy SS11: Important Open Breaks. You will note that the issues raised in these representations reflect those submitted during the earlier rounds of consultation regarding the emerging Local Plan's Identified Strategic Options and Draft Local Plan, as well as those in relation to the now withdrawn Core Strategy. Ultimately, our concerns and objections remain.

Please see attached letter, site plans and individual representations.

Changes to Plan:
Comments that a thorough review of the viability of the strategy needs to be undertaken with the settlements and scale of development in them critically appraised in the context of deliverability as set out in previous representations which remain applicable.
In particular, the Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development should be reevaluated to take into account the deliverability of development at the intended scale within the defined settlements. Consideration should be given to increasing the proportion of development within small rural villages to allow a greater choice and competition within the market and to ensure delivery of housing where there is market demand.

This will avoid overreliance on historically strategic and longstanding sites that are flawed with regard to viability and which are unlikely to be delivered within the plan period at the levels required to meet local housing need.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** To amplify and expand on the comments/concerns consistently raised during consultation.

---

**Support** Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: ID Planning (Mrs Rachael Martin) [12369]
Respondent: Avant Homes [11765]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

We support the general approach of Policy SS3 and the broad approach of the policy is considered to be sound based on a Settlement Hierarchy Study which considers the sustainability and constraints of the Districts settlements.

See attached representation for further information.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

---

**Object** Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Inspire Design and Development Ltd (Mr Lee Barnes) [10099] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Castle Homes (Chesterfield) Limited (Mr Stephen Botham) [5236]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The restrictive approach to development in small settlements as set out in Policy SS3 does not result in a strategy which supports the rural economy and village life. Villages will die without development. This is contrary to the NPPF core planning principle of supporting the thriving rural communities within the countryside.

The site shown on the attached plan offers the opportunity to deliver a sustainable high-quality development for the village of Stanfree.

This has been demonstrated in previous Local Plan submissions to the Council through detailed supporting information and that information is not unnecessarily repeated here. The previous submissions still apply, and it is requested that they are considered by the Local Plan Inspector.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See individual representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Allow for housing development in the smaller settlements including the village of Stanfree by amending SS3 (and the associated strategy) to allow for new development in the villages.

To facilitate this, allocate the attached site for housing development.

A more flexible approach to the smaller settlements including the allocation of this Stanfree site will enable the Local Plan to deliver the Government’s planning principle of supporting thriving rural communities.

Agent: Kember Loudon Williams LLP (Ms Canan Clatworthy) [12386]
Respondent: William Maude Developments Ltd (Planning Advisor) [9545]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

It is concerning that the Council's approach is to seek high delivery rates based on a number of large sites with no regard to the risk of these sites not coming forward during the Plan period at the rate envisaged, which will put the Authority in a difficult position to remedy long term shortfalls and delays in housing supply. The Council's historic housing supply shortfall reinforces the need for a sensible approach in seeking to utilise a greater range of sites.

In drafting the Local Plan, the Council is expected to be mindful of the requirements of paragraph 182 of the NPPF, which highlights the importance of meeting the tests of soundness by ensuring that plans are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

We are concerned that the Publication Local Plan does not provide sufficient certainty that the needed growth will be delivered to sufficiently boost the supply of housing as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The Council's current strategy for growth seeks to focus towards the most sustainable settlements as the principal location for development. After Bolsover and Shirebrook, development is proposed within the emerging towns of South Normanton and Clowne, and then within the large villages. Only limited development will be supported in a small number of the small villages. We acknowledge and support the principle of directing development to the largest centres, however, the proposed strategy is not considered justified as it does not allow for growth in sustainable villages through the development of suitable sites that are well related to the development envelope of the villages.

Some allowance has been made through certain proportion of distribution of the scale of development to be delivered in small villages. However, the Council should further explore the available options in delivering growth which is not likely to be accommodated within all suggested strategic sites or in brownfield sites within the development envelopes of small villages. For instance, the identified 71 units for New Houghton (52 already built since 2014) and potentially more units can be delivered in a more sustainable manner through suitable sites just outside and well related to the development boundary to ensure sensitive growth and expansion of the village, which, in turn, will assist in meeting the District's housing need. It will then also create sustainable links with the larger and more sustainable settlements whilst providing an appropriate mix of housing and employment, having direct and positive influence both on the social and economic development of the settlement.

Land north of Rotherham Road (Site Ref: New Houghton/03) is a suitable site that is not constrained by Green Belt or any national or local wildlife designations. This site was previously considered to be a sustainable location for development in the Council's SHLAA (Ref: BOL-NEWH-005) as well as being available and achievable. This site has therefore the potential to accommodate new homes, employment opportunities and community uses. It is in a highly sustainable location, being close to existing school, school playing field and existing residential areas to the north.

In the Council's updated assessment of sites for New Houghton (dated August 2017), it is acknowledged that our clients' site (Site Ref: New Houghton/03) is available and actively promoted. The development of this site can be proven to be viable, particularly when it will comprise a mix of housing and employment development.

For the purposes of comparison, we cannot see how our clients' site differs from Site Pleasley/01 or other sites allocated in small villages through Policy LC1 as Land north of Rotherham ranks similarly to these sites in terms of site sustainability constraints.

Our clients' land immediately adjoins the settlement framework of New Houghton...

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
Bolsover District Council should consider development opportunities at small villages given their sustainability credentials to meet long term housing and economic needs, both within and beyond the plan period.
The policy as drafted, in relation to Creswell, is considered unsound as it fails to be effective in its strategy and approach to residential growth in the settlement. In all, the approach to Creswell is not ‘plan led’, instead it is reliant on existing sites in the planning or development process that have permission before the plan is adopted. Therefore, objection is raised. Whilst the classification of Creswell as a 'Large Village' is welcomed in principle, given that the settlement is entirely sustainable and able to accommodate further development, the current distribution of residential development is flawed. The aspiration to deliver 289 new dwellings in Creswell is almost entirely contingent on two sites which have gained relevant planning consents or are in development. Namely, land south of the Model Village and land at Skinner Street, which, collectively are projected to deliver 269 new dwellings. This leaves only a 20 dwelling residual in the distributed housing target for Creswell. No account of future growth to reflect a scenario beyond these developments in the Local Plan period. However, given that market signals are pointing to an improved housing delivery situation in Creswell, against any past trends, this is not a progressive way forward. The housing trajectory of the Local Plan in Appendix 5.1 estimates that, effectively, by 2027/28 all sites in Creswell will have finalised construction. From 2021/22 to 2027/28 only land to the south of the Model Village will be delivering any new homes in Creswell. Therefore, evidencing an absence of positive, effective, strategic planning for the settlement.

With no allowance for further residential growth in Creswell this will act to severely restrict housing market choice and contingency in the local area. It is also of detriment to Creswell's residents who will fail to benefit from new homes, regeneration or infrastructure investment throughout the whole, particularly latter, Local Plan period. In relation to the development proposal to the south of Colliery Road, Creswell, the site will deliver much needed local housing, offers a wide range of socio-economic community benefits and, critically, will act to regenerate a substantial brownfield site within the settlement on land that previously formed part of an employment allocation and the settlement boundary of the village. Recognition of the site in the Local Plan's strategy and housing trajectory would therefore represent a positive approach to the distribution of growth in Creswell. Importantly, evidencing effective strategic planning for the settlement and a 'plan led' approach to ensuring sustainable development. The development of land to the south of Colliery Road entirely accords with the principles and strategy of the wider Local Plan. Therefore, it is critical that the site is appropriately recognised as an opportunity within the spatial strategy for the document. Finally, and importantly, the distribution of employment land in Creswell, at 0.46ha, will be entirely delivered by the development proposals for land to the south of Colliery Road. Indeed, the proposal will deliver 0.8ha of land for employment and retail purposes inclusive of the adjacent existing employment site designation. This enhanced provision therefore assures delivery of the employment needs for Creswell, as identified in Policy SS3, for the Local Plan period and will provide further job and businesses opportunities locally in Creswell.
A settlement hierarchy as set out in Policy SS3 can provide a useful guide and a level of certainty as to where development will be acceptable. The classification of Bolsover as an ‘Urban: Small Town’ is welcomed in principle given that the settlement is entirely sustainable and should be a main focus for growth. Welbeck controls land around Bolsover and can contribute to the sustainable growth of the settlement in terms of both residential, improved employment provision and retail development. Policy SS3 is supported.

Representation at Examination: Written representation

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.


Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable

9090 (Object) Strategic Sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Kember Loudon Williams LLP (Ms Canan Clatworthy) [12386]
Respondent: William Maude Developments Ltd (Planning Advisor) [9545]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

In identifying the three strategic sites to assist the delivery of the Preferred Spatial Strategy (Policy SS2), it is felt that the Council disregards the lengthy time and progress involved in the planning process to deliver these sites. Given the potential complexities in infrastructure delivery and phasing of these sites, it is not proven that the Council gives regard to para 21 of the NPPF, which state that ‘policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances’. Additional sites within small villages that can contribute towards meeting the District housing needs at an earlier stage of the plan period should be identified and included. These sites will ensure a continuous supply and will make an invaluable contribution to the housing delivery and help certain rural communities.

Land north of Rotherham Road, New Houghton (Site: New Houghton/03) can deliver the needed development that will be at a scale compatible with the character of the village, whilst supporting rural services and local housing needs with no significant strain on the local highway network.

The Local Plan must identify and include a wider range of sites to support the sustainable growth of small villages and rural settlements, which can deliver housing in the short term. The Housing White Paper carries material weight in recognising the importance of such sites to maintain consistent supply.

The Council’s ability to meet housing need locally in the longer term is questionable given the reliance on the scale of the sites allocated for development and the extent of infrastructure required to facilitate their development.

The Local Plan should ensure a continuous supply of housing land, with new sites being identified to meet the changing housing targets both in the short and medium terms. The Publication Plan, therefore, is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</th>
<th>Please refer to representations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to Plan:</strong> The Local Plan must identify and include a wider range of sites to support the sustainable growth of small villages and rural settlements. Document is not Sound</td>
<td><strong>Representation at Examination:</strong> Written representation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **9125** (Object) Strategic Sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018) | |
| Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395] | Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072] |
| Received: 15/6/2018 via Email | The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</th>
<th>Please refer to representations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to Plan:</strong> Revision to the approach taken to small settlements to enable appropriate sites to be allocated for development to secure the future of those settlements. Allocation of approved developments as housing sites, specifically 12/00269/OUTMAJ as this is a sustainable, viable and deliverable development. Similarly 15/00076/OUT should continue to be allocated as a sustainable housing development. Document is not Sound</td>
<td><strong>Reason for appearance:</strong> To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant &amp; to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **8268** (Object) Policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018) | |
| Respondent: Mr K Johnson [2665] | Received: 4/6/2018 via Paper |
| Paragraph 4.28 states that the outline planning permission for Bolsover North site was approved on the basis of the master plan shown in figure 4B adjacent. However the allocation on the policy map shows a different boundary (126 Welbeck Road) we need it to follow the map on 4B. | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</th>
<th>Paragraph 4.28 states that the outline planning permission for Bolsover North site was approved on the basis of the master plan shown in figure 4B adjacent. However the allocation on the policy map shows a different boundary (126 Welbeck Road) we need it to follow the map on 4B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to Plan:</strong> Please alter the policy plan as in 4B, as this is the legally compliant map. Document is not Sound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **8287** (Support) Policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018) | |
| Respondent: Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath) [2475] | Received: 14/6/2018 via Web |
| minor amendment to the wording of Policy SS4 point l. include’…..through the retention and improvement of Elmton Lane/Ovencroft Lane…..’ |
minor amendment to the wording of Policy SS4 point 1. include’…..through the retention and improvement of Elmton Lane/Ovencroft Lane…’

8362 (Object) Policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Education Funding Agency (Mr John Pilgrim) [9740]
Received: 31/5/2018 via Email
The clarity of this policy would be aided by the addition to bullet f of a minor change indicating at what point in the build-out of the Bolsover North site a new primary school will be provided.

8404 (Object) Policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]
Received: 18/6/2018 via Email
We welcome the inclusion of h) within this policy requiring a demonstration of adequate sewage infrastructure.

We would highlight our previous comments for the site re the nearby Poultry Farm, 'We would also add that the development is located next to Sutherland Poultry Farm, and as mentioned in our response to the planning application 14/00080/OUTEA, we would recommend that a requirement for any applicant to carry out a quantitative assessment of the potential impact of the poultry odour from Sutherland Farm on potential sensitive receptors in the proposed development'

8547 (Object) Policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: WYG (Leeds office) (Mr Mike Ashworth) [11997]
Respondent: Homes England (Ms Gill Hay) [11998]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email
Our client is concerned that the scale of housing provision identified in the strategic allocations and allocations (policies SS4, SS5, SS6 and LC1) will be ineffective in delivering the overall housing requirement and as such are considered unsound.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
This representation questions the soundness of the Bolsover Local Plan Publication Draft and recommends the
inclusion of an additional housing allocation at Pinxton to ensure that the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The inclusion of an additional deliverable housing allocation would assist with boosting significantly the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF and contribute towards the Local Plan being positively prepared. In its absence, we consider that the Plan would be unsound and lack a reliable, deliverable housing supply for Pinxton, consistent with the overall strategy.

Changes to Plan:
The Council are urged to identify additional site allocations which will deliver, in full, over the plan period. This will ensure that the overall housing requirement and a five-year supply can be demonstrated. The Council will be aware that our client is promoting the site at Talbot Road, Pinxton. Our client has an unrivaled record of site delivery which would assist the Council in plugging its delivery gap.

Document is not Sound

(Support) Policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

DCC provided extensive strategic policy and infrastructure comments on each of the strategic sites in its letters of 21st December 2015 and 13 December 2016, which remain largely relevant and are reaffirmed. More detailed strategic planning policy and developer contributions comments have also been submitted for Bolsover North. These comments also remain largely relevant. Overall these previous comments indicated DCC's broad support in principle for the three strategic site allocation.

Other specific comments regarding Bolsover North are made under the following headings:

Flood Risk
- The LLFA note that the site is located within flood zone 1.
- The LLFA notes that minimal surface water is modelled to accumulate on site in the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 critical storm duration. Please note that any variation to the land use of the site may exacerbate surface water flooding on and off site.
- The LLFA hold 3 records of flooding in close proximity to the site.

Highways
As Highway Authority, the County Council has for some considerable time been working with Bolsover District Council to support the development of its Local Plan’s transportation evidence base. Much of this work particularly the transport studies for Bolsover and Clowne has been developed to support inclusion of the strategic sites Bolsover North and Clowne Garden Village. These studies have been carried out to assess the cumulative highways impacts of the levels of development in Bolsover and Clowne. The studies have demonstrated that the levels of development in these settlements can be achieved with appropriate highway and junction improvements.

Landscape Comments
This allocation and the master-plan for the site continues to proceed in accordance with plans previously agreed as part of the project design steering group. Despite some minor changes having taken place, which are considered to be detrimental to good urban design, Officers are satisfied that this proposed development should be deliverable without significant adverse effects on the landscape character or visual amenity of the area. It is supported that the proposal will take the design brief for the site forward as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to ensure that the planning principles are brought into the development plan.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

(Support) Policy SS4: Strategic Site Allocation - Bolsover North - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: PB Planning Ltd (Mr Paul Butler) [10162] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Bolsover North Consortium [4553]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The Bolsover North development proposals can deliver significant benefits to Bolsover, alongside making an important contribution to the Council’s housing requirements over the course of the plan period.

The detailed policy criteria attached to the proposed allocation of the site (Policy SS4), has been formulated to
mirror details of the approved outline planning permission. Accordingly, the development proposals will align entirely with the criteria of Policy SS4 and in doing so they will create a sustainable, high quality and accessible development.

The site represents a deliverable residential development site. The site is located in a suitable and sustainable location for residential development. The outline planning application was supported by detailed technical assessments which confirm that there are no technical or environmental constraints to the site's development. The site is available and achievable for residential development now as Persimmon Homes and Strata Homes have an interest in the site and are seeking to commence development at the site within the next 9 months.

Following the commencement of development, it is anticipated that the site will deliver a minimum of 70 homes per annum (on average) on account of the development being delivered by two housebuilders simultaneously. The result being that the site will deliver 950 homes before the end of the Plan Period in 2033.

We wish to work closely with the Council in respect of the delivery of the Bolsover North site to ensure that the development is delivered in the timescales identified within the Publication Draft Bolsover Local Plan. In this regard should you need any further information or wish to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
We write on behalf of our clients Persimmon Homes and Strata Homes to outline their support for the proposed allocation of Bolsover North as a Strategic Site Allocation under Policy SS4 of the Publication Draft Bolsover Local Plan.

Further information in support of the allocation is in the attachment.

8230 **(Object) Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: Mr Steven Auty [11809]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Web

The number of houses is far more than our fair share.
There's no need to build on Green Belt when brownfield sites are available.
It's not a 'Garden' village development under the definition, and naming it such is very misleading.
The North Road/Barlborough Road junction is already the cause of severe delays at peak times.
It's very likely that both the housing and industrial estates will be mainly generating traffic from the motorway, from people out of the area, rather than houses and jobs for the community.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
The number of houses is far more than our fair share.
There's no need to build on Green Belt when brownfield sites are available.
It's not a 'Garden' village development under the definition, and naming it such is very misleading.
The North Road/Barlborough Road junction is already the cause of severe delays at peak times.
It's very likely that both the housing and industrial estates will be mainly generating traffic from the motorway, from people out of the area, rather than houses and jobs for the community.

Changes to Plan:
Build our fair share of houses on brownfield not Green Belt!
Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

Representation at Examination: Written representation

8239 **(Support) Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
Received: 8/6/2018 via Web

Waystone welcomes the flexibility in paragraph 4.32 that Clowne Garden Village will provide 'at least' 500 further dwellings beyond the plan period and that the land will be reserved within this local plan for this future use. This land could be brought forward to respond to changes in circumstances within the plan period if necessary, and its inclusion demonstrates flexibility, positive preparation and forward-thinking by the Council, maintaining an effective long term supply of deliverable land.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Waystone welcomes the flexibility in paragraph 4.32 that Clowne Garden Village will provide 'at least' 500 further dwellings beyond the plan period and that the land will be reserved within this local plan for this future
use. This land could be brought forward to respond to changes in circumstances within the plan period if necessary, and its inclusion demonstrates flexibility, positive preparation and forward-thinking by the Council, maintaining an effective long term supply of deliverable land.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

### 8240 (Support) Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]  
**Received:** 8/6/2018 via Web

Waystone welcomes the Council's confirmation that there are 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the release of a small area of green belt land. We support the LPA's approach in considering the robust and credible evidence provided by the independent Local Green Belt Review the evidence put forward as part of the Local Plan process. In reviewing the green belt boundary, the LPA have taken account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and have set boundaries using physical features likely to be permanent which is in accordance with national guidance.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Waystone welcomes the Council's confirmation that there are 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the release of a small area of green belt land. We support the LPA's approach in considering the robust and credible evidence provided by the independent Local Green Belt Review the evidence put forward as part of the Local Plan process. The Planning Statement submitted with our planning application (17/00640/OUT) for Clowne Garden Village demonstrates that there are exceptional circumstances which warrant the removal of some land from green belt for economic development purposes and that its loss will cause negligible harm to the ongoing function and purpose of the wider Green Belt in this area. In reviewing the green belt boundary, the LPA have taken account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and have set boundaries using physical features likely to be permanent which is in accordance with national guidance.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

### 8241 (Support) Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]  
**Received:** 8/6/2018 via Web

We support BDC's policy approach on this strategic allocation with the inclusion of an indicative masterplan to guide the delivery of an appropriate high quality design-led development and we specifically support the indicative masterplan shown in Figure 4C. This has been positively prepared by the Council and provides a clear blueprint for the Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site to deliver objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements in a design led approach to achieve a sustainable development which will contribute to the delivery of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

We support BDC's policy approach on this strategic allocation with the inclusion of an indicative masterplan to guide the delivery of an appropriate high quality design-led development and we specifically support the indicative masterplan shown in Figure 4C. The indicative masterplan clearly shows the extent of the development set within landscape buffers and bisected by green corridors, with general siting of the different uses and the key elements that are fundamental to the proposed allocation. We welcome the tweaks that have been made to this diagram such as the inclusion of the 'school link' road and the clear definition of the new woodland planting, which together with the existing Forrests Plantation will form the new defensible settlement boundary. This has been positively prepared by the Council and provides a clear blueprint for the Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site to deliver objectively assessed development needs and infrastructure requirements in a design led approach to achieve a sustainable development which will contribute to the delivery of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives.

The parameters plan which is submitted in support of the Clowne Garden Village Planning Application (17/00640/OUT) accords with the principles set by this Indicative Masterplan.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.
(Object) Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Whilst there is NO OBJECTION to the principle of strategic scale development in this location, nor the proposed Green Belt releases in this specific case, the Council is keen to see evidence of the exceptional circumstances to justify the Green Belt release in this location, which has not yet been published.

The Green Belt Review Supplementary Report concluded that there is scope for parcels CLOW/GB/04b & CLOW/GB/05b to be released from the Green Belt provided the Council can demonstrate that there are 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the removal of the land from the Green Belt (par 4.5). It went on to note that the supplementary assessment does not provide a justification as to whether or not 'exceptional circumstances' exist; it principally focuses on the contribution of the identified parcels to Green Belt purposes and considers whether it suitable and deliverable (par 4.6).

It is important that there is consistency over approaches to the strategic cross boundary Green Belt designation.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the draft Bolsover District Local Plan and related documents.

Detailed comments and observations are set out below. Wherever possible, comments have been related to a specific policy or paragraph of the Local Plan publication draft.

Subject to the detailed comments set out below, overall the council is of the view that the plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with national policy as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework.

I can confirm that the borough council has worked pro-actively with Bolsover, North East Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Districts, and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils in preparing a Statement of Common Ground to address Duty to Co-operate issues.

SSS Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village

Whilst there is NO OBJECTION to the principle of strategic scale development in this location, nor the proposed Green Belt releases in this specific case, the Council is keen to see evidence of the exceptional circumstances to justify the Green Belt release in this location, which has not yet been published.

The Green Belt Review Supplementary Report concluded that there is scope for parcels CLOW/GB/04b & CLOW/GB/05b to be released from the Green Belt provided the Council can demonstrate that there are 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the removal of the land from the Green Belt (par 4.5). It went on to note that the supplementary assessment does not provide a justification as to whether or not 'exceptional circumstances' exist; it principally focuses on the contribution of the identified parcels to Green Belt purposes and considers whether it suitable and deliverable (par 4.6).

It is important that there is consistency over approaches to the strategic cross boundary Green Belt designation.

Should you have any queries about the above comments or require clarification on any points, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Document is not Sound

(Object) Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mr Alan Arnsby [9821]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Our objection relates to the change of access from Oxcroft Way to Boughton Lane for all traffic from the M1. The length of road from Oxcroft Way to Boughton Lane is insufficient at peak times for the estimated additional 2200 plus vehicle movements.

The tailbacks from the proposed Boughton Lane access will cause traffic congestion onto Barlborough Links and beyond. We suggest the original scheme (changed by BDC) reverts back to a roundabout at Oxcroft Way giving two options for drivers accessing the new Garden Village and Clowne.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Our objection relates to the change of access from Oxcroft Way to Boughton Lane for all traffic from the M1. The length of road from Oxcroft Way to Boughton Lane is insufficient at peak times for the estimated additional 2200 plus vehicle movements.
The tailbacks from the proposed Boughton Lane access will cause traffic congestion onto Barlborough Links and beyond. We suggest the original scheme (changed by BDC) reverts back to a roundabout at Oxcroft Way giving two options for drivers accessing the new Garden Village and Clowne.

Changes to Plan:
We believe the current scheme is not sound. We suggest that access from M1 to the new Clowne Garden Village should be via a new roundabout at Oxcroft Way / Barlborough road as shown on the Waystone Scheme currently on Clowne Council Website, copy enclosed in our submission. By placing the roundabout access at this location it will give options to go onto the new garden village site without using Barlborough Road and North Road Junction thus greatly reducing congestion which with current levels of traffic is already almost at a standstill during peak hours. Given a further 2200 plus vehicle movements it is highly unlikely that the proposed solution currently offered will work.

Please advise why BDC changed this scheme.
Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: We have raised this with the parish council, Waystone and BDC and Derbyshire Highways and no-one appears to be able to support our objection and no-one will admit or explain why the access change was undertaken by BDC.

(Object) Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

DCC provided extensive strategic policy and infrastructure comments on each of the strategic sites in its letters of 21st December 2015 and 13 December 2016, which remain largely relevant and are reaffirmed. More detailed strategic planning policy and developer contributions comments have also been submitted for Bolsover North. These comments also remain largely relevant. Overall these previous comments indicated DCC’s broad support in principle for the three strategic site allocation.

Other specific comments regarding Clowne Garden Village are made under the following headings:

Green Belt

In the context of the County Council's previous concerns above relating to the allocation of land at Clowne Garden Village site that is located within the Green Belt, it is noted from paragraph 4.67 of the PLP that the District Council has commissioned a Green Belt Review in accordance with the agreed Sheffield City Region Green Belt Methodology that was developed by all officers of all the City Region local authorities including the County Council. The Review was published in November 2017 and assessed land currently defined as Green Belt in the adopted Local Plan and whether that land continues to fulfil the five main Green Belt purposes set out in the NPPF. It is noted from paragraph 4.68 of the PLP that the Review concluded that the majority of the parcels assessed serve one or more of the five Green Belt purposes. In respect of the Clowne Garden Village allocation, however, it is noted from paragraph 4.68 that those parcels of land required to facilitate the Clowne Garden Village strategic site do not affect the key purpose of the North East Derbyshire Green Belt, which is to prevent the settlements of North Derbyshire from merging into one another.

In the context of the County Council's previous concerns regarding the potential impact of the Clowne Garden Village strategic site on the main purposes of the North East Derbyshire Green Belt, it is considered that the District Council’s Green Belt Review has largely addressed those concerns and demonstrated that that part of the site within the Green Belt, proposed for employment uses could be accommodated on the site without compromising the main Green Belt purposes. However, it will still be important as part of the masterplanning of the site and through the planning application process to ensure that the layout and design of the site, including necessary landscape mitigation should ensure that the development of the site will have no significant impact on the wider area of Green Belt outside that area which is to be released. In this context it is noted that the indicative layout set out in the PLP indicates an extensive area of new woodland planting along the majority of the western part of the site adjoining the remaining area of Green Belt.

The NPPF requires local planning authorities to review or amend Green Belt boundaries only in exceptional circumstances. In this context, it is noted from paragraph 4.33 of the PLP that the District Council considers that the site's potential to create a new western employment gateway to Clowne provides the ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify the release of land from the Green Belt. Whilst this position is accepted in principle, a more thorough and extensive justification to demonstrate ‘exceptional circumstances’ is likely to be required to be provided by the District Council as part of its evidence to the Local Plan Inspector, particularly to demonstrate that the quantum of employment land proposed can be provided both viably and for which there is likely to be a
market demand.

Flood Risk

- The LLFA note that the site is located in flood zone 1.
- The LLFA notes that minimal surface water is modelled to accumulate on site in the 1 in 30 critical storm duration. Surface water is modelled to accumulate in close proximity to the watercourses...

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

8186 (Object) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Dr Bridget Ingle [11776]
Received: 13/5/2018 via Web
The realisation of Bolsover District Council's Draft Local Plan 2018 is dependent on M1 J30 access which is at capacity. There is no mitigation in the Local Plan to address this over capacity through building new roads to the M1, or by widening existing ones. The LP fails to address what happens to the the other roads in Barlborough - the A616 Oxcroft Way, Renishaw Hill. A619 Worksop Road, Chesterfield Road.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
SS5.
The realisation of Bolsover District Council's Draft Local Plan 2018 is dependent on M1 access. In the north of the District this is via M1 J30.

M1 J30 is at vehicle capacity (Highways England, Derbyshire County Council data). At peak times it is over capacity.

There is no mitigation in the Local Plan to address this over capacity through building new roads to the M1, or by widening existing ones.

Highways England want signalisation of the A619 Treble Bob roundabout. This will address the flow of traffic to M1 J30. However, this LP fails to address what happens to the other roads in Barlborough - the A616 Oxcroft Way, Renishaw Hill. A619 Worksop Road, Chesterfield Road. All are dangerous with only one signalised crossing on the A619 Chesterfield Road. Walking, running, cycling around the village is impossible to do safely.

This is particularly relevant for the SS5 site - Clowne Garden Village. Neither Bolsover District Council, nor Waystones (the Developer) see it as their responsibility to mitigate traffic problems in Barlborough which SS5 will cause. (Despite the fact that it was their collaboration on the development of Barlborough from 1990 (onwards) that have led to these problems in the first place.)

Changes to Plan:
Bolsover DC needs to give greater thought to the impact of development on the strategic road network in both Clowne and Barlborough. And mitigate the development properly rather than making the same mistakes again that they did 30 years ago. The people in Barlborough have a basic human right to be able to move around the village safely. This plan for the District will make that impossible. Two-thirds of the District's development (and not just SS5) will be accessing M1 J30.

Representation at Examination: Written representation

8187 (Object) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mr Robert Gale [11777]
Received: 14/5/2018 via Web
Improve road infrastructure before any additional building of homes or industrial units.
Government review into how Bolsover District Council operates and deals with day to day issues

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
The proposed development has not been adequately thought out again, the traffic around junction 30 of the M1 is to capacity as per the reports from Highways. The Junction at the top of Slayley View in Barlborough is an accident waiting to happen. The roads are not maintained, damaged road surface and loose gravel are on going issues reported by residents to Bolsover District Council and Derbyshire County Council which are at best ignored. Basic repairs on our local road network before any major new development can take place. In additional
to the road network Bolsover District Council cannot provide an adequate service to its current residents how will it cope with additional houses.

**Changes to Plan:**
- Review of road infrastructure before any decision with further public consultation
- Government review into Bolsover District Council and review how it spends public money

**Document**
- Document is not Legal
- Document is not Sound
- Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

**(Object) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Dr Bridget Ingle [11776]
**Received:** 14/5/2018 via Web

SSS site contradicts policy SS1. Clowne Garden Village will result in the coalescence of the historic villages of Clowne and Barlborough. This is diametrically opposed to policy SS1 which is designed to protect, create and enhance town and village heritage assets.

It will further impact on Clowne by dividing the village into old and new. SS5 is creating a new village which impacts on the heritage assets of Clowne and Barlborough which SS1 is designed to protect.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

SSS site contradicts policy SS1. Clowne Garden Village will result in the coalescence of the historic villages of Clowne and Barlborough. This is diametrically opposed to policy SS1 which is designed to protect, create and enhance town and village heritage assets.

It will further impact on Clowne by dividing the village into old and new. SS5 is creating a new village which impacts on the heritage assets of Clowne and Barlborough which SS1 is designed to protect.

**Changes to Plan:**
- BDC need to recognise that what they are creating a new village, which affects two of the most historic villages in the District. Even the SS5 name identifies what it is: Clowne Garden Village - it's not just a strategic site. SS5 should be removed from the plan.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

**(Object) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Mr Darren Taylor [9657]
**Received:** 16/5/2018 via Web

This Site should never be on the Local Plan. It is rich in wildlife, other brownfield sites must be found. There is not the infrastructure within Clowne to accommodate such a large build. Traffic, pollution, noise, the schools/doctors wont cope. I dont believe the Local Plan has been legally compliant, it has discriminated against those people who are elderly and/or disabled who do not buy the Derbyshire Times and have no access to the internet. A letter drop to the whole of Clowne should have been carried out upon the first consultation of the Local Plan in 2014.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

This Site should never be on the Local Plan. It is rich in wildlife, other brownfield sites must be found. There is not the infrastructure within Clowne to accommodate such a large build. Traffic, pollution, noise, the schools/doctors wont cope. I dont believe the Local Plan has been legally compliant, it has discriminated against those people who are elderly and/or disabled who do not buy the Derbyshire Times and have no access to the internet. A letter drop to the whole of Clowne should have been carried out upon the first consultation of the Local Plan in 2014.

**Changes to Plan:**
- This Strategic Site needs to be removed from the Local Plan and brownfield sites sought to accommodate the build.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation
Policy SS5 is justified and effective to ensure that an appropriate scale of development required by Policy SS2 will be delivered at Clowne in accordance with the Spatial Strategy in Policy SS3. The individual elements of Policy SS5 (A-N) are supported and are deliverable within the plan period. The LPA have taken a sound approach in this planning policy to ensure a broad mix of uses together with the large scale residential development. The policy criteria for the development of this strategic site link back to the Vision and Objectives. Furthermore the policies within the Local Plan are internally consistent.

We consider that the Publication Draft Local Plan has been positively prepared and specifically the allocation of Clowne Garden Village by Policy SS5 is fully supported. Policy SS5 is a justified and effective policy to ensure that an appropriate scale of development as required by Policy SS2 will be delivered at Clowne in accordance with the Spatial Strategy set out in Policy SS3.

The individual elements of Policy SS5 (A-N) are all supported and are deliverable within the plan period and this is demonstrated and evidenced in the documents which support the Clowne Garden Village Planning Application (Ref 17/00640/OUT) which was submitted in December 2017. This policy is effective and deliverable within the plan period.

The LPA have taken a sound approach in this planning policy to ensure a broad mix of uses together with the large scale residential development in order to provide opportunities for residents to undertake day to day activities including working on site. This policy clearly ensures that key facilities such as the primary school and recreational facilities are located within walking distance of most properties and seeks to improve the balance between jobs and homes in the District.

We have previously submitted evidence (CGV Concept Framework Evidence Report at Consultation Draft stage) to show that the quantums of residential and employment development as set out in criterions A, C and D of this policy are deliverable and realistic and the submission of our planning application demonstrates this commitment further. Likewise the infrastructure requirements set out in criterions E, F and G are supported and form a key part of the comprehensive proposal submitted for planning approval. We also support the policy aspirations of criterions H, I, J, K, L, M and N which help achieve the Local Plan Vision most specifically in its environmental role and also contribute to meeting a number of Local Plan objectives. It is positive that the policy criteria for the development of this strategic site links back to the Local Plan Vision and Objectives. Furthermore all of the policies within the Local Plan are internally consistent.

**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.
### Full Text: (Show Full Text)

I do not support the Clowne Garden Village proposal in any way and strongly oppose it.

I would like to end and reiterate with; I strongly object to Clowne Garden Village as a strategic site, this site is not sustainable, undeliverable, is not environmentally sound, will destroy vast amounts of Green Belt and Good Agricultural land. (Which in itself goes against BDC policies) It does not connect to the existing village, the village infrastructure cannot withstand a development of this size, it will destroy the landscape of the villages of Clowne, Barlborough, Spinkhill, Eckington and Creswell, deliverable sites have been identified and are available, the development will increase traffic, pollution and noise dramatically.

I would also like all the objections previously submitted to the Waystone village garden proposal that is currently out for public consultation REF: 17/00640/OUT to be carefully looked through and support my objection to Clowne Garden Village as a strategic site, more importantly those from the statutory bodies.

Our local plan should not be based on a national house builder - Waystones Development proposed submission. Which this clearly has.

Taking all the above into consideration and the 1000 supporting objection to the Waystones development, I would like to strongly objection and would like Clowne Village Garden site to be removed as site from the Local Plan, as it is not complaint or sound!

I object and request the Clowne Garden Village be removed as a strategic site from within the Local Plan.

### Changes to Plan:

I strongly object to the proposed Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site and my response and reasons are as follows:

Connectivity and Infrastructure

The magnitude of this proposed development will have a significant impact on not just Clowne, but all surrounding villages, with Barlborough that is already struggling with the significant amounts of traffic that passes through its village daily, with local residents and councilors petitioning because of their ongoing concerns. This proposal will only add to the already problematic amount, it will also increase significantly the risk to children, pedestrian and vehicle accidents.

Please see attached document.

Document is not Legal  
Document is not Sound  
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate  
- Majority of these reps check all these boxes

**Representation at Examination:** mainly written representations, although some show a desire to speak at examination.
The traffic implications on the village centre and to the village centre have not been adequately catered for with a 'nip point' at the Nags Head roundabout without mentioning the dangers to pedestrians and vehicles in general within the village.

What is happening to this community!!!

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

8284 **(Object) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Miss Nicola Holmshaw [11375]
**Received:** 13/6/2018 via Web

The realisation of Bolsover District Council's Draft Local Plan 2018 is dependent on M1 J30 access which is at capacity. There is no mitigation in the Local Plan to address this over capacity through building new roads to the M1, or by widening existing ones. The LP fails to address what happens to the other roads in Barlborough - the A616 Oxcroft Way, Renishaw Hill. A619 Worksop Road, Chesterfield Road.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

SS5.
The realisation of Bolsover District Council's Draft Local Plan 2018 is dependent on M1 access. In the north of the District this is via M1 J30.

M1 J30 is at vehicle capacity (Highways England, Derbyshire County Council data) and at peak times is over capacity.

There is no mitigation in the Local Plan to address this over capacity through building new roads to the M1 and any minor alterations to existing roads are not adequate to cope with the proposed development.

Highways England want signalisation of the A619 Treble Bob roundabout. This will address the flow of traffic to M1 J30. However, the LP fails to address what happens to surrounding roads in Barlborough. These are all dangerous roads with only one signalised crossing on the A619 Chesterfield Road.

The realisation of Bolsover District Council's Draft Local Plan 2018 is dependent on M1 J30 access which is at capacity. There is no mitigation in the Local Plan to address this over capacity through building new roads to the M1, or by widening existing ones. The LP fails to address what happens to the other roads in Barlborough - the A616 Oxcroft Way, Renishaw Hill. A619 Worksop Road, Chesterfield Road.

This is particularly relevant for the SS5 site - Clowne Garden Village. Neither Bolsover District Council, nor Waystones (the Developer) see it as their responsibility to mitigate traffic problems in Barlborough which SS5 will cause. (Despite the fact that it was their collaboration on the development of Barlborough from 1990 (onwards) that have led to these problems in the first place.)

**Changes to Plan:**
Bolsover DC needs to give greater thought to the impact of development on the strategic road network in both Clowne and Barlborough. And mitigate the development properly rather than making the same mistakes again that they did 30 years ago. The people in Barlborough have a basic human right to be
able to move around the village safely. This plan for the District will make that impossible. Two-thirds of the District’s development (and not just SS5) will be accessing M1 J30.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8285</th>
<th>(Object) <strong>Policy SS5:</strong> Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Miss Nicola Holmshaw [11375]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 13/6/2018 via Web</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS5 site contradicts policy SS1. Clowne Garden Village will result in the coalescence of the historic villages of Clowne and Barlborough. This is diametrically opposed to policy SS1 which is designed to protect, create and enhance town and village heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will further impact on Clowne by dividing the village into old and new. SS5 is creating a new village which impacts on the heritage assets of Clowne and Barlborough which SS1 is designed to protect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text) SS5 site contradicts policy SS1. Clowne Garden Village will result in the coalescence of the historic villages of Clowne and Barlborough. This is diametrically opposed to policy SS1 which is designed to protect, create and enhance town and village heritage assets. It will further impact on Clowne by dividing the village into old and new. SS5 is creating a new village which impacts on the heritage assets of Clowne and Barlborough which SS1 is designed to protect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to Plan:</strong> BDC need to recognise that what they are creating is a new village, which affects two of the most historic villages in the District. Even the SS5 name identifies what it is: Clowne Garden Village - it’s not just a strategic site. SS5 should be removed from the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document is not Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document is not Sound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document does not comply with duty to cooperate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation at Examination:</strong> Written representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8289</th>
<th>(Support) <strong>Policy SS5:</strong> Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath) [2475]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 14/6/2018 via Web</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SS5 amendment to point I. Provide greenways through the site that connect to the enhanced Clowne Linear Park Proposal and the Clowne Branch Line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text) Policy SS5 amendment to point I. Provide greenways through the site that connect to the enhanced Clowne Linear Park Proposal and the Clowne Branch Line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8290</th>
<th>(Support) <strong>Policy SS5:</strong> Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Mr Ronald Wilson [4675]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 7/6/2018 via Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refer to Clowne Garden Village (strategic sites 4.32/4.33) The proposal to build 1500 dwelling on 140 hectares, while constituting a respite from the overdeveloped south of Clowne, is still too many I think.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Such a volume of extra housing stock will mean an extra 3000 to 4000 more residents and possibly 2000 more cars which will strain the existing roads and infrastructure.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
I refer to Clowne Garden Village (strategic sites 4.32/4.33)

The proposal to build 1500 dwelling on 140 hectares, while constituting a respite from the overdeveloped south of Clowne, is still too many I think.

Such a volume of extra housing stock will mean an extra 3000 to 4000 more residents and possibly 2000 more cars which will strain the existing roads and infrastructure.

---

**Support** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Mrs Elizabeth Wilson [8520]
**Received:** 7/6/2018 via Paper

Where as I appreciate that we need more housing, I think Clowne now has enough. However if more are needed the north side is preferable to the south side as we already have enough. Clowne is becoming a satellite town as there still be little in the way of jobs here.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Where as I appreciate that we need more housing, I think Clowne now has enough. However if more are needed the north side is preferable to the south side as we already have enough. Clowne is becoming a satellite town as there still be little in the way of jobs here.

---

**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Mr Francis Knight [9518]
**Received:** 14/6/2018 via Paper

It is not legally compliant because of the inclusion of 17/00640/OUT, which does not comply to saved local plan policies GEN2 and GEN11 and contrary to core planning principles in the National Planning Policy Framework. Also contrary to Local Plan Policies GEN1 and ENV3.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
It is not legally compliant because of the inclusion of 17/00640/OUT, which does not comply to saved local plan policies GEN2 and GEN11 and contrary to core planning principles in the National Planning Policy Framework. Also contrary to Local Plan Policies GEN1 and ENV3.

**Changes to Plan:**
It is not legally sound because of the predetermined inclusion of 17/00640/OUT, which is neither deliverable, viable, sustainable, connectable and now very controversial as allegedly BDC's involvement.

The current amended plan is not what was proposed in the 5 year plan.
Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Mrs Christine Knight [2747]
**Received:** 14/6/2018 via Paper

I object to the inclusion of this site, the additional of which contradicts your own stated policies and those of the National Policy Framework. Some of the land to the north of Clowne is registered and clearly mapped as Harleston. The 5 year plan depends on the proposals for the north of Clowne successfully passing the planning process. It has sometimes been presented as Clowne Garden Village but the actual content is mostly the same as the old rejected plans being neither a separate development with its own infrastructure or a desirable sustainable addition to Clowne.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See attachment.
Changes to Plan:
I propose the land to the north of Clowne be omitted from the BDC 5 year plan. Because none of the previously rejected plans have addressed the issues of connectivity, highways, infrastructure here and in the wider area, natural and cultural heritage etc. It should not be considered for at least another 20 years.

At their presentation Mr. McLoughlin was adamant that Waystones would keep representing until they got their own way. This is extremely upsetting for residents and a waste of public money. It isn't just about what profit Sitwell Estates want or how convenient it is for the Council to just accept Waystone's plans in order to meet their targets, surely residents should have some say. Any future development should be of a small organic nature.

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: undefined

8355 (Support) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mrs Tracey Oley-Jones [11911]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Paper

It is my view that being developed on a site with a single developer will mean that the project will be more efficient and there will not be a patchwork of different developments.

The size of this development will create jobs for the locality which is important to the future of the residents and our young people who will hopefully be able to access these jobs.

By developing this area of Clowne it will help with the infrastructure and ensure that the majority of the traffic can be removed from the centre of Clowne as the road structures to the north of Clowne are more sustainable than the roads in Clowne South.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
It is my view that being developed on a site with a single developer will mean that the project will be more efficient and there will not be a patchwork of different developments.

The size of this development will create jobs for the locality which is important to the future of the residents and our young people who will hopefully be able to access these jobs.

By developing this area of Clowne it will help with the infrastructure and ensure that the majority of the traffic can be removed from the centre of Clowne as the road structures to the north of Clowne are more sustainable than the roads in Clowne South.

Representation at Examination: Written representation

8363 (Object) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Education Funding Agency (Mr John Pilgrim) [9740]
Received: 31/5/2018 via Email

The commitment to the provision of a new primary school within the Clowne Garden Village (paragraph 4.30) site is supported. In addition, it is helpful that the indicative masterplan for the proposed Clowne Garden Village indicates a broad location for the proposed primary school. It would be helpful if the relevant development planning documents included a specific allocation of land for the new school in order to assist in its development.

A minor amendment to bullet g of this policy outlining at what point in the development the new school is likely to be provided would be useful, it would also be helpful if an indication could be given as to the amount of land that will be safeguarded for the proposed school.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
The Education and Skills Funding Agency welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the development of planning policy at the local level.

See attached submission.
**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mr G Burton [11924]
Received: 18/6/2018 via Paper
Object to Clowne North Strategic Site principally due to poor connectivity to Clowne.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Object to Clowne North principally due to the poor connectivity to Clowne

Please refer to attachment.

Document is not Sound

---

**Support** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: The Wickets and Ridgeway Residents Association (various members)
Received: 14/6/2018 via Paper
See full text box below.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
It is my view that being developed on a site with a single developer will mean that the project will be more efficient and there will not be a patchwork of different developments.

The size of this development will create jobs for the locality which is important to the future of the residents and our young people who will hopefully be able to access these jobs.

By developing this area of Clowne it will help with the infrastructure and ensure that the majority of the traffic can be removed from the centre of Clowne as the road structures to the north of Clowne are more sustainable than the roads in Clowne South.

---

**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]
Received: 18/6/2018 via Email
We would repeat our previous comments from our response to the draft submission of the Local Plan, especially with regard to adding in a requirement to demonstrate adequate sewage infrastructure, which has been added into other strategic site allocation policies.

'We advised on our previous consultation that the size and location for this site could potentially provide improved flood risk for the area.'

Add 'flood risk reduction' and 'sustainable drainage systems' to point N (as per our consultation comments on improved flood risk)

Add 'Demonstrates that adequate sewage infrastructure and capacity exists or can be provided as part of the development'.'

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
The Environment Agency supports the publication of this Local Plan.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is legally compliant.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is sound.

We have the following comments to make in regard to the policies and sections of the Local Plan when we previously responded to the draft Local Plan.

Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village

We would repeat our previous comments from our response to the draft submission of the Local Plan, especially with regard to adding in a requirement to demonstrate adequate sewage infrastructure, which has been added into other strategic site allocation policies.
'We advised on our previous consultation that the size and location for this site could potentially provide improved flood risk for the area.

Add 'flood risk reduction' and 'sustainable drainage systems' to point N (as per our consultation comments on improved flood risk)

Add 'Demonstrates that adequate sewage infrastructure and capacity exists or can be provided as part of the development'.

Changes to Plan:
Add 'flood risk reduction' and 'sustainable drainage systems' to point N (as per our consultation comments on improved flood risk)

Add 'Demonstrates that adequate sewage infrastructure and capacity exists or can be provided as part of the development'.

**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: J. Nicholson & Son (Mr Ian Nicholson) [11996] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: J. Nicholson & Son (Messers Andrew and Ian Nicholson) [3070]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

Over development of extensive agricultural land to the north of Clowne rather than sites closer to the village centre.
This appears to be contrary to the current policy of residential development within the existing settlement framework.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
Reduce the proposed area of development of 140 ha to the north of the village and look at other options / alternatives within the existing settlement framework.

Document is not Sound

**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mrs Kay Derry [9830]
Received: 21/6/2018 via Email

I object to Clowne Garden Village for the reasons set out in the attached appendix.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to Representation.

Changes to Plan:
Acknowledge that your own green belt reviews do not strongly support use of green belt land for class B purposes (and the plan does not say exactly what for - offices? industrial? warehousing? - at least be clear what we might be living next to ). Why are you accepting the developer's preferences and not working creatively with them to result in a more acceptable development?. This is a large site - it is possible to reconfigure it to do less harm to the existing village. Do what you are required to do by para 187 of the NPPF which states" Local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area".

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** Do not trust the Council to forward my legitimate concerns to the Inspector.

**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mr & Mrs D & J Hindley [2533]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email
I strongly object to the Clowne Garden Village proposal because the proposed development is far too big and would need significant improvements to be made to infrastructure to cope with the planned development. The road network in the centre of Clowne is not appropriate for this size of development, and the roads leading to the motorway at Barlborough are already extremely busy at peak times.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representation and attachment.

**Changes to Plan:**
To make the local plan legally compliant and sound, it would require removal of the Clowne Garden Village development from the plan - which appears to be based on the proposals of one developer rather than the needs of Clowne or the wider area and is not justified. If the local plan is dependent upon additional housing in the Clowne area then it should be worded in such a way as to reassure people that there is no plan for development on such a massive scale.

Please also see separate sheets attached

**Document is not Legal**
**Document is not Sound**
**Document does not comply with duty to cooperate**

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

**8548 (Object) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: WYG (Leeds office) (Mr Mike Ashworth) [11997]
Respondent: Homes England (Ms Gill Hay) [11998]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

Our client is concerned that the scale of housing provision identified in the strategic allocations and allocations (policies SS4, SS5, SS6 and LC1) will be ineffective in delivering the overall housing requirement and as such are considered unsound.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
This representation questions the soundness of the Bolsover Local Plan Publication Draft and recommends the inclusion of an additional housing allocation at Pinxton to ensure that the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The inclusion of an additional deliverable housing allocation would assist with boosting significantly the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF and contribute towards the Local Plan being positively prepared. In its absence, we consider that the Plan would be unsound and lack a reliable, deliverable housing supply for Pinxton, consistent with the overall strategy.

**Changes to Plan:**
The Council are urged to identify additional site allocations which will deliver, in full, over the plan period. This will ensure that the overall housing requirement and a five-year supply can be demonstrated. The Council will be aware that our client is promoting the site at Talbot Road, Pinxton. Our client has an unrivalled record of site delivery which would assist the Council in plugging its delivery gap.

**Document is not Sound**

**8589 (Object) Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]
Received: 25/6/2018 via Email

Minor objection requesting slight amendment to policy wording

The policy under (m) should be strengthened by amending it to read as follows:-

Contribute towards conserving and enhancing the biodiversity of the District through the protection and incorporation of existing hedgerows, woodlands, wetlands and grasslands within the site’s general layout, design and orientation;

This is important as several of the existing habitats are fragile wetland and wet grassland areas that will require protection and enhancement if they are to continue to support their current biodiversity interest.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
The policy under (m) should be strengthened by amending it to read as follows:-
Contribute towards conserving and enhancing the biodiversity of the District through the protection and incorporation of existing hedgerows, woodlands, wetlands and grasslands within the site's general layout, design and orientation;

**Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Policy SS5: Clowne Garden Village - not justified

CPRE has objected to the planning application for this site. The possible merits of the scheme from a placemaking perspective are not guaranteed by an outline application; it is our view that any strategic site should be comprehensively masterplanned ahead of any application, in consultation with the local community, and that the masterplan should be secured by full planning applications only.

Our objections to this strategic site are:

* Its scale not appropriate to a sustainable pattern of settlement for the District, and does not therefore justify the proposed intervention in the existing settlement hierarchy (see our comments on policy SS3), especially considering that it should not be presumed that the reserved element of the site would be compatible with a future spatial strategy;
* The employment allocation lends itself to large-floorplate uses, i.e., logistics and distribution, which have a low employment density and are not compatible with the location, since they would induce significant heavy vehicle traffic through Barlborough to access the M1, whilst not adding sufficiently to the quality of employment opportunities in Clowne itself;
* The inappropriate nature of the employment development, combined with the coalescing effect of the western element of the scheme in merging Clowne and Barlborough, strongly dictate against any case of exceptional circumstances for changing the Green Belt boundary;
* In the light of our comments on the housing and employment numbers, it is our view that a smaller, more mixed residential/employment scheme suited to smaller scale businesses, occupying a smaller area, would be a much more appropriate solution.

In developing a plan for sustainable development it is necessary to consider the balance of sustainable choices. CPRE consider that the Bolsover District council have balanced viability and ease against long-term sustainability, and suggests that this is not an appropriate trade within the plan.

There is no access to sustainable transport networks to facilitate either major employment growth or the development of Clowne as an emerging town. The Plan (p146) outlines opportunities to improve rail transport in the district for both freight and passenger travel, including links to Clowne by extending the Robin Hood Line passenger service. Any change to the settlement hierarchy of the scale proposed at Clowne should only be considered if such opportunities can be realised as part of the infrastructure development plan. In its current form, the development relies on a new 'Western Link road' to support the expansion of the settlement. The rail option seems very unlikely to be realised within the plan period.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

**Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Agent:** ID Planning (Mrs Rachael Martin) [12369]
**Respondent:** Avant Homes [11765]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Whilst we generally support the thrust of the policies towards strategic sites to deliver growth and support the distribution, in this instance we object to the proposed Clowne Garden Village strategic site as set out in Policy SS5. We do not consider the proposed strategy is appropriate to achieve the spatial distribution of development as set out in Policy SS3 during the plan period. It is considered that the strategy for the Garden Village is unsound as it is not justified and is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against the reasonable
alternatives and furthermore, will not be effective for the following reasons.

Please see attached representation for further information and reasoning.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
It is not considered the Strategic site is deliverable as proposed during the plan period and will not therefore be effective.

It is considered that additional sites in the south of the Clowne should be allocated under Policy LC1 to provide additional choice and flexibility over the plan period.

See attached representation for further justification.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** Attendance at the hearing will enable a thorough discussion regarding the deliverability of the Strategic Site at Clowne and whether it will be capable of delivering the housing distribution required under Policy SS3 and the required infrastructure.

9144

**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** North Derbyshire Conservative Association (Alex Dale) [12394]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Representation not received on representation form; Council officer has made interpretation.

The Council received a survey that was conducted by Mr Conor Innes in Clowne. The survey had 3 questions about a current planning proposal on this site and a specific question about the Local Plan which asked:

"Labour run Bolsover District Council have announced they plan to include the Garden Village proposal within their local development plan for the next 15 years, signalling their support in principle for the scheme. To what extent do you support their decision?"

In response to this question, 84 respondents strongly objected to the proposal, 12 objected, 4 did not know, 3 supported the proposal and 5 strongly supported the proposal. Another 2 did not answer the question.

See attached survey sheets.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Representation not received on representation form; Council officer has made interpretation.

The Council received a survey that was conducted by Mr Conor Innes in Clowne. The survey had 3 questions about a current planning proposal on this site and a specific question about the Local Plan which asked:

"Labour run Bolsover District Council have announced they plan to include the Garden Village proposal within their local development plan for the next 15 years, signalling their support in principle for the scheme. To what extent do you support their decision?"

In response to this question, 84 respondents strongly objected to the proposal, 12 objected, 4 did not know, 3 supported the proposal and 5 strongly supported the proposal. Another 2 did not answer the question.

See attached survey sheets.

**Changes to Plan:**
Nothing recommended, however on balance, removal of the proposal would appear to be most popular.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

9169

**Object** Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
**Received:** 4/6/2018 via Email
Insofar as the Plan sets out for the provision of the site we note that the indicative Masterplan, and the Plan’s Policies Map, include land within the northern section of the site boundary that is within the Southgate House Conservation Area. It is our view that Conservation Area section be excluded from the site allocation boundary for the avoidance of doubt since no criteria relevant to conserving or enhancing the historic environment is contained within Policy SS5. Alternatively, the Conservation Area section could be highlighted within the indicative Masterplan.

In addition the current policy is not sound as it makes no reference to the historic environment, heritage assets or their setting. Any additional criteria would need to set out the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform any Masterplan for the site, and would also need to address Listed Buildings, Conservation Area and archaeology in order to demonstrate a positive approach to the historic environment.

Based on what is already known it would need to be more detailed wording than provisions made for the historic environment in other Strategic Site Policies e.g. SS6, SS7 and SS8. We consider this could be agreed through a Statement of Common Ground ahead of the EIP if timescales for submission are pressing. I can advise that we will be objecting to this policy if the historic environment is not considered within it as part of the Plan process due to the potential impacts as a result of the development on heritage assets or their setting.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

Changes to Plan:
We would be happy to meet with you to discuss potential wording for this criteria since, based on what is already known through the application work, it would need to be more detailed wording than provisions made for the historic environment in other Strategic Site Policies e.g. SS6, SS7 and SS8. We consider this could be agreed through a Statement of Common Ground ahead of the EIP if timescales for submission are pressing. I can advise that we will be objecting to this policy if the historic environment is not considered within it as part of the Plan process due to the potential impacts as a result of the development on heritage assets or their setting.

8291 (Support) Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath) [2475]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Web

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Why is there no provision for multi-user trails/greenways within Policy SS6?

8307 (Object) Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mrs Susan Wilson [11889]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Paper

The plan states this housing project for Whitwell. However, this area is still Belph (and this is where I live). My parish is Hodthorpe/ Belph. I don't understand why a housing project for Whitwell is to be built in the parish of Hodthorpe/ Belph, especially as Belph is defined as a small rural settlement with no need for extra housing.

Although the plans have 'breaks', Hodthorpe parish starts immediately behind my house allotments and an agricultural depot. The 'breaks' are not big enough to keep the parishes separate.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
The plan states this housing project for Whitwell. However, this area is still Belph (and this is where I live). My parish is Hodthorpe/ Belph. I don't understand why a housing project for Whitwell is to be built in the parish of Hodthorpe/ Belph, especially as Belph is defined as a small rural settlement with no need for extra housing.

Although the plans have 'breaks', Hodthorpe parish starts immediately behind my house allotments and an agricultural depot. The 'breaks' are not big enough to keep the parishes separate.

Document is not Sound
**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** Who else will represent my concern?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Object) Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Respondent:** Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]  
**Received:** 18/6/2018 via Email  
We welcome the inclusion of k) within this policy requiring a demonstration of adequate sewage infrastructure  
We would repeat our previous comments re the historic use of the site which is underlain by a principal aquifer and ask that a bullet point asking for 'a detailed site investigation and remediation report' should be added to this policy. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Support) Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Respondent:** Network Rail (Mrs Diane Cragg) [9799]  
**Received:** 25/5/2018 via Email  
We note the alterations to the plan in particular the amendments to the Whitwell Colliery allocation and confirm we have no further comments to make on the publication version of the document. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Object) Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Agent:** WYG (Leeds office) (Mr Mike Ashworth) [11997]  
**Respondent:** Homes England (Ms Gill Hay) [11998]  
**Received:** 14/6/2018 via Email  
Our client is concerned that the scale of housing provision identified in the strategic allocations and allocations (policies SS4, SS5, SS6 and LC1) will be ineffective in delivering the overall housing requirement and as such are considered unsound. |

This representation questions the soundness of the Bolsover Local Plan Publication Draft and recommends the inclusion of an additional housing allocation at Pinxton to ensure that the Local Plan is positively prepared.
Justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The inclusion of an additional deliverable housing allocation would assist with boosting significantly the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF and contribute towards the Local Plan being positively prepared. In its absence, we consider that the Plan would be unsound and lack a reliable, deliverable housing supply for Pinxton, consistent with the overall strategy.

**Changes to Plan:**
The Council are urged to identify additional site allocations which will deliver, in full, over the plan period. This will ensure that the overall housing requirement and a five-year supply can be demonstrated. The Council will be aware that our client is promoting the site at Talbot Road, Pinxton. Our client has an unrivalled record of site delivery which would assist the Council in plugging its delivery gap.

Document is not Sound

### Object 8590

**Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]

**Received:** 25/6/2018 via Email

Object subject to changes to wording of policy

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust are concerned about the proposed development and the impact this will have on biodiversity.

The development of Whitwell Colliery will have an adverse impact on biodiversity including UK BAP habitat and species. A Local Wildlife Site is present within the footprint of the site and looks likely to be lost as part of the development. The LWS supports species rich grassland within an 'open mosaic' of grassland, bare ground and scrub. These habitats are also found elsewhere within the site. UK BAP priority butterflies, moths and birds are present within the site. Clearly any development of the site will need to demonstrate that there is a net gain to biodiversity that fully offsets the loss of the existing habitats.

The proposed future restoration of the site to a Country Park provides this opportunity, but this needs to be fully underpinned by the policy and any planning guidance produced by BDC. The Country Park must incorporate substantial gains for wildlife through the creation of flower rich open habitats, wetlands, scrub and woodland.

We would suggest that the policy under (i) is strengthened to read as follows:

Contribute towards conserving and enhancing the biodiversity of the District through the protection and incorporation of existing hedgerows and woodlands and the creation and enhancement of open flower rich grassland, wetland and scrub habitats within the site’s general layout, design and orientation;

The full biodiversity objectives and details of how restoration and the creation of the Country Park must achieve a net gain overall should be developed within the Supplementary Planning Document.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Please refer to representations.

### Changes to Plan:

We would suggest that the policy under (i) is strengthened to read as follows:

Contribute towards conserving and enhancing the biodiversity of the District through the protection and incorporation of existing hedgerows and woodlands and the creation and enhancement of open flower rich grassland, wetland and scrub habitats within the site’s general layout, design and orientation;

The full biodiversity objectives and details of how restoration and the creation of the Country Park must achieve a net gain overall should be developed within the Supplementary Planning Document.

### Object 8606

**Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Mr Mark Rawson [9810]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Paper

The break between Whitwell and Hodthorpe should be to the road frontage to maintain the break between the two Parishes.
The break between Whitwell and Hodthorpe should be to the road frontage to maintain the break between the two Parishes.

**Changes to Plan:**
The break between Whitwell and Hodthorpe should be to the road frontage to maintain the break between the two Parishes.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

**Object** Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

DCC provided extensive strategic policy and infrastructure comments on each of the strategic sites in its letters of 21st December 2015 and 13 December 2016, which remain largely relevant and are reaffirmed. More detailed strategic planning policy and developer contributions comments have also been submitted for Bolsover North. These comments also remain largely relevant. Overall these previous comments indicated DCC's broad support in principle for the three strategic site allocation.

Other specific comments regarding Former Whitwell Colliery site are made under the following headings:

**Flood Risk**
- The LLFA note that the southern tip of the site is located within flood zone 3.
- The LLFA notes that surface water is modelled to accumulate in the North West and along the southern boundary of the site in the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 critical storm duration.
- The LLFA hold one record of surface water flooding in proximity to the site.

**Landscape Comments**

Whitwell Colliery - Figure 4d shows an allocation of land greater than anticipated following previous conversations with BDC's Officers and the developer. The overall proposal for housing and business development is acceptable in principle but the proposal to restore the former Whitwell Colliery Tip to a country park, as shown on the plans, continues to be at odds with the established character of the wider landscape. Alternative designs for the site have been provided that better respect the character of the immediate and wider landscape but these do not appear to have been accepted, which is disappointing.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

---

**Object** Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Planning and Design Group (Mr Chris Jesson) [9530] (unconfirmed)

**Respondent:** Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Welbeck Estates Company Ltd ("The Estate") continues to support the identification of the former Whitwell Colliery site for allocation. The site has been technically appraised to be available, achievable and deliverable following its allocation for housing and employment in the new Local Plan. A scheme for 450 dwellings has been prepared for imminent submission through the planning application process in the form of an Outline planning application to the District Council and Full (Minerals and Waste) EIA to Derbyshire County Council.

Adjoining the built framework of Whitwell, proximate to and within the Parish of Hodthorpe and Belph, the site offers a sustainable strategic growth site, in an area characterised by residential development. The site is largely previously developed (brownfield) land and due to its nature and current condition, it is considered to be a ‘detractor’ in the local landscape. The NPPF seeks to encourage the effective reuse of brownfield land, which can be achieved, in principle, through Policy SS6.

Whitwell is a second-tier settlement with a number of sustainability credentials and so our agreement to its role as a Large Village is supported. It is widely accepted that this is a sustainable location where a strategic development could take place in line with the requirements of the NPPF. Indeed, it is entirely appropriate to follow a sequential approach to allocating sites, looking to Large Villages to accommodate the addition of growth
required outside the District's main settlements.

In accordance with the wider aspirations and objectives of the emerging Local Plan, the allocation of the former Whitwell Colliery site will promote the delivery of key regenerative benefits including:

* Significant public benefit of housing delivery;
* Local employment opportunities to meet an identified need and prevent out commuting;
* Built development will be readily assimilated into the receiving landscape and will improve the appearance of the site;
* Contribution to vitality and vibrancy of Whitwell;
* Enhanced green infrastructure, and biodiversity
* Resolve shortfalls in open space and recreational land, identified in the Council's Green Space Strategy (2018);
* Improved accessibility at Whitwell Railway Station;
* Retail provision, increased choice;
* Traffic management along Station Road;
* Additional footpath connectivity, providing safe and convenient access to wider countryside;
* Improved drainage, re-directing the watercourse to make the existing culvert safe from collapse; and
* Resolve localised flooding issues at Millash Lane.

The only matter of concern in the policy wording is regarding criteria l) to avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources; the timing of this development is located on a former colliery site whereby the industry and extraction for coal has long since been exhausted. Other resources will be accounted for in the reclamation process by virtue of reuse, recycling and recovery. The EIA Screening Opinion issued by Derbyshire County Council for the reclamation scheme (ref: SCRM/S/104) shows that the Minerals Planning Authority is content that "the site has been subject to many years of coal mining activity and as such any natural resources are not envisaged to be abundant or of superior quality". The development is planned strategically so as to avoid conflicts and not prejudice the minerals extraction at the Whitwell quarry site, planned to be in operation until 2043, so we question the role of this particular criteria in this policy and suggest its deletion.

Whilst the principle of this strategic allocation (Policy SS6) is in accordance with the NPPF and other emerging Local Plan policies, we consider that the plan submitted for consultation in Figure 4D does not adequately reflect the parameters of the masterplan that has been subject to previous consulta...

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
A Masterplan has been prepared reflecting the emerging proposal to develop a residential-led development of up to 450 dwellings on the site (latest copy enclosed ref: 13.012 32g). This includes additional land to the north of Station Road, Whitwell which has been informed by a significant amount of technical work and evidence and amounts to the plan put forward for several rounds of public consultation.

The Masterplan has previously been provided to the Council as part of a process of collaborative working, informing previous Local Plan representations and the forthcoming planning application for the site. The technical work assessed the impacts of a proposed mixed-use development on site and supports the deliverability of 450 dwellings and up to 6 hectares of employment on site, without significant harm to the surrounding village context or conflict with the Council's emerging Spatial Strategy.

The exclusion of some of the land north of Station Road in Figure 4D is based upon the Council's assertion, relatively late on in the plan preparation, that the development would improperly encroach into Hodthorpe. At the time this was first raised, there was no evidence base provided by the Council to support this view. As of now, while the Council has produced an Important Open Break Review, this is acknowledged to be largely a desk-based analysis and provides no reasoned account of the corresponding review of the Important Open Break we have commissioned by DSA Environment + Design (2017), a matter we state in our response to emerging Policy SS11.

Therefore, the most relevant and sound position to base the allocation boundary on is this technical evidence, as prepared by Welbeck's professional consultant team, but a decision on such boundaries is being taken outside of the scope of reviewing such evidence. The appraised boundary for the forthcoming application places no harm upon the integral functions of the Important Open Break since the land between the site and Hodthorpe is safeguarded by the newly implemented allotment site and community woodland that both contribute significantly to the area's openness.

Further, Policy SS6 criterion c) indicates the completion of at least 200 dwellings within the site during the Plan period. Whilst it is acknowledged that this figure is a minimum, the Estate can demonstrate the deliverability of the site, including additional land north of Station Road, for at least 350 dwellings by 2033. The present development area provided by Figure 4D amounts to approximately 16.3ha versus 19ha for the development masterplan. In Figure 4D, some 11.3ha of the development area would be residential, which would equate to 395 dwellings at an average of 35 per hectare, the remaining 5ha as commercial. This is considered to be too low in our view to be able to generate the full and viable quantum of development that is proposed on this site.
To achieve the 11.3ha of residential land, this situation is more acute given the plan also proposes the loss of commercial land west of Southfield Lane in favour of residential; a proposal that we have appraised in the past and omitted on account of a) local feedback at public consultations and b) conflict with the now approved workings at Whitwell Quarry until 2043.

Our proposals, fully tested and to be assessed in the forthcoming application, involve 13ha of residential land, and 6ha of employment land, without needing to develop in the commercial area but does include additional land north of Station Road. At an average density of 35 dwellings per hectare, this would meet the proposed development quantum. The Council's proposed build out rates meet broadly with our expectations though we consider they would not taper off as prescribed between the years 2030/31 and 2032/33, rather the build out at 35dph would continue. We therefore suggest that the Council’...

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** The strategic allocation of the former Whitwell Colliery site is fundamental to the soundness of the Plan. Accordingly, the Estate recognise their role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan and are keen to support the Council in the allocation of this site, offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector. It is also appropriate and necessary for the Estate to participate at the Hearing Sessions to allow effective decision making in respect of the allocation boundary and the housing delivery figure specified during the Plan period.

---

**Object** Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation - Former Whitwell Colliery Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]  
**Received:** 4/6/2018 via Email

Policy SS6: Strategic Site Allocation: former Whitwell Colliery Site - criteria (m) - It is recommended that 'protect' be replaced with 'conserve or enhance' in line with NPPF terminology. 'Conserve' has a useful definition in the NPPF glossary which makes provision for management and more flexibility than 'protect'.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

---

**Object** Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

DCC provided extensive strategic policy and infrastructure comments on each of the strategic sites in its letters of 21st December 2015 and 13 December 2016, which remain largely relevant and are reaffirmed. More detailed strategic planning policy and developer contributions comments have also been submitted for Bolsover North. These comments also remain largely relevant. Overall these previous comments indicated DCC's broad support in principle for the Coalite Regeneration Priority Area.

Other specific comments regarding the Coalite Regeneration Priority Area are made under the following headings:

**Flood Risk**
- The LLFA note that the site is located within flood zone 3 adjacent to the River Doe Lea. For further information in relation to flood risk attributed to Main Rivers, the LLFA recommends consultation with the Environment Agency. The LLFA has a record of extensive ordinary watercourses on site.  
- The LLFA notes that surface water is modelled to accumulate extensively across the site in the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 critical storm duration. Please note that any variation to the land use of the site may exacerbate surface water flooding on and off site.  
- The LLFA hold one record of fluvial flooding in proximity to the site.

**Landscape**
Concerns have been previously expressed regarding the scale of the proposed development at the former Coalite Works, particularly when considered alongside the proposed allocation within North East Derbyshire District. The primary issues relate to the potential impact on the established character of the local landscape and visual...
amenity, the cumulative effects of this development when considered alongside the proposed strategic allocation at North Bolsover, and the potential impact on the setting of Bolsover Castle and historic town, particularly with regard to the visitor experience and sense of arrival. Officers continue to have concerns about the proposed development of the greenfield part of the site adjacent to the A632 within the North East Derbyshire District.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td>iSec Group (Sophie Watkin) [4539] (unconfirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent:</td>
<td>Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received:</td>
<td>15/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the supporting text, we object to the following statement at paragraph 4.48 (highlighted in capitals):

"the landowner has confirmed that they remain committed to the development of the entire site BUT INDICATE THAT A REVISED SCHEME FOR THE WHOLE OF THE SITE WILL BE NECESSARY TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE IMPACTS OF HS2"

To be clear, we have not at any point indicated that a revised scheme / masterplan is necessary for the BDC part of the site; we are discharging pre-commencement planning conditions. Only the NEDDC part of the site is impacted upon by HS2, and as we have made clear to NEDDC through their local plan process, we do intend to revisit that scheme with a revised masterplan.

In respect of paragraph 4.49, and the following: "there is still a lot of work related to the full remediation of the site, and the complexities added by the routing of HS2"; we again reiterate that the routing of HS2 does not add complexities to the BDC permission or its implementation. We also reiterate that remediation is underway.

The supporting text needs to provide a clear distinction between the permissions / schemes in relation to the two Local Authority Plans. There are clearly different issues facing the NEDDC part of the site, and it is important that these issues are not misinterpreted to impact upon the BDC part of the site. To fulfil the duty to co-operate the two Local Plans do not need to provide nearly identical policies and supporting text.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes to Plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our suggested changes do not equate to challenge on soundness of the Plan as a whole or legal compliance, rather amendments we feel will provide a more accurate and up to date framework and policy position for the BDC part of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** To provide the most up to date information and evidence about the timing of the remediation and the phased delivery of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Policy SS7: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent:</td>
<td>Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received:</td>
<td>15/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The council SUPPORTS the allocation of the Coalite site as a Priority Regeneration Area. The development of this site will need to be the subject of on-going co-operation on cross boundary impacts, in particular the impact of additional traffic on the highways network and specifically on the capacity of J29a of the M1 and the Chesterfield Road/Rectory Road junction, taking into account the cumulative impacts of this proposal, the associated development of the Coalite site in NEDDC, and the Staveley Works and Eastern Villages proposals in the adopted Chesterfield Borough Core Strategy and emerging draft Local Plan.

Whilst recognising the uncertainty in the end form of development we do believe that the policy should nonetheless identify the range of uses that would be considered acceptable on the site and some indication of the potential scale of development.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the draft Bolsover District Local Plan and related documents.

Detailed comments and observations are set out below. Wherever possible, comments have been related to a specific policy or paragraph of the Local Plan publication draft.

Subject to the detailed comments set out below, overall the council is of the view that the plan has been
positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with national policy as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework.

I can confirm that the borough council has worked pro-actively with Bolsover, North East Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Districts, and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils in preparing a Statement of Common Ground to address Duty to Co-operate issues.

SS7 Coalite Priority Regeneration Area
The council SUPPORTS the allocation of the Coalite site as a Priority Regeneration Area. The development of this site will need to be the subject of ongoing co-operation on crossboundary impacts, in particular the impact of additional traffic on the highways network and specifically on the capacity of J29a of the M1 and the Chesterfield Road/Rectory Road junction, taking into account the cumulative impacts of this proposal, the associated development of the Coalite site in NEDDC, and the Staveley Works and Eastern Villages proposals in the adopted Chesterfield Borough Core Strategy and emerging draft Local Plan.
Whilst recognising the uncertainty in the end form of development we do believe that the policy should nonetheless identify the range of uses that would be considered acceptable on the site and some indication of the potential scale of development.

Should you have any queries about the above comments or require clarification on any points, please do not hesitate to contact me.

8410 **(Support) Policy SS7: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]
Received: 18/6/2018 via Email
We welcome the additional points included within the policy to take into account flood risk, to protect the water quality of the River Doe Lea and to protect and enhance biodiversity.

We note that a comprehensive masterplan is required which would include the infrastructure requirements for the site which presumably will include providing adequate sewage infrastructure as part of this.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
The Environment Agency supports the publication of this Local Plan.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is legally complaint.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is sound.

We have the following comments to make in regard to the policies and sections of the Local Plan when we previously responded to the draft Local Plan.

Policy SS7: Strategic Regeneration Site - Former Coalite Chemical Works site

We welcome the additional points included within the policy to take into account flood risk, to protect the water quality of the River Doe Lea and to protect and enhance biodiversity.

We note that a comprehensive masterplan is required which would include the infrastructure requirements for the site which presumably will include providing adequate sewage infrastructure as part of this.

8591 **(Object) Policy SS7: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]
Received: 25/6/2018 via Email
The Supplementary Planning Guidance needs to consider the impact of the development on biodiversity and ensure that habitat creation and enhancement is delivered as part of the overall development such that no net loss of biodiversity occurs.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.
(Support) Policy SS7: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: iSec Group (Sophie Watkin) [4539] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

In summary we have suggested a number of amendments to the wording of the Policy SS7 (see attachment).

Much of this can easily be done by differentiating between the two sites / permissions which would present a far more accurate representation of what is actually happening on the ground.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

Changes to Plan:
Our suggested changes do not equate to challenge on soundness of the Plan as a whole or legal compliance, rather amendments we feel will provide a more accurate and up to date framework and policy position for the BDC part of the site.

Representation at Examination:
Reason for appearance: To provide the most up-to-date information and evidence about the timing of the remediation and phased delivery of the site.

(Object) Policy SS7: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Policy SS7: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - criteria (c) - It is recommended that 'protect' be replaced with 'conserve or enhance' in line with NPPF terminology. 'Conserve' has a useful definition in the NPPF glossary which makes provision for management and more flexibility than 'protect'.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Support) Policy SS8: Pleasley Vale Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]
Received: 18/6/2018 via Email

We note the additional regeneration area proposed at Pleasley Vale. We welcome the requirements for any future development to have to provide an NPPF compliant flood risk assessment (FRA), taking into account the flood zones and the respective uses allowed in each flood zone.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
The Environment Agency supports the publication of this Local Plan.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is legally complaint.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is sound.

We have the following comments to make in regard to the policies and sections of the Local Plan when we previously responded to the draft Local Plan.

Policy SS8: Pleasley Vale Regeneration Area

We note the additional regeneration area proposed at Pleasley Vale. We welcome the requirements for any future development to have to provide an NPPF compliant flood risk assessment (FRA), taking into account the flood zones and the respective uses allowed in each flood zone.
**Support** Policy SS8: Pleasley Vale Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Flood Risk Comments

- The LLFA notes that the Mill sites are located within flood zone 3. For further information in relation to flood risk attributed to Main Rivers, the LLFA recommends consultation with the Environment Agency.
- The LLFA notes that surface water is modelled to accumulate across the site, along the course of the River Meden in the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 critical storm duration. Please note that any variation to the land use of the site may exacerbate surface water flooding on and off site.
- The LLFA hold 2 records of historic flooding in proximity to the site.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

5427 (Support) Policy SS8: Pleasley Vale Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mansfield District Council (Ms Katie Mills) [9744]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Mansfield District Council supports the inclusion of Policy SS8 Pleasley Vale Regeneration Area, as the vale faces important issues in terms of its long term future which are clearly outlined in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2009). Under the Duty to Cooperate both Bolsover District Council and Mansfield District Council have discussed the proposed policy to allow the re-use of the brownfield land and heritage assets, where employment, commercial and tourist related uses would be welcomed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see representations.

8988 **Support** Policy SS8: Pleasley Vale Regeneration Area - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Policy SS8: Pleasley Vale Regeneration Area - Notwithstanding the requirements of criteria (c) it is recommended that 'historic environment, heritage assets and their setting' be included after the 'special appearance and character of the area' wording for the avoidance of doubt.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

8396 (Support) Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: National Farmers Union (Mr P Tame) [3615]
Received: 18/5/2018 via Paper

We support Policy SS9 as a sensible approach for development on farms in the district.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
please refer to individual representations

8572 (Support) Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Specific recognition of the contribution that rural development can make to the District is welcome, including farm diversification.

As noted in the 'general' comment above, across the farmed estate, there is an ongoing need to modernise and take advantage of scale economies. Many existing farmsteads do not meet the needs of modern agriculture. Modern agricultural infrastructure no longer needs to be located in or near a village. Villages often provide constraints and conflicts with modern agricultural machinery, to the detriment of local amenity. There is therefore a strategic need for CST to rationalise/amalgamate farms (as tenancies expire), move farmsteads out of villages where necessary, and secure viable, deliverable redevelopment opportunities of vacated assets (including residential conversion of redundant barns).

Alongside, and as part of, this process of modernisation, diversification of activities within agricultural holdings is an essential part of ensuring the sustainability of the farm units and wider rural economy. The application of Policy SS8 must recognise that this is a dynamic process and some change to rural character (through the introduction of larger buildings suited to modern agricultural machinery and buildings for a more diverse range of uses) is inevitable. The countryside has long been a place of such evolutionary changes; application of the Local Plan should acknowledge and embrace such change.

---

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 13/6/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy SS9 sets out that 'Development proposals in the countryside outside development envelopes will only be granted planning permission where it can be demonstrated that they fall within one or more of the following categories'.

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

The intent of this criteria is seemingly clear, but the use of 'and other' rather than 'or other' would require proposals to be 'necessary' for all of the stated industry types, i.e. 'agriculture', 'horticulture', 'forestry' and 'other appropriate land based businesses', if they were to meet the requirements of policy.

The text should be amended to replace 'and other' with 'or other'.

---

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

**Changes to Plan:**
Criteria (b) should be amended to read:

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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We support this policy, with one modification: part (a) should read "involve a change of use or the re-use of
vacant, derelict or previously developed land, so long as the proposed use is sustainable and appropriate to the location."

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Part (a) should read "involve a change of use or the re-use of vacant, derelict or previously developed land, so long as the proposed use is sustainable and appropriate to the location."

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

---

**Object** Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Miss Megan Pashley [9623]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

As stated in our response to Policy SS3, Gladman do not support the use of settlement limits to restrict sustainable development opportunities from coming forward.

Gladman are of the view that Policy SS9 is overly prescriptive and inconsistent with the policy emphasis contained within the Framework. In its current form, the proposed policy would act to restrict sustainable development proposals from coming forward, for example those that are well related to sustainable settlements and the services that they contain. Additional flexibility should be included within the policy in order to ensure that it can be used as part of a balanced judgement between the three dimensions of sustainable development when determining planning applications.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Having considered the submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development policies. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination.

Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate success.

Please see attachment and representations.

**Document is not Sound**

---

**Object** Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Planning and Design Group (Mr Andrew Grayson) [12388]
**Respondent:** Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

This policy, in proposing land which falls into the countryside, is currently considered unsound as it is not fully justified in its approach and fails to account fully for the settlement context of Creswell. This representation also relates to Policy SC1: Development within the Development Envelope which acts to establish the principles of development within settlement boundaries.

The recognition that the redevelopment of brownfield land is an exception criterion to Policy SS9 is welcomed in principle. This accords with the sequential preference of brownfield land regeneration contained both in the draft Local Plan and NPPF.

Nevertheless, in relation to Creswell the proposed development boundaries place a large proportion of the former Creswell colliery under a countryside designation and as such objection is raised. Current development proposals are positively seeking to regenerate this land, however, designation as countryside would be detrimental to this sustainable development opportunity. In a degraded condition, land at the former Creswell colliery will never be able to effectively operate as a sympathetic part of the countryside. The land has historically formed a part of the settlement and to remove this designation is unjustified and arbitrary.

Fundamentally, the approach fails to recognise the character and nature of the site in the context of Creswell.
Without regeneration the former Creswell colliery will remain in a poor physical condition for many years to come. This is of severe detriment to Creswell’s local community who desire a positive solution for the former colliery land and no wider development benefits will be able to be drawn from the land. Overall, representing a ‘lose-lose’ situation where a brownfield site does not function in the countryside and a sustainable development opportunity is not brought forward.

In all, whilst the former Creswell colliery can still be regenerated under the criteria of Policy SS9, it is not justified, and indeed detrimental, to place the brownfield site under a countryside designation.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
For reasons that this is clearly not a site of a countryside context, as a cleared industrial site, and to accounting of needs throughout the plan period and positively to the future rather than just existing commitments, Policy SS9 should exclude land south of Colliery Road, Creswell from the present countryside designation. The site should be included within the settlement boundary of this settlement to accommodate the sustainable development of this brownfield site in what is an equally sustainable location.

Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: As a major landowner within the District, Welbeck manages a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities.

(Object) Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: As a major landowner within the District, Welbeck manages a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities.

(Support) Green Belt - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
Received: 8/6/2018 via Web

Paragraphs 4.68-4.69: We strongly support the reported findings of the Local Green Belt Review and the Council’s assessment of the exceptional circumstances. It is appropriate that the Council have undertaken a review of the Green Belt and considered the evidence put forward as part of the Local Plan process and this is in accordance with national guidance. We believe that the Council’s conclusion that exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green belt boundary in a limited way to allow for sustainable patterns of development and with the new boundary set using physical features likely to be permanent, is justified.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Paragraphs 4.68-4.69: We strongly support the reported findings of the Local Green Belt Review and the Council’s assessment of the exceptional circumstances. It is appropriate that the Council have undertaken a review of the Green Belt and considered the evidence put forward as part of the Local Plan process and this is in accordance with national guidance. We believe that the Council’s conclusion that exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green belt boundary in a limited way to allow for sustainable patterns of development and with the new boundary set using physical features likely to be permanent, is justified.

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.
### (Object) Green Belt - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Para 4.68 - inaccurate

We consider this finding of the Green Belt Review as stated here to be factually wrong, in two ways:

- The Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site does increase the coalescence of Barlborough and Clowne;
- The para implies that settlement merger is the key purpose of the Green Belt, when national policy makes no distinction between the five purposes, and when the strategic site clearly encroaches into the countryside.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

---

### (Object) Policy SS10: Development in the Green Belt - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** National Farmers Union (Mr P Tame) [3615]

**Received:** 18/5/2018 via Paper

We would like to see buildings necessary for farm and rural diversification added to the list of developments allowed in the green belt.

Too often diversification is not allowed in the green belt for the detriment of farm business situated there which cannot move out of the green belt and site development elsewhere.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
please refer to individual representations

**Changes to Plan:**
Add "and farm and rural diversification" to the end of "buildings necessary for the purposes of agriculture or forestry" in criteria (a) of Policy SS10.

**Document is not Sound**

---

### (Object) Policy SS10: Development in the Green Belt - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Pegasus Group (Leeds office) (Mr Edward Senior) [11947] (unconfirmed)

**Respondent:** ARBA Group (Mr Richard Burns) [10122]

**Received:** 11/6/2018 via Email

**Summary (Please refer to separate sheet for full representation)**

On behalf of ARBA Group, we strongly object to Policy SS10: Development in the Green Belt and specifically to the inclusion of parcel BARL/GB/01 from the Councils Green Belt review 2017. The inclusion of this parcel of land within the Green Belt is considered to be unsound.

The Green Belt Review identified that the parcel of land does not robustly meet Green Belt purposes and could be considered for release from the Green Belt.

The inclusion of the parcel of land does not conform with Paragraph 85 which states that local planning authorities should:
- not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open and define boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable.

In this case, the land would be surrounded by development to the north and east, with the M1 to the west. The parcel of land does not meet Green Belt purposes and therefore should be removed from the Green Belt.
Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please find enclosed our representation for the Publication Draft Consultation Draft

Changes to Plan:
It is considered that the Local Plan policy map should be amended to omit this parcel of land from the Green Belt. It does not meet the Green Belt purposes, it is unnecessary to keep the land permanently open and the land is not defined clearly using physical features which are readily recognisable. The Green Belt boundary therefore does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 85 of the NPPF and therefore is unsound. The land should no longer be retained in the Green Belt and the eastern edge of the green belt boundary on the proposals map should instead be defined by the M1.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Written representation

8830 (Object) Policy SS10: Development in the Green Belt - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Policy SS10: Development in the Green Belt - not positively prepared

We support this policy, with one modification: part (f) should read “limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, which would not have a greater impact on the openness or purpose of the Green Belt, and would be sustainable and appropriate to its location”.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

Changes to Plan:
Part (f) should read “limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, which would not have a greater impact on the openness or purpose of the Green Belt, and would be sustainable and appropriate to its location”.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

8891 (Support) Policy SS10: Development in the Green Belt - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The Coal Authority supports the identification in this policy that mineral extraction may be an acceptable form of development in the Green Belt.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Representation at Examination: Written representation

8956 (Object) Policy SS10: Development in the Green Belt - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Policy SS10 sets out a detailed policy for the assessment of the impacts of new development on the Green Belt, which is fully compatible with the policy for Green Belt in the NPPF and appropriately sets out the range of appropriate uses within the Green Belt and the exceptions to the normal policy of development constraint. The inclusion of this policy is fully supported as it will give increased certainty and clarity to developers and the public on to the application of Green Belt policy at the local level.

However, DCC's previous concerns made its response on the CDLP are reaffirmed that the Local Plan should set out a clear commitment that the principle role of the North East Derbyshire Green Belt will be maintained. It is
suggested that this commitment is set out in the first paragraph of Policy SS9.

As noted in the comments set out above, the County Council’s previous concerns about the amendment to Green Belt boundaries in association with the Clowne Garden Village allocation have been largely addressed by the District Council’s Green Belt Review, which has concluded that the parcels of land within the Green Belt forming part of the scheme to accommodate new employment land would not compromise the main purpose of the North East Derbyshire Green Belt in preventing the coalescence of settlements in North East Derbyshire.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

8544 (Object) Policy SS11: Development in Important Open Breaks - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Mr Richard Cobb [11878] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Mr James Wild [4393]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

Whitwell is defined as rural large village in the settlement hierarchy and the proposed Spatial Strategy Policy SS3 directs sustainable development to small and emerging towns and then to large villages including Whitwell.

Provision is made in the emerging new Local Plan for an additional 218 houses in the Whitwell, of which over 200 are proposed on the former colliery site south of the village. Redevelopment of that site along the lines of the masterplan shown in the Local Plan is likely to take many years to produce housing to meet the short and medium needs of the village for affordable housing. That is large site which, while supported cannot deliver housing in the short term.

Both the 2017 Housing White Paper and recently published proposed revisions to the NPPF emphasise the importance of small and medium sized housing sites where housing can be delivered much quicker.

The Policies Map defines a settlement boundary for Whitwell on its eastern side which excludes two strips of land north and south of Welbeck Street which are both unused and are separately owned from any agricultural land in more open countryside to the east.

The Objection is thus that the new Local Plan fails to identify adequate small housing sites such as the example given to meet local housing needs especially for affordable housing or to take positive steps to enhance the important gap between Whitwell and Hodthorpe, policy for which is set out in SS11.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representation.

Changes to Plan:
The Council should designate these redundant fringe sites on the east edge of Whitwell for affordable housing, where well designed schemes would

* enhance the approach to the village
* introduce new housing with quality landscaping and tree planting
* remove eyesore sites subject to fly tipping
* make effective use of otherwise unused land and
* properly protect the important gap for the future giving it a firm defensible boundary.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To bring the Inspector’s attention to to these fringe areas of Whitwell which have not received proper consideration by the LPA despite repeated representations.
Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Policy SS11: Important Open Breaks - ineffective

We support the intention of this policy, but it is not robust and will therefore not be effective. It should make clear that development will "not normally be allowed in the open breaks, unless it can be clearly shown that an alternative location not affecting the open break cannot be found, and that the development does not detract from...."

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

Changes to Plan:
It should make clear that development will "not normally be allowed in the open breaks, unless it can be clearly shown that an alternative location not affecting the open break cannot be found, and that the development does not detract from...."

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination:
Reason for appearance: Appearance at the Examination
To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

8847 (Object) Policy SS11: Development in Important Open Breaks - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

North Policies Map
This clearly shows that the western part of the strategic site allocation should in fact be added to the Important Open Breaks designation, and that the proposed Green Belt change should not take place. Without these modifications, there is a very high risk of coalescence of Clowne and Barlborough.

South Policies Map
We would expect to see greater use of the Important Open Breaks policy to maintain more openness between South Normanton and the adjacent settlements, especially along the A38 corridor.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination:
Reason for appearance: Appearance at the Examination
To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

8879 (Object) Policy SS11: Development in Important Open Breaks - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The HBF suggests the Council should re-consider whether or not the level of protection proposed in Policy SS11 - Development in Important Local Breaks is justified.

There is no national policy for the provision of strategic gaps and no encouragement in Government policy to have such designations. The NPPF and NPPG make no reference to such designations and provide no advice on the detailed definition of boundaries. In these circumstances the Council should re-consider the principle of continuing with the designation of such areas of local separation.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC’s, regional developers
and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** To further discuss the matters raised.

**Support** Policy SS11: Development in Important Open Breaks - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

- **Respondent:** Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
- **Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email
- The use of 'Important Open Areas' is supported, particularly where it will help to respect aspects of landscape character such as nucleated settlement patterns and historic field patterns by preventing the coalescence of settlements.

**Object** Policy SS11: Development in Important Open Breaks - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

- **Respondent:** Miss Megan Pashley [9623]
- **Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email
- Gladman suggest that the Council reconsider the inclusion of this policy within the plan. There is no national policy for the provision of strategic gaps and no encouragement in Government policy to have such designations.

**Object** Policy SS11: Development in Important Open Breaks - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

- **Agent:** Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Pickrell) [12342]
- **Respondent:** Mr Basil Hill [2524]
- **Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email
- Representations are made in response to the proposal to include land to the east of Park Avenue, Glapwell within an extension to the Glapwell - New Houghton Important Open Space.

The site to the east of Park Avenue (as shown in withdrawn application ref. 17/00599/OUT) is bound by existing residential development to the south, west and with Glapwell Cricket Ground to the north. The site is well related to the historic core of the village with good potential access to services and facilities within the village and good public transport routes along the A617, linking to nearby villages and beyond.

The site is approx. 1km from Stony Houghton and New Houghton, with views of the area limited to long distance views from a public right of way. Views from the A617 are obscured by the topography of the area, partial roadside planting and existing development along the A617.

The land east of Park Avenue has very limited value in the visual break between Glapwell, New Houghton and Stony Houghton. The designation is unsound as it is excessively restrictive on future development of the site and adds a further barrier to the delivery of housing in a location where market demand makes residential
development both viable and deliverable. It also is not necessary as the visual break between New Houghton and Stony Houghton is sufficiently protected by other policies in the Local Plan, including SS9.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Further to the above consultation, please find enclosed representations concerning the emerging Plan’s draft Policy SS2: Scale of Development, Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development and Policy SS11: Important Open Breaks. You will note that the issues raised in these representations reflect those submitted during the earlier rounds of consultation regarding the emerging Local Plan’s Identified Strategic Options and Draft Local Plan, as well as those in relation to the now withdrawn Core Strategy. Ultimately, our concerns and objections remain.

Please see attached letter, site plans and individual representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
The inclusion of land to the east of Park Avenue is not necessary for the prevention of coalescence of Glapwell and Stony Houghton or New Houghton and presents an unnecessary restriction to the development of sustainable sites in a location where there is market demand for housing. As such, the extension of the designated Important Open Break, proposed in site ref. ALP 12, is unsound and should be omitted from the Local Plan.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To amplify and expand on the comments/concerns consistently raised during consultation.

---

9084

**Object** Policy SS11: Development in Important Open Breaks - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: IBA Planning Limited (Mr Nick Baseley) [4560]
Respondent: All Foundations (Planning Advisor) [10066]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Further to the Council’s consultation on the above document, my client, All Foundations (UK) Ltd, wishes to make the following representations.

We have previously written to the Council’s Policy Section on 22 June 2016 advising of our client’s need to expand their existing employment site, or to redevelop their existing site for housing as a means to fund the relocation of the existing premises elsewhere.

At the same time, we submitted a formal pre-application enquiry to your Development Management colleagues which highlighted the constraints imposed by the current Local Plan - more particularly, by the extent of the existing settlement envelope and open space designation.

In addition, we have also made representations to the previous Consultation Local Plan in December 2016 (further copy enclosed for ease of reference) seeking the review of the current open space designation to remove the land within my client's ownership, immediately to the south of Primrose Business Park, to enable the reasonable expansion of the existing business park (to ensure the employment site remains within the settlement), or as part of the redevelopment of the existing employment site as a housing site/allocation as the only means of funding the relocation of the business to alternative employment premises.

In either scenario, as previously stated, my client is entirely flexible in terms of the design/form the development on the land presently beyond the settlement boundary would take so as to avoid visual encroachment and ensure better assimilation within the rural setting.

It was hoped that, as a local business/employer, my client’s development requirements could be satisfactorily incorporated into the new Local Plan to enable the continued sustainable growth of this local business either within Blackwell, or at an alternative location within the District (funded as it will need to be via residential redevelopment) - rather than to lose a valuable source of local employment to a neighbouring authority.

However, this appears to have been overlooked and my client’s land to the south of Primrose Business Park continues to remain within the open space designation.

Accordingly, my client is not able to support the Publication Draft Local Plan in its current form.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

See representations and attached site plan.

**Changes to Plan:**
In order to remedy the situation, the Council is requested to remove that additional land owned by my client to the south of the existing business park from the open space designation and include it within the settlement boundary for Blackwell.
Again, as before, my client will be happy to discuss their particular requirements (and how these might be accommodated within Blackwell/the new Local Plan) with you further as a consequence of these representations and in advance of submission of the Local Plan for Examination.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Written representation

9121

(Object) Policy SS11: Development in Important Open Breaks - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Chris Jesson) [9530] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Welbeck Estates Company Ltd ("The Estate") supports the principle of Important Open Breaks (IOB) where they are reasonably applied on the basis of a robust evidence base. While it is understood that Important Open Breaks can contribute to the identity of individual settlements and guide development to appropriate locations, we have concerns at this stage of the Local Plan at the way in which revisions to the policy are applied and are not fully evidenced.

As has been identified in representations to previous Local Plan consultations, there is a need to consider amendments to the Important Open Break between Whitwell and Hodthorpe to better provide for growth opportunities on the former Whitwell Colliery site and meet the regenerative intentions of the site’s strategic allocation (Policy SS6). We consider there is a role for the Whitwell-Hodthorpe Important Open Break but its current form is not fully justified.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
Policy SS11 has not been informed by objectively assessed need nor has the Council, in acknowledgement of completing a purely desk based exercise, fully evidenced the purpose and significance of the Whitwell-Hodthorpe Important Open Break.

In support of the emerging development proposals for the Whitwell Colliery site, Welbeck has completed their own review of the Important Open Break between Whitwell and Hodthorpe. The opportunity to robustly review Important Open Breaks has so far been missed. In its current form, the IOB is not sufficiently justified or evidenced, in accordance with the principles of the NPPF and broader policy aspirations within the emerging Local Plan. The most relevant and sound position to base the IOB boundary on is the technical evidence as prepared by P&DG and DSA Environment + Design Ltd (enclosed with these representations ref: P&DG 13.012/ IOAR). This suggested a broad review of the IOA that retained a safeguarded zone between the two villages to protect against their coalescence, but also crucially extended the designation towards the edge of Belph and its Conservation Area.

The Council defines this particular Open Break in ref: ALP17 of the Important Open Break Review (2017) to serve "as a strong protection against coalescence of the settlements, and should be maintained. Development north of Station Road may be acceptable if a deep and well landscaped northern boundary was provided to mitigate against the significant reduction in the existing open break." It is not substantiated why there is a significance of depth of a landscaping buffer nor an answer to the question of whether a meaningful buffer can be achieved at a shorter depth. Landscape advice would suggest that the significance and purpose of a landscape buffer is not defined on its depth, but its density and variety. Both of which can be achieved equally as successfully at shallower depths. The development proposes a strong boundary at a shallower depth in recognition of this to the north, but in doing so it will enhance an expansion of the parkland setting beyond that is more dispersed and offers greater openness to satisfy the Important Open Break characteristics. In turn, coalescence is safeguarded not least by the expansion of this parkland area, but its relationship with the community woodland, allotments and recreation ground that make up the remainder of the gap with Hodthorpe, all of which contribute to safeguard this space from the coalescence of the two settlements. To omit the land altogether would unnecessarily stifle the holistic planning of this development with those land uses to the north which play an important contribution to the proposed new community by virtue of public open space, recreation and allotment space, and would leave an agricultural field of a size with little potential for intensive farming.

In order to meet the aspirations of the emerging Local Plan and the Council’s housing growth needs in full, residential development is proposed at the former Whitwell Colliery site including land north of Station Road, beyond that currently identified by Policy SS6. This additional land has also been subject to extensive public consultation and technical appraisal. Please see our separate representations in respect of Policy SS6.

Moving away from purely the area subject to the IOB, the proposed development will be inclusive of additional green infrastructure along the entirety of its western, northern and eastern boundaries and over 25ha of land
representing the former colliery that is to be landscaped, including green links and trails, biodiversity enhancements, and formal connectivity to Whitwell and Hodthorpe villages and is such that without the additional land proposed for development, some of the wider green infrastructure, landscape and connectivity opportunities of this site are also lost or not f...
In CPRE's view, the OAN and housing requirement need to be revisited in the light of both the new standardised DHCLG methodology, and our comments on job density.

The Plan does not itself contain an employment growth target, but the Employment Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) (para 2.43) provides a figure of 4,100 net additional jobs by 2030, which is 16 years of the 19 year plan period. The Plan would therefore envisage 4,352 new homes over the same period (at 272pa), which is in a ratio of 1.06 homes per job. The District’s current job density is approximately 1.2 homes per job, so clearly a plan that sought to rectify relatively low job density would require the new homes and jobs over the plan period to be in a ratio of less than 1.

The SHMA update 2017 finds a demographic baseline of 247 homes per annum, and concludes that an uplift to 272pa is appropriate to support both affordability and economic growth. However, the new DHCLG methodology gives an OAN of 244pa including the affordability adjustment. This difference has not been adequately analysed.

In any case, the DHCLG figure of 244pa would give 4,636 homes over the plan period, or 3,904 over the period to 2030 for which a job growth figure is identified. That would provide a job density ratio of 0.95 homes per job, which would seem more appropriate in the light of the District’s current job density and the need to reduce out-commuting.

Whilst we are concerned that the 10% flexibility buffer is arbitrary, we understand the logic for applying a buffer, and doing so to the DHCLG figure would give a total of 5,100 homes over the plan period.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.
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Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

---

Currently under the NPPF the Council should be proactively supporting sustainable development to deliver needed homes by identifying and then meeting housing needs (para 17) in particular the Council should be significantly boosting the supply of housing (para 47). The Council should also ensure that its assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are fully integrated (para 158). The NPPG currently advises that housing need should be assessed in relation to the relevant functional area known as the HMA (ID 2a-008). An OAHN should be unconstrained (ID 2a004) and the NPPG recommends the use of its standard methodology (ID 2a-005). This methodology is a three stage process comprising :-

* Demographic (based on past population change and Household Formation Rates (HFR)) (ID 2a-015 - 017) ;
* Economic (to accommodate and not jeopardise future job growth) (ID 2a-018) ;
* Market signals (to consider undersupply relative to demand) (ID 2a-019 & 020) ;
* Affordable housing need is separately assessed (ID 2a-022 - 028) but delivering affordable housing can be a consideration for increasing planned housing provision (ID 2a-029).

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC’s, regional developers and small, local
builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new “for sale” market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To discuss these matters in greater detail.

(Object) Scale of Housing Provision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
In conclusion, the Plan is unsound in respect of :-

* a lack of contingency in the Council’s HLS.

See attachment for full discussion.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC’s, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new “for sale” market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To discuss these matters in greater detail.

(Object) Scale of Housing Provision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) – East Midlands office (Ms Caroline Richardson) [11698] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Woodall Homes [5247]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The Publication Local Plan proposes to meet its housing requirement through a combination of completions, expected completions, strategic site allocations and other site allocations.

Unfortunately, the delivery of large strategic sites is often unreliable for a variety of reasons. The HBF comments on the Publication Local Plan identifies constraints to the delivery of large sites such as the constrained logistics of sites, discharge of precommencement planning conditions, limited availability of skilled labour, limited supplies of building materials, provision of local transport infrastructure, limited availability of capital, slow speed of installation by utility companies, difficulties of land remediation, absorption sales rates of open market housing and limitations on open market housing receipts to cross subsidise affordable housing.

Overall, it is considered that the Council’s proposed approach to OAN is highly inflexible and, as such, poses situations whereby the District’s five-year land position will be undermined and render the emerging Local Plan policies on housing out-of-date. This inflexibility demonstrates that the Local Plan will not be able to respond to rapidly changing circumstances as required by paragraph 153 of the Framework.

Please see attachment for full case.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to attachment and representations.

Changes to Plan:
In order to make the plan sound we believe that the Council should fully understand the potential unmet housing need from the Sheffield City Region, and the likely ‘ripple effect’ this will have upon the City’s neighbouring authorities’ ability to meet their own housing need as well as achieving the Duty to Co-operate.

To provide an uplift in planned housing land supply during the plan period a larger contingency buffer (a minimum of 20%) should be put in place, to ensure an appropriate level of flexibility to the housing land supply. To achieve this flexibility the Council should look beyond the minimum provision the Plan is based upon and allocate additional sites for residential development and / or introduce some reserved sites into the process.
In this regard, we consider it necessary for the Publication Local Plan to include additional residential sites for Clowne to ensure that any additional housing requirements can be met across the District and also ensuring that a wide range of housing opportunities are provided.

In particular, we consider that the parcel of land subject to this representation which is located adjacent to the proposed 'Development Envelope' for Clowne should be allocated for residential development.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** It is important that we are able to participate in the Hearing Sessions. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the merits of the site subject to this representation in relation to the future growth of Clowne and the obvious housing opportunities available. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for additional allocations and future reserve sites to allow for a suitable buffer in the context of the housing requirements for the District.

---

**Object** Scale of Housing Provision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

The Publication Local Plan proposes to meet its housing requirement through a combination of completions, expected completions, strategic site allocations and other site allocations.

The HBF comments on the Publication Local Plan identifies constraints to the delivery of large sites such as the constrained logistics of sites, discharge of precommencement planning conditions, limited availability of skilled labour, limited supplies of building materials, provision of local transport infrastructure, limited availability of capital, slow speed of installation by utility companies, difficulties of land remediation, absorption sales rates of open market housing and limitations on open market housing receipts to cross subsidise affordable housing.

Overall, the Council has failed to prepare the Plan in a sound fashion by not including land to the rear of 64 Hardwick Street as part of the existing proposed allocation 'land south of Overmoor View' nor has the plan allowed for windfall sites, which the representation site would be perfectly suited for should an allocation not be provided as part of the Plan process.

Please see attachment for full case.

**Changes to Plan:**
In order to make the plan sound we believe that the Council should fully understand the potential unmet housing need from the Sheffield City Region, and the likely 'ripple effect' this will have upon the City's neighbouring authorities' ability to meet their own housing need as well as achieving the Duty to Co-operate.

To provide an uplift in planned housing land supply during the plan period a larger contingency buffer (a minimum of 20%) should be put in place, to ensure an appropriate level of flexibility to the housing land supply. To achieve this flexibility the Council should look beyond the minimum provision the Plan is based upon and allocate additional sites for residential development and / or introduce some reserved sites into the process.

Accordingly, land to the rear of 64 Hardwick Street, Tibshelf should be allocated for residential development either as part of the existing proposed allocation 'land south of Overmoor View' or at least as a reserved site, to aid in the flexibility of the Council achieving its planned housing land supply.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** It is important that we are able to participate in the Hearing Sessions. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the merits of the site subject to this representation in relation to the future growth of Tibshelf and the obvious housing opportunities available. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for additional allocations and future reserve sites to allow for a suitable buffer in the context of the housing requirements for the District.
The Publication Local Plan proposes to meet its housing requirement through a combination of completions, expected completions, strategic site allocations and other site allocations.

The HBF comments on the Publication Local Plan identifies constraints to the delivery of large sites such as the constrained logistics of sites, discharge of precommencement planning conditions, limited availability of skilled labour, limited supplies of building materials, provision of local transport infrastructure, limited availability of capital, slow speed of installation by utility companies, difficulties of land remediation, absorption sales rates of open market housing and limitations on open market housing receipts to cross subsidise affordable housing.

The Council has failed to positively prepare the Plan in a sound, justified and effective fashion which is consistent with national policy by not including land north of Mooracre Lane as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan. The site has been proven to be available, suitable and achievable for residential development and is not physically constrained in any way that would prevent the development of the site. The site would make a considerable contribution towards meeting the evidenced OAN of the District and would relieve pressure to develop in other, less sustainable locations.

Please see attachment for full case.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to attachments and representations.

Changes to Plan:
In order to make the plan sound we believe that the Council should fully understand the potential unmet housing need from the Sheffield City Region, and the likely 'ripple effect' this will have upon the City's neighbouring authorities' ability to meet their own housing need as well as achieving the Duty to Co-operate.

To provide an uplift in planned housing land supply during the plan period a larger contingency buffer (a minimum of 20%) should be put in place, to ensure an appropriate level of flexibility to the housing land supply. To achieve this flexibility the Council should look beyond the minimum provision the Plan is based upon and allocate additional sites for residential development and / or introduce some reserved sites into the process.

Accordingly, land north of Mooracre Lane, Bolsover should be allocated for residential development. The site has been assessed favourably in the HLAA and would align harmoniously with the forthcoming proposed allocation to the south of Mooracre Lane to provide a highly sustainable extension to Bolsover.

Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: It is important that we are able to participate in the Hearing Sessions. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the merits of the site subject to this representation in relation to the future growth of Bolsover and the obvious housing opportunities available. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for additional allocations and future reserve sites to allow for a suitable buffer in the context of the housing requirements for the District.

(Support) Housing Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

It is supported in principle that Policy LC1 identifies a range of 22 proposed housing allocations that would meet the full housing requirement as set out in Policy SS2. Each of these proposed allocations, however, would raise a range of infrastructure requirements to support their development particularly primary and secondary school place provision (including new schools), highway and access improvements and Green Infrastructure. It is noted that a number of the proposed allocations already benefit from planning permission. DCC has previously provided officer developer contributions comments on these sites, which remain largely relevant to their development. Under the Duty to Co-operate BDC is requested to liaise with DCC on an ongoing basis to identify and secure the strategic infrastructure requirements that would be required to support the development of the proposed allocation sites in order to ensure that they provide for a sustainable form of development. As you will be aware DCC has established regular meetings with the District Council to discuss key infrastructure requirements associated with new housing development in the district, particularly new school place requirements.

In this respect it is noted and welcomed that the background text on pages 61 to 64 sets out details of the individual allocations and identifies key infrastructure requirements for each allocated site, including the need for education, highways and Green Infrastructure improvements. It is also noted and welcomed that Policy LC1
indicates that the District Council will impose conditions on planning permissions or seek to enter into planning obligations to secure the expected infrastructure requirements for each site. This should help to ensure that developer contributions required by DCC to facilitate key infrastructure improvements is appropriately secured.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

---

8317 **(Support) Policy LC1: Housing Allocations a) Land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane, Bolsover - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: Mr John Adamson [9674]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Paper

We fully support the Council’s decision for the inclusion to the new local plan of the land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane, Bolsover.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
We fully support the Council's decision for the inclusion to the new local plan of the land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane, Bolsover.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

8330 **(Support) Policy LC1: Housing Allocations a) Land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane, Bolsover - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd - Sheffield office (Mr Michael Bamford) [11835] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Pace Properties Ltd [11901]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Web

We support the wording of Policy LC1 a) Land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane, Bolsover. However, We recommend that the allocations are set out in a table stating the capacity of each site, as currently set out in the text at paragraphs 5.16 - 5.40. This approach will provide clarity and ensure that the policy is robust in respect of the ability of allocated sites to meet the identified housing need, therefore ensuring soundness.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Policy LC1 sets out proposed housing allocations including LC1 a) Land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane, Bolsover.

The provision of new housing on the proposed allocation site will support the vitality of businesses within the settlement. In accordance with paragraph 38 of the Framework, this site is sustainable in terms of its proximity to essential shops, services and facilities.

We support the wording of Policy LC1 but suggest that it is worded to includes the maximum and minimum acceptable number of dwellings in order to provide certainty to developers in an area of relatively low sale value vs build costs.

We recommend that the allocations are set out in a table stating the capacity of each site, as currently set out in the text at paragraphs 5.16 - 5.40. This approach will provide clarity and ensure that the policy is robust in respect of the ability of allocated sites to meet the identified housing need, therefore ensuring soundness.

---

9126 **(Support) Policy LC1: Housing Allocations c) Land between Shuttlewood Road and Oxcroft Lane, Bolsover - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

15/00076/OUT should continue to be allocated as a sustainable housing development.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound
**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable.

---

(8278) **(Object)** Policy LC1: Housing Allocations e) Land at Brookvale, Shirebrook - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Mr C Fritchley [2237]

**Received:** 13/6/2018 via Web

 rejection of the proposal to expand brookvale and suggested replacment

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

The expansion of the Brookvale site contradicts a number of the aims outlined in this consultation document. By expanding the site we would be increasing urban sprawl, removing development away from local services and sustainable transport. One of the plans aims is to cater for an aging population, further expansion of this site would increase reliance on motor vehicle and result in increased isolation of the elderly from local shops, doctors surgeries and other community resources.

A better proposal would be to expand the settlement framework to include land around the railway station. By expanding the development boundary to the boundary of the district council 4 hectares of land would be available for housing, this land would be within a few meters of the railway station and within easy walking distance of the town center.

In support of this proposal I include the following paragraphs from the proposed new local plan:

Objective H: Sustainable Transport

To reduce the need for people to travel by car and reduce out-commuting through

a) Directing growth towards the most sustainable settlements

b) Providing more employment in the District

c) Working with others to improve public transport (bus and rail) services in the District

d) Encouraging provision for walking and cycling to help develop walkable settlements

8.58

To ensure that development growth leads to sustainable transport patterns, the Local Plan for Bolsover District directs the majority of its planned growth to the District’s most sustainable settlements.

a) Good proximity, i.e. within 400 metres walking distance, to existing bus or rail service stops

Policy ITCR10: Supporting Sustainable Transport Patterns

Planning permission will be granted where new development and the provision of services are located so as to support sustainable transport patterns and the use of the District’s sustainable transport modes.

When the proposed expansion of the Brookvale site was raised at a local consultation event we were told that the site was owned by a pseudo public body and the council had an obligation to use the site, I am sure that the council's obligation to this companies “shareholders” will not override the needs of our local community but it would be much appreciated if the council would look again at more sustainable sites before agreeing to the further expansion of a site that the council has acknowledged in that the past is unpopular with residents due to its isolation.

**Changes to Plan:**

reconsideration of proposal

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

(9165) **(Object)** Policy LC1: Housing Allocations h) Land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, Alfreton Road, South Normanton - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
The allocation has the potential to harm the setting of GII* Carnfield Hall and the Carnfield Hall Conservation Area and it is not clear how the historic environment is addressed in relation to the Plan. For the purposes of the Plan guiding future development it is recommended that a requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the heritage assets, including views out of and within the undesignated designed landscape setting of Carnfield Hall (which is included in the designated as a Conservation Area) is included in this paragraph.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

8492 **(Support)** Policy LC1: Housing Allocations i) Land at Town End Farm, Lees Lane, South Normanton - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]
Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

Draft Plan Summary Comment: We support the proposal for a residential allocation of the land as delineated at Appendix 1. We do however kindly request that the Council consider marginally increasing the proposed scale of development on site from 'approximately 40' to in the order to 50 units, given that the site has been demonstrated within earlier draft masterplans (see Appendix 3) to be capable of accommodating such a scale of development.

Furthermore, we seek the delivery of the allocation of the land delineated at Appendix 1 within the first five years of the Plan, as opposed to the current proposal for delivery between years 6 and 15. This can be justified on the basis of significant developer interest in the site, and a desire by the landowner to bring the site forward as soon as feasible.

The minor amendments being proposed within these representations are justified and will assist in securing the delivery of a sound Plan.

Please refer to attachment.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
Draft Plan Summary Comment: We support the proposal for a residential allocation of the land as delineated at Appendix 1. We do however kindly request that the Council consider marginally increasing the proposed scale of development on site from 'approximately 40' to in the order to 50 units, given that the site has been demonstrated within earlier draft masterplans (see Appendix 3) to be capable of accommodating such a scale of development.

Furthermore, we seek the delivery of the allocation of the land delineated at Appendix 1 within the first five years of the Plan, as opposed to the current proposal for delivery between years 6 and 15. This can be justified on the basis of significant developer interest in the site, and a desire by the landowner to bring the site forward as soon as feasible.

Reason for appearance: To detail the justification for additional development on site.

8184 **(Object)** Policy LC1: Housing Allocations p) Land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Sonia Pidduck [11773]
Received: 8/5/2018 via Web

Resident of one of the houses on Victoria road

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Resident of one of the houses on Victoria road
### Changes to Plan:
I don’t think there is a capacity for the village to have a new estate. Couple of new houses where the pubs were that’s fine but not whole estates. The roads are already too busy, schools and surgery is already overcrowded, it’s easy to say it will have easy access to a38 but why should people be travelling out of the village to seek medical advice or education

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8574</th>
<th><strong>(Support) Policy LC1: Housing Allocations u)Land between 11 and 19 Back Lane, Palterton - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 13/6/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocation 'u) Land between 11 and 19 Back Lane, Palterton' is supported. This land is owned by CST and benefits from an extant outline planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 11no. dwellings with access from Main Street and Back Lane (ref.16/00410/OUT). The site is being progressed towards the market and delivery, following the approval of a future reserved matters application, is expected within 5 years.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8450</th>
<th><strong>(Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: W.A.Barnes LLP (Mr Nigel Carnall) [11783] (unconfirmed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Executors of E. Reddish (Planning Advisor) [4269]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 4/6/2018 via Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My clients were unaware of the call for sites under the SHLAA and therefore did not make any representations for their site fronting Common Lane / Little Lane, Shirebrook. A site information sheet has been submitted to Bolsover Council. The site is surrounded by Housing on two sides and is within walking distance of the town centre shops, schools, bus stops, and doctor’s surgeries, etc, Shirebrook has had less than 1% growth over the last few years.

145 and 147 Delivery of Housing. I believe this particular site would help the Housing needs of Shirebrook and allow it to grow the site will probably sustain 50-60 dwellings. We believe the site is not necessarily deliverable.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representation

**Changes to Plan:**
We believe that the local plan is not sound on the basis that it fails to address the housing needs of Shirebrook and this particular site complied with the objectives to reduce the needs to travel and also enables efficient use of sites within the town.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8455</th>
<th><strong>(Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: Sigma Planning Services (Mr Chris Hough) [10113] (unconfirmed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Paul Burton) [8873]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 23/5/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re-install site c) Land at Blind Lane, Bolsover into the list of housing allocations in policy LC1 together with Paragraph 5.16 o the Consultation Draft Local Plan October 2016. Include the site within the Development Envelope boundary.

Please refer to attachments.
Re-install site c) Land at Blind Lane, Bolsover into the list of housing allocations in policy LC1 together with Paragraph 5.16 of the Consultation Draft Local Plan October 2016. Include the site within the Development Envelope boundary.

8496 **(Object)** Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Mr Lee Johnson [5240]
**Received:** 12/6/2018 via Email

Attached is the information used to object to the Consultation draft in October 2016 which has since been compounded further by the lack of housing delivery across the whole of the District. At 1.18 in the draft it states that in consultation with three other Housing Market Area authorities option b) a housing target of 240 dwellings be adopted. In March of this year the MHCLG published its draft revisions to the NPPF and Chapter 5 Countryside and Housing it provides for the development of exception sites for entry - level homes (suitable for first - time buyers or those looking to rent their first home) on sites outside existing settlements, on land not already allocated for housing - unless the need for such homes is already being met within the local planning authorities area and needs to be able to adapt to emerging NPPF policies/recommendations.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Attached is the information used to object to the Consultation draft in October 2016 which has since been compounded further by the lack of housing delivery across the whole of the District.

**Changes to Plan:**
In view of my response to Q.3 I feel that due recognition should be given to the NPPF revisions and provision should be made in any emerging policy/s for the possible outcome to be accommodated. It could be specifically attached to non-delivery of housing numbers but should be able to take into account any revisions to the NPPF over the period of the plan i.e. 15 years.

Document is not Sound
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**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

8527 **(Object)** Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** J. Nicholson & Son (Mr Ian Nicholson) [11996] (unconfirmed)
**Respondent:** J. Nicholson & Son (Messers Andrew and Ian Nicholson) [3070]
**Received:** 14/6/2018 via Email

Representation form (15.12 2015) : Ref BOL-CLOW-046

Proposed 2.60 ha of land on Church Lane, Clowne as a sustainable settlement, bound by residential properties to the south and east, with good access, and close to local amenities.

Previous developers have suggested sympathetic future development that would enhance the current setting and compliment the existing character of the area.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound

8543 **(Object)** Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Mr Richard Cobb [11878] (unconfirmed)
**Respondent:** Mr James Wild [4393]
**Received:** 14/6/2018 via Email

The Objector’s interest here is in respect of land at the rear of an existing row of ex-colliery cottages served off the Parkway, south of Welbeck Street, which back onto the village boundary. That strip of land amounting to around 0.2 hectares - a more detailed site plan of which is attached - was allotments many years ago but has deteriorated in recent years such that it is now a derelict site subject to fly tipping.

Representation by the Objector in the past as part of the evolving new Local Plan process have urged the Council
to consider designation the land for housing purposes.

The objection is thus that the new Local Plan fails to identify adequate small housing sites such as the example given to meet local housing needs especially for affordable housing or to take positive steps to enhance the important gap between Whitwell and Hodthorpe, policy for which is set out in SS11.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representation.

Changes to Plan:
The Council should designate these redundant fringe sites on the east edge of Whitwell for affordable housing, where well designed schemes would

* enhance the approach to the village
* introduce new housing with quality landscaping and tree planting
* remove eyesore sites subject to fly tipping
* make effective use of otherwise unused land and
* properly protect the important gap for the future giving it a firm defensible boundary.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination:
Reason for appearance: To bring the Inspector's attention to to these fringe areas of Whitwell which have not received proper consideration by the LPA despite repeated representations.

8550 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: WYG (Leeds office) (Mr Mike Ashworth) [11997]
Respondent: Homes England (Ms Gill Hay) [11998]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

Our client is concerned that the scale of housing provision identified in the strategic allocations and allocations (policies SS4, SS5, SS6 and LC1) will be ineffective in delivering the overall housing requirement and as such are considered unsound.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
This representation questions the soundness of the Bolsover Local Plan Publication Draft and recommends the inclusion of an additional housing allocation at Pinxton to ensure that the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The inclusion of an additional deliverable housing allocation would assist with boosting significantly the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF and contribute towards the Local Plan being positively prepared. In its absence, we consider that the Plan would be unsound and lack a reliable, deliverable housing supply for Pinxton, consistent with the overall strategy.

Changes to Plan:
The Council are urged to identify additional site allocations which will deliver, in full, over the plan period. This will ensure that the overall housing requirement and a five-year supply can be demonstrated. The Council will be aware that our client is promoting the site at Talbot Road, Pinxton. Our client has an unrivalled record of site delivery which would assist the Council in plugging its delivery gap.

Document is not Sound

8562 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

CST controls land at the Small Towns of Bolsover and Shirebrook, and the Large Villages of Creswell and Whitwell, in addition to land in and around many of the Small Villages, which could contribute to the sustainable growth of those settlements in terms of both residential and employment development.

Through the Local Plan preparation, including its evidential process such as the SHLAA, a number of sites owned CST and suitable for residential development have been put forward for allocation. The Council has determined that many of those sites are not required within this Local Plan period to meet housing needs, and have therefore not been allocated within the emerging Local Plan. To that effect, Local Plan (including identified settlement frameworks (settlement boundaries)) do not respond positively to all opportunities for sustainable growth, that would generally accord with the objectives and policies of the emerging Local Plan. Should the Council, or the Inspector appointed to examine the Local Plan, consider that additional sites are required to meet OAN for new
housing, the following opportunities for residential development are available and deliverable, and as such could be allocated:

* Land north of Shirebrook Academy/land east of Common Lane, Shirebrook (SHLAA ref. BOL-SHIR-018).

The Shirebrook opportunity would represent a logical ‘rounding off’ of the north-western edge of the settlement, at a location that has good access to local facilities. Additional landscaping could be introduced to ensure an appropriate transition across the rural-urban boundary.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:
If additional sites are required allocate this site.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: The spatial strategy and distribution of development that will be supported by the Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (‘CST’) offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated, additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

8563 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

CST controls land at the Small Towns of Bolsover and Shirebrook, and the Large Villages of Creswell and Whitwell, in addition to land in and around many of the Small Villages, which could contribute to the sustainable growth of those settlements in terms of both residential and employment development.

Through the Local Plan preparation, including its evidential process such as the SHLAA, a number of sites owned CST and suitable for residential development have been put forward for allocation. The Council has determined that many of those sites are not required within this Local Plan period to meet housing needs, and have therefore not been allocated within the emerging Local Plan. To that effect, Local Plan (including identified settlement frameworks (settlement boundaries)) do not respond positively to all opportunities for sustainable growth, that would generally accord with the objectives and policies of the emerging Local Plan. Should the Council, or the Inspector appointed to examine the Local Plan, consider that additional sites are required to meet OAN for new housing, the following opportunities for residential development are available and deliverable, and as such could be allocated:

Land off Sheffield Road, Creswell (Agricultural land enveloped by urban development and isolated from the countryside; previously submitted as SHLAA site suggestion).

The above Creswell site is an isolated agricultural parcel located within an area that otherwise is clearly characterised as part of the settlement. To the south of the site (beyond the railway line) is residential development. To the north is a playing field with residential development immediately to the north of that. It is only after passing that residential development that the genuine edge of the settlement is reached. Residential development on the site would represent infill development, that could be accommodated without significant impacts on values of importance.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:
If additional sites are required to meet OAN for new housing, allocate this site.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: The spatial strategy and distribution of development that will be supported by the Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (‘CST’) offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated, additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management,
development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

8564 **(Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Responsant: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

* Land east of Skinner Street, Creswell (Land to north of proposed allocation LC1(p)). This site formed form part of allocation for residential development in the currently adopted Local Plan. BDC resolved to approve an outline application (all matters reserved except access) (ref. 10/00124/OUTMAJ) for residential development (180 dwellings) that included the site on 19th June 2013, submitted by Ben Bailey Homes. Subsequent to this, a full planning application (ref. 14/00079/FULMAJ) for 87 dwellings that excluded land under the control of CST land was approved on 24th July 2014. The masterplan submitted as part of that application indicated land to the north (i.e. CST land) as part of 'future phase 2 development area'. Within its 'Statement of Consultation - Consultation Draft Local Plan’ (September 2017), the Council states that the site ‘is bounded by houses to the north and west and remains within the settlement framework and could come forward for development as a windfall site’.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

**Changes to Plan:**
If additional sites are required to meet OAN for new housing, allocate this site.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** The spatial strategy and distribution of development that will be supported by the Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees ('CST') offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated, additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

8565 **(Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Responsant: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

* Land west of Skinner Street, Creswell (SHLAA ref. BOL-CRES-012. Agricultural land enclosed by Skinner Street to the east, Hazelmere Road to the north, route of former railway line to the west and residential development to the south. This site offers the potential for a comprehensive, masterplan-led extension to Creswell, including employment and residential development). It is recognised that the scale of this opportunity falls outside the distribution sought by the emerging Local Plan.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

**Changes to Plan:**
If additional sites are required to meet the OAN for new housing, allocate land as detailed in the response to Question 3.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** The spatial strategy and distribution of development that will be supported by the Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees ('CST') offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated, additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.
**8566**

**Object** Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Land off Worksop Road, Whitwell (Land on northern edge of settlement within easy access to local facilities, suitable for low density, high quality housing).

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

**Changes to Plan:**
If additional sites are required to meet OAN for new housing, allocate this site.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** The spatial strategy and distribution of development that will be supported by the Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees ('CST') offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated, additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

---

**8568**

**Object** Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

* Land off Selwyn Street, Hillstown, Bolsover (Land forming part of SHLAA ref. BOL-BOLS-032. An opportunity for 'rounding off' of Bolsover town, that could include additional land controlled by CST to the east with frontage to Langwith Road and Rotherham Road (B6417). A comprehensive scheme could provide employment as well as residential development opportunities).

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

**Changes to Plan:**
If additional sites are required to meet OAN for new housing, allocate this site.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** The spatial strategy and distribution of development that will be supported by the Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees ('CST') offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated, additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

---

**8899**

**Object** Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) - East Midlands office (Ms Caroline Richardson) [11698] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Woodall Homes [5247]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The allocation of the promoted land south of Ramper Avenue, Clowne (see attached plan), for housing would help achieve the Government's aims and objectives regarding the delivery of additional residential stock throughout the Country and serve to meet the specific objectively assessed housing need. There are no insurmountable physical constraints which would prevent the efficient use of this site for residential development.

Please see attachment for full case for proposed site.
Please refer to attachment and representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Allocate land south of Ramper Avenue, Clowne, for housing.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** It is important that we are able to participate in the Hearing Sessions. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the merits of the site subject to this representation in relation to the future growth of Clowne and the obvious housing opportunities available. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for additional allocations and future reserve sites to allow for a suitable buffer in the context of the housing requirements for the District.

---

(Object) **Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Agent:** DLP (Planning Ltd) - East Midlands office (Mr Ian Long) [12322] (unconfirmed)

**Respondent:** Keepmoat Homes [11415]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

This representation demonstrates that development of the land to the rear of 64 Hardwick Street, Tibshelf for housing has the following benefits:

* Efficient use of available land which will relate well with the completed 'land south of Overmoor View' development;
* Positive contribution towards achieving the planned housing land supply;
* Sympathetic with forthcoming and existing residential uses;
* Tibshelf is a sustainable location with a variety of services and facilities, and benefits from good public transport links.

Please see attachment for full case for proposed site.

---

(Object) **Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Miss Megan Pashley [9623]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

As the Council will be aware, Gladman have land interest off of Mansfield Road, Clowne. A site location plan can be found at Appendix 1 (refer to attachment).

An outline application (reference 17/00409/OUT), for up to 100 dwellings public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system was validated in August 2017. The application was refused by Bolsover District Council in November 2017.

The 4.24 ha application site comprises of 2 fields in agricultural use. It is well related to the settlement and it is contained by physical features at its urban edge. The development would represent a logical extension to Clowne. The site is well contained within the landscape and important trees and other landscape features are retained and the local highway network has capacity to accommodate the additional traffic associated with the development, without adverse impacts.

We consider the site to be a sustainable and viable location for growth and believe that up to 100 dwellings could
be delivered over a 4-year period. Gladman therefore request that the Council take note of the availability and suitability of the site should it be determined through this consultation or indeed through any subsequent Examination, that further development opportunities are required.

The delivery of the proposed development at land off Mansfield Road will bring benefits to the local community, including:

* The delivery of market and affordable housing in a sustainable location to meet housing needs;
* The provision of new public open space that is not currently available and a high-quality landscape setting, along with more informal recreation space and landscaping to meet the needs of existing and future residents;
* The creation of a high quality residential development which respects the character of the surrounding area.

The delivery of this scheme will result in significant benefits for the local community and surrounding area including the provision of New Homes Bonus payments, increasing the economic activity of the area and provide a number of aspirations that are currently being targeted by the Bolsover Local Plan.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Having considered the submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development policies. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination.

Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan’s ultimate success.

Please see attachment and representations.

Document is not Sound

9037 **(Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Agent:** Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Pickrell) [12342]
**Respondent:** Mr Basil Hill [2524]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Bolsover Road, Glapwell

As you are aware, and as previously submitted during earlier rounds of consultation (November 2015 and December 2016) and pre-application discussions, our client is promoting sites in Glapwell (Bolsover Road), where proposals for residential development would be appropriate and are considered deliverable within the next 5 years. Site plans and information forms for each have previously been provided to the Council and I enclose these again for ease of reference.

In brief, and for the sake of clarity, the site at Glapwell has been split into three. The first comprises the relocation of the existing Glapwell Nursery and redevelopment to provide 65 dwellings. This site incorporated the extant permission for redevelopment of part of the nursery site to provide 16 dwellings and was subject of application ref. 17/00598/OUT which was refused permission on 7 February 2018. The application is currently awaiting consideration at appeal. The second part of the site is to be accessed from Park Avenue, linking to the Nursery site and infilling an area of arable farm land between properties along the A617 and Glapwell Cricket Club to provide 65 dwellings. An application was made on 17 November 2017 (ref. 17/00599/OUT) but withdrawn prior to determination. The third part of the site is located to the east of Park Avenue, north of properties on the A617 and has the potential to provide a further 140 dwellings, providing a total of 260 dwellings across the three phases of development.

The sites being promoted are all located in Flood Zone 1 and therefore such allocations would be consistent with the sequential approach to development prescribed in the NPPF. All sites have access points available to the adopted Highway and their development would provide much needed market and affordable housing.

Ultimately these settlements and the sites therein are considered to be sustainable locations, providing access to services, facilities and employment opportunities including convenience stores, pubs, village hall/community centres, a vehicle garage, church and a hotel/B&B, in addition to sports and recreation facilities throughout. Scarcliffe and New Houghton also offer primary schools and it is noted that these are currently undersubscribed. The settlements also offer good public transport links to neighbouring settlements and include regular bus services to Nottingham, Chesterfield, Sheffield and Mansfield, along with easy access to Junction 29 of the M1.

Development of these sites for residential purposes will significantly assist with housing delivery in sustainable and logical extensions to the existing built settlements. The sites are all in single ownership and have no major constraints such that they are available and deliverable within 5 years. Consequently these sites are considered...
appropriate locations to meet housing needs in the area whilst providing vital support/custom to maintain the viability of services and boost the local economy.

As is set out in the attached representations, Glapwell, New Houghton and Scarcliffe are highly desirable, viable and deliverable locations that largely coalesce and function with the other neighbouring settlements such as Doe Lea / Bramley Vale and Pleasley. These settlements should not be discounted as cumulatively they provide a range of services, facilities, leisure and employment opportunities to support sustainable housing growth in this locality. Development of these sites for residential purposes will significantly assist with housing delivery through sustainable and logical extensions to the existing built settlements. The sites are all in single ownership and have no major constraints such that they are available and deliverable within 5 years. Consequently these sites are considered appropriate locations to meet housing needs in the area whilst providing v...

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Further to the above consultation, please find enclosed representations concerning the emerging Plan's draft Policy SS2: Scale of Development, Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development and Policy SS11: Important Open Breaks. You will note that the issues raised in these representations reflect those submitted during the earlier rounds of consultation regarding the emerging Local Plan's Identified Strategic Options and Draft Local Plan, as well as those in relation to the now withdrawn Core Strategy. Ultimately, our concerns and objections remain.

Please see attached letter, site plans and individual representations.

Changes to Plan:
Include land at Bolsover Road, Glapwell as a housing allocation.

Document is not Sound

9039 **(Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Pickrell) [12342]
Respondent: Mr Basil Hill [2524]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Land off Garden Avenue, New Houghton

As you are aware, and as previously submitted during earlier rounds of consultation (November 2015 and December 2016) and pre-application discussions, our client is promoting sites in New Houghton (Land off Garden Avenue) where proposals for residential development would be appropriate and are considered deliverable within the next 5 years. Site plans and information forms for each have previously been provided to the Council and I enclose these again for ease of reference.

In terms of the site at New Houghton, as has been referenced in the previously provided Site Information Form (2016), a larger site of over 7ha proposing 180 houses was refused planning permission in August 2015 and an appeal subsequently dismissed in June 2016. The reasons for refusal primarily related to the impact on landscape character and appearance of the area through erosion of the gap between New Houghton and Glapwell. To address these points, the revised site area is much smaller at 3.1ha and is contained to the lower land area adjoining the existing settlement. The scale of development envisaged is also much reduced at circa 80 dwellings, with access proposed only off Garden Avenue negating the need for a roundabout/junction and associated infrastructure on the A617. Cumulatively, it is considered that these amendments, by way of reduction in site area, scale of development and associated infrastructure, coupled with containment to the lowest area of the site, significantly reduces the impact of the development on the landscape character such that it would address the Inspector's concerns relating to the original proposal. It is also considered that the amended development, as proposed, would make no consequential impact in terms of erosion to the gap between New Houghton and Glapwell such that development of this site for residential purposes is considered acceptable in the wider planning balance.

The sites being promoted are all located in Flood Zone 1 and therefore such allocations would be consistent with the sequential approach to development prescribed in the NPPF. All sites have access points available to the adopted Highway and their development would provide much needed market and affordable housing.

Ultimately these settlements and the sites therein are considered to be sustainable locations, providing access to services, facilities and employment opportunities including convenience stores, pubs, village hall/community centres, a vehicle garage, church and a hotel/B&B, in addition to sports and recreation facilities throughout. Scarcliffe and New Houghton also offer primary schools and it is noted that these are currently undersubscribed. The settlements also offer good public transport links to neighbouring settlements and include regular bus services to Nottingham, Chesterfield, Sheffield and Mansfield, along with easy access to Junction 29 of the M1.

Development of these sites for residential purposes will significantly assist with housing delivery in sustainable and logical extensions to the existing built settlements. The sites are all in single ownership and have no major
* constraints such that they are available and deliverable within 5 years. Consequently these sites are considered appropriate locations to meet housing needs in the area whilst providing vital support/custom to maintain the viability of services and boost the local economy.

As is set out in the attached representations, Glapwell, New Houghton and Scarcliffe are highly desirable, viable and deliverable locations that largely coalesce and function with the other neighbouring settlements such as Doe Lea / Bramley Vale and Pleasley. These settlements should not be discounted as cumulatively they provide a range of services, facilities, leisure and employment opportunities to support sustainable housing...

---

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Further to the above consultation, please find enclosed representations concerning the emerging Plan's draft Policy SS2: Scale of Development, Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development and Policy SS11: Important Open Breaks. You will note that the issues raised in these representations reflect those submitted during the earlier rounds of consultation regarding the emerging Local Plan's Identified Strategic Options and Draft Local Plan, as well as those in relation to the now withdrawn Core Strategy. Ultimately, our concerns and objections remain.

Please see attached letter, site plans and individual representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Include land at Garden Avenue, New Houghton as a housing allocation.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To amplify and expand on the comments/concerns consistently raised during consultation.

---

9041 *(Object)* Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Pickrell) [12342]

Respondent: Mr Basil Hill [2524]

Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Budget Lane, Scarcliffe

As you are aware, and as previously submitted during earlier rounds of consultation (November 2015 and December 2016) and pre-application discussions, our client is promoting sites in Scarcliffe (Land off Budget Lane) where proposals for residential development would be appropriate and are considered deliverable within the next 5 years. Site plans and information forms for each have previously been provided to the Council and I enclose these again for ease of reference.

The site at Scarcliffe would result in the redevelopment of brownfield land, providing a low density residential development that would, in view of the existing built form/road network to the northern, eastern, southern and western site boundaries, be well related to and contained within the existing urban framework. It is not considered that any insurmountable issues would be raised that would constrain or restrict development of this site.

The sites being promoted are all located in Flood Zone 1 and therefore such allocations would be consistent with the sequential approach to development prescribed in the NPPF. All sites have access points available to the adopted Highway and their development would provide much needed market and affordable housing.

Ultimately these settlements and the sites therein are considered to be sustainable locations, providing access to services, facilities and employment opportunities including convenience stores, pubs, village hall/community centres, a vehicle garage, church and a hotel/B&B, in addition to sports and recreation facilities throughout. Scarcliffe and New Houghton also offer primary schools and it is noted that these are currently undersubscribed. The settlements also offer good public transport links to neighbouring settlements and include regular bus services to Nottingham, Chesterfield, Sheffield and Mansfield, along with easy access to Junction 29 of the M1.

Development of these sites for residential purposes will significantly assist with housing delivery in sustainable and logical extensions to the existing built settlements. The sites are all in single ownership and have no major constraints such that they are available and deliverable within 5 years. Consequently these sites are considered appropriate locations to meet housing needs in the area whilst providing vital support/custom to maintain the viability of services and boost the local economy.

As is set out in the attached representations, Glapwell, New Houghton and Scarcliffe are highly desirable, viable and deliverable locations that largely coalesce and function with the other neighbouring settlements such as Doe Lea / Bramley Vale and Pleasley. These settlements should not be discounted as cumulatively they provide a range of services, facilities, leisure and employment
opportunities to support sustainable housing growth in this locality. Development of these sites for residential purposes will significantly assist with housing delivery through sustainable and logical extensions to the existing built settlements. The sites are all in single ownership and have no major constraints such that they are available and deliverable within 5 years. Consequently these sites are considered appropriate locations to meet housing needs in the area whilst providing vital support/custom to maintain the viability of services and boost the local economy.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Further to the above consultation, please find enclosed representations concerning the emerging Plan’s draft Policy SS2: Scale of Development, Policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development and Policy SS11: Important Open Breaks. You will note that the issues raised in these representations reflect those submitted during the earlier rounds of consultation regarding the emerging Local Plan’s Identified Strategic Options and Draft Local Plan, as well as those in relation to the now withdrawn Core Strategy. Ultimately, our concerns and objections remain.

Please see attached letter, site plans and individual representations.

Changes to Plan:
Include land off Budget lane, Scarcliffe as a housing allocation.
Document is not Sound

Reason for appearance: To amplify and expand on the comments/concerns consistently raised during consultation.

9046 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) - East Midlands office (Mr Ian Long) [12322] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Woodall Homes [5247]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

This representation demonstrates that developing land north of Mooracre Lane, Bolsover for housing has the following benefits:

* Efficient use of available land which will relate harmoniously with the forthcoming development to the south of Mooracre Lane;
* Provide a positive contribution towards achieving the planned housing land supply;
* Will be sympathetic with nearby forthcoming and existing residential uses;
* Bolsover is one of the most sustainable settlements in the District which benefits from a wealth of services and facilities, with good public transport links.

Please see attachment for full case for proposed site.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to attachments and representations.

Changes to Plan:
Allocate land north of Mooracre Lane, Bolsover, for residential development in the Local Plan.
Document is not Sound

Reason for appearance: It is important that we are able to participate in the Hearing Sessions. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the merits of the site subject to this representation in relation to the future growth of Bolsover and the obvious housing opportunities available. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for additional allocations and future reserve sites to allow for a suitable buffer in the context of the housing requirements for the District.

9064 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Agent: ID Planning (Mrs Rachael Martin) [12369]
Respondent: Avant Homes [11765]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

We object to the proposed Housing Allocations for Clowne as set out in Policy LC1 and the explanatory text as an appropriate strategy to achieve the spatial distribution of development as set out in Policy SS3. It is not considered that the policy is sound, the allocation of four sites in the town is not justified as the most appropriate strategy to support the growth of the town when assessed against reasonable alternative and will not be effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document is not Sound Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination</th>
<th>Reason for appearance: Attendance at the hearing will enable a thorough discussion regarding the deliverability of the proposed housing allocations and whether they will be capable of delivering the housing distribution required under Policy SS3 and the required infrastructure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Changes to Plan:

It is considered that additional sites in the south of the Clowne should be allocated to provide additional choice and flexibility over the plan period.

The sites referred to in Section 2 of this report, referred to as Clowne 29 (land to the North of Congreave House and the South of High Ash Farm, Mansfield Road, Clowne) and Clowne 10 (Land to the north, south and east of Stanfree Farm. Low Road, Stanfree) in the Plan evidence base documents should be allocated to provide additional sites to deliver new housing to meet the distribution requirements set out in Policy SS3.

The sites are available, deliverable and suitable to deliver sustainable new housing to assist the strategy for growth in Clowne. The merits of the sites are discussed in more detail in the attached representation.

**Representation at Examination:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document is not Sound Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination</th>
<th>Reason for appearance: Attendance at the hearing will enable a thorough discussion regarding the deliverability of the proposed housing allocations and whether they will be capable of delivering the housing distribution required under Policy SS3 and the required infrastructure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 9082 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** IBA Planning Limited (Mr Nick Baseley) [4560]

**Respondent:** Mr G E Towndrow [3690]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

I act on behalf of Mr G Towndrow, owner of land at 136 The Hill, Glapwell - which the Council will be aware benefits from extant consent for five dwellings with the application for Reserved Matters approval currently pending determination.

We have previously made representations in relation to the Consultation Draft Local Plan (October 2016) (further copy attached for ease of reference) to the effect that my client’s site should (as with the Glapwell Nurseries site) logically be identified as a housing allocation in the new Local Plan, with the settlement boundary drawn to include it within the main built-up area.

The settlement boundary has now been re-drawn in this latest draft version of the new Local Plan to include my client’s site within the settlement and my client welcomes this amendment in the new Local Plan.

However, my client’s site has not been identified as a housing allocation within the relevant Policy LC1: Housing Allocations (as is the case with the Glapwell Nurseries site) despite its status as a site benefitting from extant outline planning consent and the Council now in a position to approve the (pending) Reserved Matters submission. It is therefore requested that my client’s site also be included within Policy LC1 as a housing allocation for Glapwell.

I trust the above is of assistance and look forward to being consulted on any subsequent consultation stages as the Council progresses towards formal adoption.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Please see representation.

### Changes to Plan:

Include my client’s site within Policy LC1 as a housing allocation for Glapwell.

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

### 9088 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Inspire Design and Development Ltd (Mr Lee Barnes) [10099] (unconfirmed)

**Respondent:** Castle Homes (Chesterfield) Limited (Mr Stephen Botham) [5236]

**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The restrictive approach to development in small settlements as set out in Policy SS3 does not result in a strategy which supports the rural economy and village life. Villages will die without development.
This is contrary to the NPPF core planning principle of supporting the thriving rural communities within the countryside.

The site shown on the attached plan offers the opportunity to deliver a sustainable high-quality development for the village of Stanfree.

This has been demonstrated in previous Local Plan submissions to the Council through detailed supporting information and that information is not unnecessarily repeated here. The previous submissions still apply, and it is requested that they are considered by the Local Plan Inspector.

**Changes to Plan:**
Allow for housing development in the smaller settlements including the village of Stanfree by amending SS3 (and the associated strategy) to allow for new development in the villages.

To facilitate this, allocate the attached site for housing development.

A more flexible approach to the smaller settlements including the allocation of this Stanfree site will enable the Local Plan to deliver the Government's planning principle of supporting thriving rural communities.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To explain the need for the smaller settlements to be allowed to grow and to demonstrate that this Stanfree site would be sustainable, deliverable and be in accordance with national planning principles.

---

**9094 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: Kember Loudon Williams LLP (Ms Canan Clatworthy) [12386]
Respondent: William Maude Developments Ltd (Planning Advisor) [9545]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

As it was made clear in our previous submissions (attached as Appendix 1), our client's land north of Rotherham Road, New Houghton (Ref: New Houghton/03) is best situated for mixed-use development with a strong and meaningful employment base, integrated with housing and live-work units. Up to 2 hectares of the overall site (6ha), can be developed as employment land comprising Use Classes B1(a) office and B1(c) light industrial starter units, which would clearly contribute to the employment target in the District.

**Changes to Plan:**
Bolsover District Council should consider development opportunities at small villages given their sustainability credentials to meet long term housing and economic needs, both within and beyond the plan period.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

**9110 (Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Dawn Shakespeare [12389]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

We believe that an allocation for residential development on each element of this site would be one example of compliance with the Duty to Cooperate. I have also submitted a letter to Amber Valley Borough Council on this basis.

It is appreciated that an allocation in this location will probably need to be led by Amber Valley as the housing here, including the part in Bolsover, would contribute primarily to the housing needs of Alfreton/Amber Valley. Development here would also be physically related to Alfreton rather than any Bolsover settlement.

The site is immediately adjacent to the residential development to the north west and is contained by clearly defensible boundaries to the south (A38) and east (former railway landscaped area). This area serves no real
purpose as agricultural land and does not contribute to the visual amenity of the wider landscape.

We have every reason to believe that the development of this site is suitable, available and achievable in terms of the SHLAA tests. The development of the land to the north west has proven to be viable and deliverable and there is no reason to believe this development would be different.

The owner is very willing to discuss this site with any Officer of the Council or contribute to the Local Plan Examination if relevant.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See individual representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
This site should be included as a housing allocation together with a statement of intent that this site be delivered in association with land within Amber Valley Borough.

Inclusion of this site as a housing allocation and the associated joint working with Amber Valley Borough Council would enable Bolsover DC to demonstrate compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** To explain the opportunity for the delivery of this site as an example of Duty to Cooperate with Amber Valley Borough Council

---

**9113** *(Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)*

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Andrew Grayson) [12388]
Respondent: Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
Received: **15/6/2018 via Email**

For reasons of accounting of needs throughout the plan period and the future rather than existing commitments being built out in a settlement that is already regarded as a sustainable location, Policy SS3 should include the allocation of land south of Colliery Road, Creswell currently being considered by the Council, and extend the settlement boundary of this settlement to accommodate the sustainable development of this brownfield site. (Please see our accompanying Masterplan submitted in accompaniment to planning application 18/00087/OUT enclosed, ref: 14.057/02S).

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Allocate this site.

Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** As a major landowner within the district, Welbeck, manages a diverse portfolio of land property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the district and seeks to maintain its positive role within the communities.

---

**9127** *(Object) Promoted other sites - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)*

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: **15/6/2018 via Email**

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

The failure to allocate sites such as 12/00269/OUTMAJ at Shuttlewood which have planning permission is not a sound approach. Shuttlewood is in close proximity to Bolsover and was concluded as sustainable in the granting of 12/00269/OUTMAJ. The reserved matters scheme has been granted and will be delivered within 5 years.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.
Changes to Plan:
Revision to the approach taken to small settlements to enable appropriate sites to be allocated for development to secure the future of those settlements.

Allocation of approved developments as housing sites, specifically 12/00269/OUTMAJ as this is a sustainable, viable and deliverable development.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable

8331 (Object) Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd - Sheffield office (Mr Michael Bamford) [11835] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Pace Properties Ltd [11901]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Web

Based on the findings in the BVA assessment, the 10% affordable housing policy is unlikely to be deliverable on the majority of sites above the proposed 25 unit threshold where values are in the ranges characterised by Value Points C and D which accounts for significant proportion of the housing market within the authority area.

In order to reflect the evidence base provided by the BVA report, we recommend setting affordable housing requirements by different market areas. This approach combined with the introduction of a formal rural exceptions policy will support delivery, and will therefore be sound.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Policy LC2 is currently worded to 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. We object to this policy as it is not supported by the published evidence base.

The Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA) for the District of Bolsover by Bailey Venning Associates Limited on behalf of Bolsover District Council (March 2018) looks at whether a policy requirement of 10% affordable housing is viable.

The primary challenge identified by the BVA report which is presented by residential development in Bolsover (at least over the early years of the plan), is ensuring that sufficient development goes ahead. The economics of residential development in the district is recognised as being fragile. Based on the findings in the assessment, the 10% affordable housing policy is unlikely to be deliverable on the majority of sites above the proposed 25 unit threshold where values are in the ranges characterised by Value Points C and D which accounts for significant proportion of the housing market within the authority area.

In order to reflect the evidence base provided by the BVA report, we recommend setting affordable housing requirements by different market areas. Whilst it is acknowledged that the extent of higher value areas likely to support affordable housing are small, this approach combined with the introduction of a formal rural exceptions policy will support delivery, and will therefore be sound.

Therefore we suggest that Policy LC2 is amended to reduce the policy compliant requirement for affordable housing down to 5% or below in accordance with the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA) for the District of Bolsover by Bailey Venning Associates Limited on behalf of Bolsover District Council (March 2018).

Changes to Plan:
In order to reflect the evidence base provided by the BVA report, we recommend setting affordable housing requirements by different market areas.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the extent of higher value areas likely to support affordable housing are small, this approach combined with the introduction of a formal rural exceptions policy will support delivery, and will therefore ensure that the policy is sound.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: Based on the findings in the BVA assessment, the 10% affordable housing policy is unlikely to be deliverable on the majority of sites above the proposed 25 unit threshold where values are in the ranges characterised by Value Points C and D which accounts for significant proportion of the housing market
within the authority area. Due to the technical nature of viability, oral representation is required at the examination in order to allow dialogue between the Council, inspector and ourselves.

(Object) Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: *Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp)* [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Acknowledgement of the weak viability of residential development within the District and resulting (relatively) modest 10% requirement for affordable housing is welcome. The policy is however still considered to be unsound in its current form as it is not justified based on current evidence, as set out within the Local Plan’s supporting text.

The recognition that the District has an excess supply of social housing is noted, with ‘the demand for affordable housing...already met by the Council and the private sector across the District’. The complexity of affordable housing need in the District cannot therefore be addressed simply through an excess provision of further social housing.

The emerging NPPF takes a more pragmatic view of what formally constitutes affordable housing. In relation to this, Policy LC2 is not clear on the definition of affordable housing and although the policy recognises the importance of scheme viability it still retains a blanket request for 10% affordable housing delivery on larger sites (i.e. comprising 25 or more dwellings). The policy therefore requires greater refinement and should be more sensitive to the context of affordable housing need in the District. In particular, the conclusions of the Plan Wide Viability Assessment (2018) and the influence of there being a current oversupply of social housing across the District.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:
Policy LC2 should be amended to better reflect the complexity and genuine requirements for ‘affordable housing’ across the District.

Document is not Legal

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: The requirement to provide Affordable Housing is a key consideration in the delivery of (viable) residential development. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (‘CST’) offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated, additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

(Object) Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: *Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett)* [11330]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Persimmon Homes recognises the need for affordable housing and to introduce different tenures in an area to ensure there is a wide choice of housing available. the emerging NPPF includes a broader definition of affordable housing than previously and it is recommended that this is accounted for in the local plan.

Reviewing the viability evidence the Local Plan is relying on (Whole plan viability assessment for the district of Bolsover’ by BVA; March 2018. there is a clear recognition of different areas of the borough being able to support different levels of affordable housing. This is the result of lower revenues but not lower build costs. A flexible approach needs to be taken by the Council on this to ensure continued delivery of housing over the plan period.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation’s largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy’s that are relevant and can impact on our ability
to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

Document is not Sound

8839 **(Object)** Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing - ineffective

We welcome the clarity of the policy's title, but we consider it is ineffective in delivering the District's overall need for affordable housing, and should therefore be complemented by another policy for 'Affordable Housing - Other Solutions'. It is inconceivable that LC2 will come near to meeting total affordable need, and the importance of alternative delivery cannot be overstated. Specifically, we consider that the plan should make clear the proportion of the total housing requirement that should be expected to be affordable, and the extent to which non-market solutions are needed to deliver that.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

8880 **(Object)** Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

If the Bolsover Local Plan is to be compliant with national policy then the Council must satisfy the requirements of the NPPF whereby development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that viability is threatened (paras 173 & 174). Policy LC2 - Affordable Housing Through Market Housing proposes 10% affordable housing provision on sites of 25+ dwellings subject to viability. The Council's up to date viability evidence is set out in Whole Plan Viability Assessment for Bolsover Local Plan dated March 2018 by Bailey Venning Associates.

The Council's latest evidence shows that viability across the District is challenging. The evidence demonstrates that policy compliant (10% affordable housing provision) residential development is only deliverable if a minimum selling price of £230 per square foot is achieved (identified as Value Point 4) which occurs in a relatively small portion of the District and on very few allocations because generally Bolsover is a low value area.

The residual land value model is highly sensitive to changes in its inputs whereby an adjustment or an error in any one assumption can have a significant impact on viability. In Bolsover policy compliant residential development only becomes viable if BCIS build costs are reduced. The theoretical reduction in build costs is achieved by using the lower quartile rather than the median cost as well as applying a discount for economies of scale and efficiency on sites of more than 40 dwellings. Such assumed lower build costs may not happen and therefore is not an appropriate evidential justification for the policy requirements set out in Policy LC2. Even after this assumed reduction in BCIS build costs development in Shirebrook, Hodthorpe, Tidshelf and Bolsover remains unviable. Indeed the Council's own evidence states that the aforementioned settlements should be specifically excluded from Policy LC2 (see para 1.28).

The Council should clarify the proportion of sites with the benefit of planning permission and signed Section 106 Agreements in order to assess the extent to which delivery of the Local Plan is threatened by an unviable affordable housing policy. It is known that when the Council waived the requirement for affordable housing provision there was an increase in housing delivery (see para 1.25). The cumulative burden of policy requirements should not be set at a level which results in routine rather than occasional negotiations because
development is unviable. It is recommended that Policy LC2 is amended to reduce the policy compliant requirement for affordable housing in accordance with the Council’s own viability evidence.

### Full Text: (Show Full Text)

Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC’s, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** To further discuss the issues raised.

### (Support) Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The approach to the provision of affordable housing in the district as set out at policy LC 2: Affordable housing is fully supported which indicates that BDC will require applications for residential development comprising 25 or more dwellings to provide 10% as affordable housing on site, or to provide a detailed viability appraisal to inform any alternative level of affordable provision.

DCC’s officers are aware that viability and deliverability remains a key concern throughout much of the District, notwithstanding the improvement in housing market conditions nationally in recent years. The background text to Policy LC2 provides a well balanced reasoned justification for the 10% requirement for affordable housing in development schemes of 25 dwellings on more. This is based on up-to-date evidence in the SHMA and SHMA Update and the District Council’s Whole Plan Viability Assessment, which provide clear justification to support the policy approach in Policy LC2.

Appropriate recognition is also given to the risk that, if the affordable housing requirement is set too high, market housing may become unviable, affecting its delivery. National planning guidance requires that planning obligations should not be so onerous as to prevent development coming forward.

In its consultation responses on all planning applications for 11 or more dwellings, DCC requests developer contributions of a more local nature towards infrastructure, such as affordable housing are set at an appropriate level to ensure that there is sufficient viability in development schemes to also fund infrastructure of a more strategic nature, such as school place provision. In this context the approach to Policy LC2 is supported.

### Full Text: (Show Full Text)

Please see attachment and representations.

---

### (Object) Policy LC2: Affordable Housing Through Market Housing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Planning and Design Group (Mr Andrew Grayson) [12388]  
**Respondent:** Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy is considered unsound in its current form given that it is unjustified based on current evidence and supporting text in the Local Plan. Therefore, objection is raised.

The recognition that the District has an excess supply of social housing is noted. Certainly, the complexity of affordable housing need in the District cannot be addressed through an excess provision of further social housing.

The emerging NPPF takes a more pragmatic view of what formally constitutes affordable housing. In relation to this Policy LC2 is not clear on the definition of affordable housing and although recognises, critically, the importance of scheme viability it still retains a blanket request for 10% affordable housing delivery on larger sites.

### Full Text: (Show Full Text)

Please refer to representations.
Changes to Plan:
The policy requires far greater refinement and should be more sensitive to the context of affordable housing need in the District. In particular, the conclusions of the Plan Wide Viability Assessment (2018) and the influence of there being a current oversupply of social housing in Creswell as well as the District.

Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** As a major landowner within the District, Welbeck manages a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities.

---

**8611 (Object) Policy LC3: Type and Mix of Housing - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

There is general support for this policy as worded as it will allow the market to lead reflecting the local context. There appears to be a focus also on older and specialist housing. While this is supported to ensure a mix of communities is delivered, there should be a focus also on starter homes and ensuring there is sufficient choice for people to enter the housing market. This will ensure the longevity of the borough and settlements within.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

---

**8432 (Support) Policy LC4: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Mrs Diane Searston [9711]
**Received:** 4/6/2018 via Email

Regarding the Local Plan Bolsover District Council, proposed policy LC4, We've been on the list now for over 2 years waiting for a self build through the government help? We requested to build our own home, 3 bedroom bungalow with a garage in either Whitwell or Clowne. Now, I’m sure the builder development industry, may say they are not doing any bungalows on their planning submissions, so if that is the case, we would have either a 3/4 bedroom house with a garage, although obviously prefer a bungalow.

We would work with the builders, as not to cause any problems.

I don't know how many people are interested in self build, and maybe some people have given up on the idea, but if you could let the builders know how many, then it probably wouldn't be such a big issue to them.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Regarding the Local Plan Bolsover District Council, proposed policy LC4, We've been on the list now for over 2 years waiting for a self build through the government help? We requested to build our own home, 3 bedroom bungalow with a garage in either Whitwell or Clowne. Now, I’m sure the builder development industry, may say they are not doing any bungalows on their planning submissions, so if that is the case, we would have either a 3/4 bedroom house with a garage, although obviously prefer a bungalow.

We would work with the builders, as not to cause any problems.

I don't know how many people are interested in self build, and maybe some people have given up on the idea, but if you could let the builders know how many, then it probably wouldn't be such a big issue to them.
Object) Policy LC4: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

The policy is considered unsound in its current form given that it is unjustified based on current evidence and supporting text in the Local Plan.

The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding (Register) Regulations 2016 impose requirements on the Council to keep a register of those interested in self-build opportunities. That register helps to provide evidence of the level of interest in self-build opportunities. The Local Plan has not confirmed the number of people who have expressed interest in self build opportunities. However, supporting text for the policy states that 'to date, very few people have expressed an interest in this type of building.'

Whilst the principle of self-build properties is supported, to simply ascribe this limited interest in the register due to it 'only recently [having] been set up (April 2016)' yet impose a significant policy requirement on the basis of it (5% of plots to be reserved) is arbitrary and unreasonable. The Regulations do not impose a requirement on developers to provide such plots. Other mechanisms are available to the Council to facilitate the availability of plots for self-build and custom build opportunities.

Seeking to provide opportunities for custom and self-build plots through the mechanism of proposed Policy LC4 will simply frustrate the delivery of new homes. It would introduce significant uncertainty into the design, planning and viability of schemes. Development schemes are subject to detailed business planning in advance of commencement on site. Upon commencement, developers seek certainty, with a programmed build out of plots. It is entirely unrealistic to expect plots reserved for self-build on any particular site to be 'made available and marketed...for at least 12 months' and even then for their development to be certain.

If this model was implemented, a good number of sites would be built out before the end of the aforesaid marketing period. Resources (builders, site cabins etc) would have been removed from the site. Re-establishing such facilities (to complete development of the site - the Policy suggesting that the plots be 'built out by the developer as an affordable housing unit') would be inefficient and increase the total development costs.

Should the Council wish to support custom and self-build opportunities then it may wish to consider the specific allocation of development sites, perhaps using land within its control, or on a site-by-site basis with landowners/developers as appropriate where interest emerges. As drafted, this policy is unworkable and should be deleted.

It is noted that North East Derbyshire District Council proposed an identical policy ('Policy LC5: Custom and Self Build Dwellings') within its consultation draft Local Plan (February 2017). That policy was not presented within its Publication Draft Local Plan (February 2018). Within 'Policy LC4 Type and Mix of Housing' the following text has been included:

'4. Self and Custom Build Homes
The inclusion of self and custom build dwellings will be encouraged, in line with Council's Self and Custom Build Register'.

At paragraph 5.92 of that Publication Draft Local Plan it is stated that 'only 7 people expressed an interest in this type of house building' (individuals and associations who are looking for serviced plots of land in the district on which to build their own homes). Given the geographical proximity of North East Derbyshire to Bolsover it is likely that demand for custom and self build dwellings will be similar across the two areas.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:
The policy is unjustified and unworkable and should be deleted.
Document is not Sound
Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: undefined
This policy requires 5% of houses on major proposals to incorporate self-build plots. Although supportive of self build plots in general, Persimmon does not however support the inclusion of a restrictive policy which currently has very little evidence to support its inclusion. This does not promote and boost housing supply and only changes the builder of the plot which is not a material consideration. Further, the marketing period of 12 months is overly long ensuring increased uncertainty and difficulties in delivering. For example, if there were zero takers for the self build plot, there would be increase cost and disruption in changing the build programme and potentially re-opening a closed site. the delay is increased further as it's suggested that a planning application is needed. This disposal procedure should be encapsulated in the original Section 106 that approved the self-build plots in the first instance.

A further point that needs revision is that if the plot does not get sold as a self build, it reverts to an affordable house. This is not a justifiable policy and adds a potential extra 5% affordable housing which was not subject to sufficient viability testing. The self build plots will contribute to the supply of the houses on the open market if sold once complete meaning it does not affect the supply of affordable housing. There is therefore no justifiable reason and no evidence presented to support the policy and it should be deleted.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

Document is not Sound

**Object** Policy LC4: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Policy LC4 - Custom & Self Build Dwellings proposes at least 5% self build dwellings on sites of more than 10 dwellings. The HBF is supportive of proposals to encourage self / custom build for its potential additional contribution to the overall housing supply. It is noted that policies which encourage self / custom build have been endorsed in a number of recently published Inspector's Final Reports for East Devon Local Plan, Warwick Local Plan, Bath & North East Somerset Place-making Plan and Derbyshire Dales Local Plan. The HBF is also supportive of the allocation of specific sites for self / custom build.

However the HBF is not supportive of restrictive policy requirements for the inclusion of such housing on residential development sites as proposed by the Council. This approach only changes housing delivery from one form of house building company to another without any consequential additional contribution to boosting housing supply. If these plots are not developed by self / custom builders then these undeveloped plots are effectively removed from the housing land supply unless the Council provides a mechanism by which these dwellings may be developed by the original non self / custom builder in a timely manner. The Council's proposed release mechanism in the event of self / custom builders not coming forward is unworkable. The proposed marketing period of at least 12 months is too long and offering for sale to the Council or housing association is unrealistic option. Before introducing any such policy the Council should also give consideration to the practicalities of health & safety, working hours, length of build programme, etc. as well as viability assessing any adverse impacts. The NPPG confirms that "different types of residential development such as those wanting to build their own homes ...are funded and delivered in different ways. This should be reflected in viability assessments" (ID 10-009).

Any policy requirement for self / custom build serviced plots on residential development sites should be fully justified and supported by evidence. If the Council wishes to promote self / custom build it should do so on the basis of evidence of need. The Council should assess such housing needs in its SHMA work as set out in the NPPG (ID 2a-021) collating from reliable local information (including the number of validated registrations on the Council's Self / Custom Build Register) the demand from people wishing to build their own homes. The Council's own evidence states that it is "difficult to demonstrate concrete evidence of demand at a local level" in August 2017 there were only 7 entries on the Self Build Register (see Table 86 of North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw SHMA 2017) concluding that it "would expect most new delivery on small windfall sites". Therefore there is no justification for Policy LC4 which should be delete.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF...
is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC’s, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new “for sale” market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To further discuss issues raised.

**Object** Policy LC4: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Miss Megan Pashley [9623]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Gladman contend that any policy requirement for self/custom build serviced plots on residential development sites should be fully justified and supported by robust evidence. We are not satisfied that such evidence exists and indeed the as part of the Council’s own evidence it is states that it is ‘difficult to demonstrate concrete evidence of demand at a local level” (Table 86 of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw SHMA 2017).

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Having considered the submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development policies. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination.

Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan’s ultimate success.

Please see attachment and representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
We therefore suggest that policy LC4 is deleted.

Document is not Sound

**Object** Policy LC4: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Planning and Design Group (Mr Andrew Grayson) [12388]
**Respondent:** Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy is considered unsound in its current form given that it is unjustified based on current evidence and supporting text in the Local Plan. Therefore, objection is raised.

The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding (Register) Regulations 2016 impose requirements on the Council to keep a register of those interested in self-build opportunities. That register helps to provide evidence of the level of interest in self-build opportunities. The Local Plan has not confirmed the number of people who have expressed interest in self build opportunities. However, supporting text for the policy states that ‘to date, very few people have expressed an interest in this type of building.’

Whilst the principle of self-build properties is supported, to simply ascribe this limited interest in the register due to it ‘only recently [having] been set up (April 2016)’ yet impose a significant policy requirement on the basis of it (5% of plots to be reserved) is arbitrary and unreasonable. Furthermore, where the housing trajectory is delivered in full this would lead to an excess of plots which would far outstrip demand.

Relevant regulations do not impose a requirement on developers to provide such plots. Other mechanisms are available to the Council to facilitate the availability of plots for self-build and custom build opportunities.

Seeking to provide opportunities for custom and self-build plots through the mechanism of proposed Policy LC4 will simply frustrate the delivery of new homes. It would introduce significant uncertainty into the design, planning and viability of schemes. Development schemes are subject to detailed business planning in advance of commencement on site. Upon commencement, developers seek certainty, with a programmed build out of plots. It is entirely unrealistic to expect plots reserved for self-build on any particular site to be ‘made available and marketed…for at least 12 months’ and even then for their development to be uncertain.
Changes to Plan:
Should the Council wish to support custom and self-build opportunities then it may wish to consider the specific allocation of development sites, perhaps using land within its control, or on a site-by-site basis with landowners/developers as appropriate where interest emerges. As drafted, this policy is unworkable and should be deleted.

Document is not Sound
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: As a major landowner within the District, Welbeck manages a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities.

8938 (Support) Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
The policy approach to the provision of sites to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Traveling Showpeople set out in Policies LC5 and LC6 and their supporting text at paragraphs 5.59 to 5.66 is fully supported.

It is particularly welcomed that paragraph 5.59 makes reference to the Derby, Derbyshire. Peak District National Park and East Staffordshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) which was commissioned by DCC on behalf of 9 city, district and borough councils in Derbyshire, the PDNPA, East Staffordshire District Council and the Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group; and to its recommendations for Bolsover District that between 2014 and 2034, provision should be made for 17 residential pitches; 7 bricks and mortar units; and 13 travelling Showpeople’s plots.

8361 (Object) Policy LC5: Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Para 5.59 to para 5.66
Chesterfield Borough Council wishes to lodge a holding OBJECTION to this section of the Local Plan. This may be withdrawn if robust evidence is published on site identification and assessment.

The Local Plan does not allocate sufficient sites for Gypsies and Travellers to fully meet the need identified in the Derbyshire Peak District and East Staffordshire Gypsies & Travellers Accommodation Assessment 2014. If the identified pitch requirements (11 pitches remaining) are not met within BDC there will be a shortfall across the North Derbyshire GT HMA. This may result in additional pressure for sites in neighbouring districts and may lead to an increased risk of unauthorised encampments.

Whilst there is no objection in principal to the use of a criteria based policy to meet the outstanding provision where insufficient suitable sites can be identified, the additional background evidence on Bolsover District's land to support this position is not yet available for comment.

Paragraph 5.64 states that 'The District Council has not been able to identify suitable and available sites after reviewing its landholdings.' It would be helpful if the background evidence that has been published (GT LAA) clearly set out the sites from BDC landholdings that were reviewed and reasons for rejection; particularly given that BDC have made a request of Chesterfield Borough for assistance under the Duty to Cooperate to find sites for Gypsies and Travellers to the borough council on the basis of a lack of suitable sites.

Full Text: Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the draft Bolsover District Local Plan and related documents.

Detailed comments and observations are set out below. Wherever possible, comments have been related to a specific policy or paragraph of the Local Plan publication draft.

Subject to the detailed comments set out below, overall the council is of the view that the plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with national policy as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework.
I can confirm that the borough council has worked pro-actively with Bolsover, North East Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Districts, and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils in preparing a Statement of Common Ground to address Duty to Co-operate issues.

LIVING COMMUNITIES
Scale of Housing Provision
See comments on policy SS2, above.
Gypsies, Travellers And Travelling Showpeople
Para 5.59 to para 5.66
Chesterfield Borough Council wishes to lodge a holding OBJECTION to this section of the Local Plan. This may be withdrawn if robust evidence is published on site identification and assessment.

The Local Plan does not allocate sufficient sites for Gypsies and Travellers to fully meet the need identified in the Derbyshire Peak District and East Staffordshire Gypsies & Travellers Accommodation Assessment 2014. If the identified pitch requirements (11 pitches remaining) are not met within BDC there will be a shortfall across the North Derbyshire GT HMA. This may result in additional pressure for sites in neighbouring districts and may lead to an increased risk of unauthorised encampments.

Whilst there is no objection in principal to the use of a criteria based policy to meet the outstanding provision where insufficient suitable sites can be identified, the additional background evidence on Bolsover District's land to support this position is not yet available for comment.

Paragraph 5.64 states that 'The District Council has not been able to identify suitable and available sites after reviewing its landholdings.' It would be helpful if the background evidence that has been published (GT LAA) clearly set out the sites from BDC landholdings that were reviewed and reasons for rejection; particularly given that BDC have made a request of Chesterfield Borough for assistance under the Duty to Cooperate to find sites for Gypsies and Travellers to the borough council on the basis of a lack of suitable sites.

Should you have any queries about the above comments or require clarification on any points, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Document is not Sound

(Support) Policy LC5: Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

It is further welcomed and supported that Policy LC 5 proposes to allocate two sites at Hilcote and Shuttlewood for Gypsies and travellers to accommodate 5 pitches and one site at Pinxton to accommodate 14 Showpeople's Plots. This will help to meet a significant proportion of the overall accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople identified in the GTAA.

It is noted that paragraph 5.64 makes reference to the fact that the County Council had not been able to identify any sites in its ownership which might be suitable for Gypsy and Traveller sites. However, since the PLP was drafted the District Council has more recently contacted DCC to request it assesses land in its ownership that might be suitable to accommodate Travellers sites. This work is currently ongoing by the County Council and a response will be provided to the district in due course.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

(Object) Policy LC6: Applications for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr Alan Roger Yarwood) [4485]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

My comments relate to Policy LC 6 and its supporting text.

Whilst we consider that a small level of under allocation is acceptable provided a flexible criteria based policy is included, we do not believe the current plan is sound because the under allocation is significant and the criteria based policy is too restrictive.

We believe there is further scope to increase the size of some small family pitches and we believe some sites
suggested in earlier consultations have been unreasonably dismissed.

Given the under allocation and lack of a 5 year provision, Policy LC 6 is too restrictive.

Criterion C) is too prescriptive, particularly in relation to indicating a desired distance from services and failing to recognise proximity to public transport as a factor.

Criteria I) is wholly unacceptable and unnecessary and will place an unreasonable burden on applicants. Such a restriction does not require a legal agreement but can be secured by condition.

Furthermore it is non-compliant with National Policy as set out in Paragraph 10 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015, which requires that local plans must set out criteria to assess planning applications even where no need has been established. As such criterion (a) is unacceptable.

The Local Plan will not be sound unless changes are made to address these issues and the organisation will seek to oppose the plan at the examination hearings.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
My comments relate to Policy LC 6 and its supporting text.

Whilst we consider that a small level of under allocation is acceptable provided a flexible criteria based policy is included, we do not believe the current plan is sound because the under allocation is significant and the criteria based policy is too restrictive.

We believe there is further scope to increase the size of some small family pitches and we believe some sites suggested in earlier consultations have been unreasonably dismissed.

Given the under allocation and lack of a 5 year provision, Policy LC 6 is too restrictive.

Criterion C) is too prescriptive, particularly in relation to indicating a desired distance from services and failing to recognise proximity to public transport as a factor.

Criteria I) is wholly unacceptable and unnecessary and will place an unreasonable burden on applicants. Such a restriction does not require a legal agreement but can be secured by condition.

Furthermore it is non-compliant with National Policy as set out in Paragraph 10 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015, which requires that local plans must set out criteria to assess planning applications even where no need has been established. As such criterion (a) is unacceptable.

The Local Plan will not be sound unless changes are made to address these issues and the organisation will seek to oppose the plan at the examination hearings.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To oppose the plan.

(Support) Policy LC6: Applications for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

It is fully supported therefore that paragraph 5.64 and 5.66 sets out BDC's indication that policy LC6 will be used to determine planning applications and ensure that the needs of Gypsies, Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople are met. The criteria included in Policy LC6 are considered to be comprehensive and in accordance with the requirements of national planning policy in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

(Object) Policy LC8: Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

8578 (Object) Policy LC9: Removal of Agricultural and Other Occupancy Conditions - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Policy LC9 sets out criteria against which any application for the removal of a restrictive occupancy condition can be evidenced. Criterion (c) requires that 'The property has been marketed locally for an appropriate period (minimum 18 months) at an appropriate price and evidence of marketing is demonstrated'.

A marketing period of 'minimum 18 months' is onerous and unduly long. Through an effective package of marketing, it would be possible to ascertain whether there was ongoing demand for a restricted occupancy dwelling of that type in that location within a much shorter period of time. To require an 18 month (minimum) marketing period would impose an unreasonable burden and an extended period of uncertainty on individuals and businesses. An extended marketing period can also in effect advertise a property as vacant (whether an on-site sign board is provided or not), and vulnerable to unwanted (criminal) attention.

The Local Plan does not evidence why such an extended period of marketing should be required. Any period of marketing should not be required to extend beyond 12 months, and could indeed be shorter.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:
Criterion (c) should be amended thus:

'The property has been marketed locally for an appropriate period (maximum 12 minimum 18 months) at an appropriate price and evidence of marketing is demonstrated'.

This would ensure Policy LC9 is both justified and effective.

9128 (Object) Policy LC9: Removal of Agricultural and Other Occupancy Conditions - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable
Chapter 6 – Working Communities

(Object) Introduction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Chapter 6 Working Communities - There is no policy, or policies, in respect of shop fronts, advertisements or security grilles/shutters all of which have the potential to impact on the historic character of settlements which in turn impacts on the sustainability of settlements via resident and visitor economies. We would be pleased to discuss this further with you and agree any new policy wording through a Statement of Common Ground ahead of the EIP.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Object) Employment Land Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Williams Gallagher (Mr Matthew Williams) [12004]
Respondent: Eisinger LTD [12003]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

We support the identification of and concur with the statement at Para 6.18 that the Wincobank Farm site is a well-located site to the strategic highway network and that it is suitable for a variety of employment uses (these being B-Class or similar but not retail employment which is dealt with under separate policy), or could be suitable for a large single occupier. Its proximity to the M1 makes the site particularly suitable for logistics firms (Para 6.7).

We note that Para 6.18 also refers to the current proposal for a retail park on the front part of the site. Reference to this should be removed as this proposal is clearly contrary to the objectives of the Plan for the site (alternatively it should be made clear that this proposal is in direct conflict with the objectives of the Plan).

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Williams Gallagher act on behalf of Eisinger Ltd (c/o Ellandi LLP), owners of the Idlewells Shopping Centre in Sutton-in-Ashfield Town Centre.

We have reviewed and make comment on the Publication Local Plan owing to its potential to bring about cross-boundary impacts (including impacts on the viability and vitality of town centres outwith Bolsover District such as that of Sutton Town Centre in Ashfield District (which is approximately 2.4 miles east of the edge of the Bolsover District boundary)).

For the avoidance of doubt, the development of the Wincobank Farm site for retail and town centre uses is wholly unacceptable for the reasons set out in our Planning Objection Report dated December 2017 (submitted alongside this representation for ease of reference).

It is within the above context that our representations are made (representations which are largely supportive of the Plan as drafted).

Changes to Plan:
Remove reference to the retail park proposal at Para 6.18 or make it clear that this proposal is in direct conflict with the objectives of the plan (which it clearly is).

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: In order to ensure our client’s interests are protected and to provide a response to opposing views on policies affecting the future vitality and viability of Sutton-in-Ashfield Town Centre (where necessary).

(Object) Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Q+A Planning act on behalf of Limes Developments Ltd. Our client is promoting a mixed-use development on the site known within the draft Plan as ‘Wincobank Farm, South Normanton’. On behalf of our client, we object to the wording of draft Policy WC1 that limits the development of the listed sites to B class uses because the approach is inflexible and therefore not positively prepared, justified, nor effective, considering the wording of paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Q+A Planning act on behalf of Limes Developments Ltd. Our client is promoting a mixed-use development on the site known within the draft Plan as ‘Wincobank Farm, South Normanton’. Two planning applications have been submitted to the Council for a mix of employment and retail uses on this site and remain un-determined. The site has been identified within paragraph 6.7 of the plan as a site that could potentially accommodate a ‘large retail logistics firm’. It is one of two large sites that the Council have concluded may come forward during the Plan period, thus leading the Council to target the delivery of between 65 ha and 100 ha of B class employment land before the end of the plan.

Although we support the objective of bringing forward major development on the Wincobank Farm site, on behalf of our client we object to the wording of draft Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations. Draft Policy WC1 states that ‘the Council will support the development of the following sites for B1, B2 and B8 uses only, over the plan period’ and then lists a series of sites under construction, with planning permission and finally local plan allocations. The Wincobank Farm site is listed under the local plan allocations for 14 hectares of B2/B8 use. Whilst we support the recognition that this site should be developed, we have a fundamental objection to the wording of the policy’s focus on solely B1/B2 and B8 uses. The proposed wording is unsound, since it is not positively prepared, justified, nor effective, considering the wording of paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Flexibility should be applied in policy to allow for the number of jobs generated by any given development to be considered by the decision taker, as well as the overall economic benefit to the economy. The protection of land for the use of solely B-class uses should be avoided in policy since this does not recognise the many economic benefits that non-B class jobs provide. The approach adopted in draft Policy WC1 is not supported by the evidence.

For example, paragraph 9.14 of the Bolsover Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) (2015) explains that ‘total job growth within the District of 3,864 is forecast under the baseline scenario. As such, the majority of employment growth (2,819 jobs) is expected to occur in sectors that would not traditionally generate a requirement for B class floorspace. These sectors may also require additional floorspace in order to accommodate increases in employment over the period to 2033’.

Retail is one such alternative sector and the EDNA rightly recognises that the need for other land uses will be addressed separately. Therefore, retail for example, is not addressed in Section 10 of the EDNA. The need for retail uses is included the Retail and Centres Study (RCS) published in April 2018. We comment on the retail evidence and its policies in our response to the relevant retail policies, but here we note that paragraph 6.38 of the draft plan recognises that there is a ‘clear lack of quality comparison goods stores within Bolsover District that are able to retain Bolsover District household expenditure’. To rectify this requires a critical mass of new floorspace that can provide an alternative option locally. Accordingly, there is also a clear qualitative need for a type of floorspace that is not within Class B; when this factor is coupled with the recognition that the majority of job growth is expected to occur in sectors that would not trad...

**Changes to Plan:**
Delete the word ‘only’ from Policy WC1 and to also refer to the ability for the Wincobank Farm site to include other employment generating uses to include retail, leisure and tourism uses.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** This Wincobank Farm site, as allocated within draft Policy WC1, is one of the Council’s largest allocations and therefore, as agent for the site’s promoters, we consider it would assist the examination if we could participate.

---

**Support** Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Williams Gallagher (Mr Matthew Williams) [12004]
Respondent: *Eisinger LTD [12003]*
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

We support the allocation of the Wincobank Farm site for B2 and B8 uses. We are particularly supportive of the fact that the Policy indicates that only these uses will be acceptable (thereby making clear that retail and town centre uses are unsuitable and not to be regarded as contributing to the District’s employment land supply). Its proximity to the M1 makes the site particularly suitable for logistics firms.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Williams Gallagher act on behalf of Eisinger Ltd (c/o Eilland LLP), owners of the Idlewells Shopping Centre in Sutton-in-Ashfield Town Centre.
We have reviewed and make comment on the Publication Local Plan owing to its potential to bring about cross-boundary impacts (including impacts on the viability and vitality of town centres out with Bolsover District such as that of Sutton Town Centre in Ashfield District (which is approximately 2.4 miles east of the edge of the Bolsover District boundary)).

For the avoidance of doubt, the development of the Wincobank Farm site for retail and town centre uses is wholly unacceptable for the reasons set out in our Planning Objection Report dated December 2017 (submitted alongside this representation for ease of reference).

It is within the above context that our representations are made (representations which are largely supportive of the Plan as drafted).

Changes to Plan:
N/A

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: In order to ensure our client’s interests are protected and to provide a response to opposing views on policies affecting the future vitality and viability of Sutton-in-Ashfield Town Centre (where necessary).

8782 (Object) Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: DHA Planning (Mr Jonathan Buckwell) [9557] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Laing O’Rourke (Sir / Madam) [4525]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Finally, whilst the proposed allocation area appears broadly correct, and we are in agreement on the 10.7ha area proposed, the boundaries of the allocation area as shown on the Proposals Map are not fully consistent with those shown on the approved masterplan (08/00762/OUTEA) attached. Notwithstanding the approach taken on the Proposals Map of merging together the approved development platforms (to which we do not object), the shapes of the allocation area are, in places, clearly different from those shown on the approved plan. Whilst it is difficult to fully ascertain from the scale at which the proposals map is presented, we are concerned that some areas with planning permission for development may have been excluded from the allocation area. Although these areas are small, this creates confusion and uncertainty.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Laing O’Rourke remain fully supportive of the proposed allocation and welcome the Council’s recognition that the site can make an important contribution towards meeting the District’s employment needs during the plan period.

Unfortunately, the proposed allocation at Explore Industrial Park, both in terms of the policy wording and the proposals map, is not fully consistent with the extant planning permission and so it has been necessary to raise objections on both of these points. I would be very happy to discuss these further, prior to Submission, and hope that we can resolve both points swiftly, which would enable Laing O’Rourke to withdraw both objections.

Changes to Plan:
Ensure that the boundaries of the proposed employment allocation are consistent with those approved in permission 08/00762/OUTEA.

Document is not Sound

8783 (Object) Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: DHA Planning (Mr Jonathan Buckwell) [9557] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Laing O’Rourke (Sir / Madam) [4525]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Laing O’Rourke fully supports the proposed 10.7ha employment allocation at Explore Industrial Park but objects to the proposed B2/B8 use restriction.

This restriction is inconsistent with planning permission 08/00762/OUTEA (see approved masterplan attached), which allowed B1, B2 and B8 uses here. Whilst B2/B8 uses were permitted elsewhere on the site, the area to the west of Explore Way was permitted for B1 uses, for which it is more suitable for landscape and ground conditions reasons. Both reasons prevent larger scale buildings in this area. B1 office, light industrial and research/development uses should be acceptable here.
Laing O'Rourke remain fully supportive of the proposed allocation and welcome the Council's recognition that the site can make an important contribution towards meeting the District's employment needs during the plan period. Unfortunately, the proposed allocation at Explore Industrial Park, both in terms of the policy wording and the proposals map, is not fully consistent with the extant planning permission and so it has been necessary to raise objections on both of these points. I would be very happy to discuss these further, prior to Submission, and hope that we can resolve both points swiftly, which would enable Laing O'Rourke to withdraw both objections.

Changes to Plan:
The policy should be amended to allow B1 uses, in addition to B2 and B8, to reflect the extant planning permission.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: It is important to my client to ensure that the policy is positively worded and sufficiently flexible in relation to this allocation to ensure that the employment benefits are maximised.

(Proposal) Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - not justified

We object to the employment allocation at Clowne Garden Village on the basis of our comments on the plan as a whole. Given that WC1 allocates land towards the upper limit of the 65-100 hectare range, and Clowne is a relatively unsustainable location, it currently accounts for almost half of the Local Plan allocations by hectarage.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

Changes to Plan:
We consider that a reduced allocation to Clowne is needed.

Document is not Legal
Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

(Proposal) Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: South Normanton Parish Council (Lisa Powell) [11867]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Winconsin farm development

The area known as Winconsin Farm is situated on the junction of the A38 leading to Hillcote and South Normanton and such forms one of the three main gateways to South Normanton.

The Local Plan has classified this site as B2 and B8 use whilst in the description within the report the development currently in planning for the site includes a Hotel with restaurant, retail, leisure and cafes on the front portion of the site with the rear being allocated as B2 and B8 usage.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See representation.

Changes to Plan:
For this reason and to correct the conflicting entries in the Plan we would request that this site includes the C1, A3, D2, and A1 classifications in addition to the B2 and B8 classifications within the Local Plan.
We object to Policy WC1 as the final draft Local Plan allocates just below 92 ha of employment land in the District, but paragraph 6.6 of the preamble to this policy notes that the Council's independent economic development needs assessment recommends that the Local Plan allocates a target of between 65 and 100 ha up to 2033, with the higher figure justifiable if sites can be identified with sufficient flexibility to accommodate up to two large logistics developments.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representation.

Changes to Plan:
We therefore seek to allocate an additional 5.65 ha of employment land at Markham Vale (see enclosed Site Location Plan) in Bolsover's Local Plan for reasons as follows:

* Policy WC1 does not allocate sufficient employment land to meet the District's needs based on a figure of between 65 ha and 100 ha. The additional land at Markham Vale will contribute to the 92 ha allocated and bring this figure closer to the 100 ha figure.

* Most of the employment allocations in the draft Local Plan are either medium to long term opportunity sites and are unlikely to attract the type of occupiers who would be attracted to Markham Vale. This therefore offers the Council an opportunity for a better mix of employment land allocations and therefore attract a wider range of employment uses to the District.

* An expansion of Markham Vale North is a short term opportunity that will allow for logistics developments to locate in the District, as Markham Vale is effectively full and other suitable sites may not be available in the short term and by not providing for immediate opportunities, the District will lose investment to other locations.

We consider that the inclusion of the additional site at Markham Vale would allow the Council to allocate suitable and deliverable land to meet the requirements of the Council's evidence base to allocate closer to 100 ha of employment land.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: We are requesting participation at the Hearing sessions. We consider this necessary as we wish to discuss the current wording of Policy WC1, seek clarity on the Council's evidence base and therefore justification for only allocating 92 ha and also to outline the suitability of allocating an additional 5.65 ha of employment land at Markham Vale.

(Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
Bolsover District Council should consider development opportunities at small villages given their sustainability credentials to meet long term housing and economic needs, both within and beyond the plan period.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Written representation
Our separate representations raise concerns as to the soundness of this policy on many counts. This principally concerns the Council's method of calculation to inform the policy, in that sites that are already being built out are effectively informing the employment land allocation and skewing the overall hectareage demonstrable in the Employment Development Needs Assessment (EDNA). This in turn strongly influences the extent at which the Council lies in the range of recommended employment land needs suggested by the EDNA. On this basis a large part of the policy is considered to be unsound at the present time.

Notwithstanding this, in respect of the employment land allocations proposed for Colliery Road, Creswell, this element of the policy is considered sound as it seeks to allocate an appropriate distribution of land on this site for employment purposes in the settlement. We would however expect the employment creation generated by retail to have a role in the flexibility of land uses desired for employment land allocations.

The allocation of land for employment at Colliery Road, Creswell is supported and will be entirely delivered by wider proposals for land to the south of Colliery Road currently subject to an outline planning application (ref: 18/00087/OUT). This proposal will deliver 0.8ha of land for employment and convenience retail uses covering both the existing employment allocation and the proposed 0.46ha to be allocated by the emerging Plan. Therefore, bringing about significant local job and business opportunities whilst also delivering against the economic aspirations of the Local Plan.

### Full Text:
(Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

### Changes to Plan:
Our view that the policy be amended to reflect employment needs as a minimum would reflect a positively prepared policy. Should the policy be subject to further review, it is vital that this includes an appraisal of further employment allocations in the settlement of Creswell as part of the overall composition of sites.

Document is not Sound  
Document does not comply with duty to cooperate

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** As a major landowner within the District, Welbeck manages a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities.

### 9118

**Object** Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - Publication

**Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Agent:** Planning and Design Group (Ms Claire Hutt) [12390]  
**Respondent:** Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy as drafted is confusing as it seemingly incorporates two varied employment targets, also targets are not expressed as a minimum. In its current form the policy is therefore unsound as it misleading and fails to plan positively for employment delivery. We would also expect the employment creation generated by retail to have a role in the flexibility of land uses desired for employment land allocations.

The employment target is misleading as it states 92 hectares of land will be accommodated across the plan period within the pre-text, however this figure relies on 4 already delivered sites (Sports Direct, Shirebrook; Beaufit Lane, Pinxton; Land off Midland Way, Barlborough; Castlewood Business Park, North). Within policy WC1, 71.95 hectares of employment is identified. Given that Employment Development Needs Assessment identified 65 - 100 hectares should be allocated the figure expressed in policy WC1 does not need to be overinflated.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
Please refer to representations.

### Changes to Plan:
Therefore, the employment target should be amended to 71.95 hectares which accurately reflect the planned delivery of employment land. The significant contribution that retail makes to employment should also be acknowledged within the policy. This is important as the economic and commercial markets face great changes over the coming years, what with Brexit and growing competition and pressures in retail. Furthermore, the revised figure should be expressed as a minimum, in order for the plan to be positively prepared in accordance with the NPPF.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** The Estate is a major landowner within the District, managing a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities. Land managed by The Estate offers significant opportunities across a range of land to help meet the development needs of the District.
(Object) Policy WC1: Employment Land Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email
Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site.

Does allocating specific employment land for this site, and other strategic sites within Policy WC1 prejudice the comprehensive development of the strategic site through Masterplan? Should a caveat be included in Policy WC1 to clarify that the land set out as part of Strategic sites can only be developed as part of that wider site development and not on a piecemeal basis? Such piecemeal development would have potential to harm the historic environment, heritage assets or their setting.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Support) Policy WC2: General Principles for Economic Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]
Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email
Policy WC 2 is supported.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

(Object) Policy WC2: General Principles for Economic Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Ms Claire Hutt) [12390]
Respondent: Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
General Note:

Castle Industrial Estate is included a protected employment site, however the uses on the site would fall within retail/trade or sui generis. Welbeck welcome the inclusion of flexible uses within the employment definition as this plays a vital role within the District. However, if employment covers only B class uses then this should be removed as it is not relevant to apply the assumed employment uses in 2018 based on the opinion of the last Local Plan in 2000.

Support:

Welbeck support the point b as set out in the first section of the policy in encouraging higher wages, skilled businesses and jobs to the area. Welbeck welcome the opportunity to improve existing employment provisions in Bolsover. There is a high level of out-commuting from Bolsover to access employment opportunities and Welbeck seeks to improve the existing employment provision to secure new employment opportunities for local businesses and people. However, by virtue of their location, surroundings and associated vantage points, sites like Bolsover Business Park (and Intake Way) are important ‘gateway’ sites into Bolsover. Therefore high quality employment development supported by retail, anchoring the site and enabling redevelopment opportunities would be important to ensure the long term viability and vitality of the business park. Given Welbeck’s extensive land ownership in the area such a comprehensive redevelopment of the business park could give rise to opportunities to improve vistas from the Castle and the experience visitors encounter at this important 'gateway' to Bolsover.

Object:

Welbeck objects to point a in the second part of the policy relating to the marketing of a site for redevelopment. This is very vague and provides no clarity for a business meaning they cannot plan proactively within a volatile
and changing economic market. The policy should define a time period to allow businesses the opportunity to respond and proactively plan without the need for potentially onerous and protracted discussions with the Authority.

**Changes to Plan:**
Employment uses should acknowledge the significant and important role retail plays. Mixed use developments can prove to be more viable and sustainable in the long term as they have the flexibility to adapt. Furthermore, sites which offer a range of employment opportunities can create a better working environment for people of sites, making different spaces and experiences, therefore attracting higher quality and skilled businesses.

The policy should express a time limit regarding the extent of marketing required before redevelopment opportunities are explored. It is vital to businesses that they can respond proactively to changes in the market. It is suggested the minimum time limit should be 12 months.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** The Estate is a major landowner within the District, managing a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities. Land managed by The Estate offers significant opportunities across a range of land to help meet the development needs of the District.

**Support** Policy WC3: Supporting the Rural Economy - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Recipient: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Support for sustainable rural employment and diversification is welcome.

**Object** Policy WC3: Supporting the Rural Economy - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Recipient: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Policy WC3: Supporting the Rural Economy - ineffective

All the criteria in the policy should be subject to proposals demonstrating that they are appropriate and sustainable for their location. Otherwise, for example, the re-use of brownfield land could be used to justify a wholly inappropriate use of a site.

**Object** Policy WC3: Supporting the Rural Economy - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Recipient: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.
**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable

---

**Object** Policy WC4: Rough Close Works, South Normanton - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]
Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

In order to ensure further clarify on the content of the Health and Safety Legislation referred to within draft Policy WC4, we would suggest one further minor modification to the Publication Draft Local Plan to include the definitions of the various distances, as follows:

* Class A distances should be used for bridleways, footpaths, footways and waterways used by more than 20 people in any 24-hour period. Class A distances should also be used for a road used by more than 20 and no more than 500 vehicles every 24 hours.
* Class B distances should be used for a road used by more than 500 and no more than 10 000 vehicles every 24 hours.
* Class D distances should be used for buildings that are normally occupied (ie where people are, or are likely to be, present either all the time or from time to time), and include all dwellings (including mobile homes and caravans), shops, government and public buildings, churches, colleges, schools, hospitals, theatres, cinemas or other buildings (such as sports stadiums) where the public assemble.
* Class E distances should be used for any vulnerable buildings.

In addition, we welcome the inclusion on the Proposals Map of the various safeguarding zones associated with Rough Close Works. This helps to provide clarity to all parties in relation to the areas affected by the operations of the hazard site, and the positioning of the various zones referred to within the policy.

---

**Changes to Plan:**

In order to ensure further clarify on the content of the Health and Safety Legislation referred to within draft Policy WC4, we would suggest one further minor modification to the Publication Draft Local Plan to include the definitions of the various distances, as follows:

* Class A distances should be used for bridleways, footpaths, footways and waterways used by more than 20 people in any 24-hour period. Class A distances should also be used for a road used by more than 20 and no more than 500 vehicles every 24 hours.
* Class B distances should be used for a road used by more than 500 and no more than 10 000 vehicles every 24 hours.
* Class D distances should be used for buildings that are normally occupied (ie where people are, or are likely to be, present either all the time or from time to time), and include all dwellings (including mobile homes and caravans), shops, government and public buildings, churches, colleges, schools, hospitals, theatres, cinemas or other buildings (such as sports stadiums) where the public assemble.
* Class E distances should be used for any vulnerable buildings.

In addition, we welcome the inclusion on the Proposals Map of the various safeguarding zones associated with Rough Close Works. This helps to provide clarity to all parties in relation to the areas affected by the operations of the hazard site, and the positioning of the various zones referred to within the policy.

---

**Representations:**

**Object** Retail, Town Centre and Local Centre Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

8322

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To be available to answer any queries the Inspector may have on our clients niche use and associated HSE legislation (unless our concerns are addressed by way of a minor modification in advance of the Hearing)
Q+A Planning act on behalf of Limes Developments Ltd. Our client is promoting a mixed-use development on the site known within the draft Plan as 'Wincobank Farm, South Normanton'. Two planning applications have been submitted to the Council for a mix of employment and retail uses on this site and remain undetermined.

On behalf of our client, we wish to object to the plan's approach to retail need. We note that the quantitative need as cited within the Retail and Centres Study (RCS) published in April 2018 for comparison goods is given as a range of between minus 2,600 sqm to minus 4,100 sqm as presented in paragraph 6.35. However, this paragraph may be misleading, since it is first presenting these figures as a 'quantitative need', but then in effect showing a minus figure - in other words, no quantitative need. However, paragraph 161 of the NPPF requires the needs for both quantitative and qualitative need to be assessed, and as the RCS makes clear at paragraph 6.38, a qualitative need for new floorspace in Bolsover is identified. In order to deliver this qualitative need, new floorspace will need to be constructed, to ensure there is a 'step change' in spending patterns.

Paragraph 6.36 seeks to explain the minus figures by stating that 'The floorspace requirements range for comparison goods are negative figures because the amount already developed within the study period has exceeded the need identified. In essence, in quantitative (sic) modelling terms, the District has too much comparison floorspace, and effectively would need to lose at least 3,087m2 before any new Comparison goods floorspace is needed'.

Setting aside the merits or otherwise of the figures cited, we have a number of concerns in relation to this particular paragraph, and these concerns lead us to request that it be deleted from the plan. The concerns can be summarised as follows:

- First, retail capacity modelling is not sophisticated enough to suggest that any floorspace should be demolished before new floorspace is built, and the relationship between loss of floorspace and the effects of construction of new space is too indirect to allow the conclusion to be drawn.
- Secondly, the retail capacity exercise as set out in the RCS results in negative figure primarily because the turnover of commitments exceeds the growth in expenditure. However, this exercise is based on numerous assumptions, which include:
  - Turnover and floorspace are in 'equilibrium' in the base year of 2017 - in other words, no retailers are doing better than expected, and none are doing worse than expected.
  - A turnover level achieved by commitments.
  - The growth in turnover of existing retailers materials (assumed to be around 2% per annum).
  - We certainly acknowledge that any retail capacity assessment is out of necessity based on a range of assumptions. However, it should also be noted that, if any of these assumptions made in the RCS are adjusted, the quantitative outputs for Bolsover are likely to be significantly different.
  - It is also noted that the RCS treats the retail uses on the Wincobank Farm site as a 'commitment' within the quantitative exercise. In other words, for retail modelling purposes, the RCS is assuming the development has planning permission (whereas i...
We support the findings of the Chesterfield Borough, Bolsover District and North East Derbyshire Retail and Centres Study 2018 and the Bolsover Retail and Town Centre Uses Land Availability Assessment (updated March 2018) which confirm, inter alia, that:

* based on the current market share claimed by Bolsover District facilities and stripping out as yet underdetermined applications such as Park 38, there is no capacity for additional comparison goods floorspace across the District over the Plan period;

* capacity for convenience goods floorspace in Bolsover District is limited;

* there is no overriding / pressing qualitative need for the type of retail development proposed at Wincobank Farm as the study area generally benefits from relatively good access to retail venues with a strong comparison goods offer outside of the study area (which have an appropriate role to play in meeting some of the needs of the residents of the study area) (Para 10.5 of the Retail and Centres Study 2018);

* whilst there would be benefit in improving the range and quality of the comparison goods offer across the smaller town centres (in order to improve the health of those centres, improve consumer choice and reduce the need to travel), most residents within the Study Area are able to access a complementary network of centres which are capable of meeting varied needs.

A detailed review of the Retail and Centres Study (which has only just been published) confirms that the methodology employed is broadly robust and based on up to date and representative survey work (namely a household survey conducted across 1,500 households in November 2016).

Even if adjustments to certain assumptions were made (for example by using the more recent Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 15 (2017)), this does not materially alter the conclusion that there is a limited quantitative requirement for new retail floorspace in Bolsover District across the Plan period (indeed, we would be happy to review any counter arguments to this effect - in other words, we will look to robustly defend against any counter argument that there is a pressing need for the scale of retail development proposed at Wincobank Farm).

Allied to the above point, we note that in calculating capacity for new comparison goods retail floorspace, the Retail and Centres Study has adopted a constant market share thus assuming that the performance of comparison retailers within the relevant authority areas continues to be commensurate with its current market share. This is considered to be entirely appropriate given the scale of existing retail facilities in Bolsover District and their relationship with existing centres in neighbouring authority areas (a number of which perform important regional / sub-regional roles such as Sheffield, Mansfield and Nottingham).

Whilst it is appreciated Bolsover may wish to stem leakage to competing centres outwith the District and thereby improve its market share, this must be achieved in consultation and collaboration with neighbouring authorities and addressed as a strategic cross-boundary issue (as opposed to arbitrarily adjusting market shares through quantitative retail assessment).

Any substantive adjustments with a view to significantly increasing Bolsover's market share would need to be consulted upon with neighbouring authorities as part of the authority's Duty to Cooperate as clearly this will have significant cross-boundary impacts (indeed, NPPG paragraph 008 reference ID: 9-008-20140306 clearly states that local planning authorities lead strategic planning effectively through their Local Plans, addressing...
The NPPF requires Local Plans to identify a network and hierarchy of retail centres. We support the identification of this as part of Policy WC5. However it is the preceding text to the policy that we object to as it is misleading at best and factually incorrect at worst.

Para 6.37 (and indeed the Council's new Retail Study, dated April 2018 and published May 2018), detail the retail commitments across the District. However, the implemented (albeit not built out) permission for a new Morrisons foodstore and PFS at the Sherwood Lodge site (application ref: 12/00324/FULMAJ) fails to be referenced as a retail commitment. Indeed Para 6.40 states that the permission for Morrisons in Bolsover town was never implemented, which is factually incorrect.

There is also no mention of the current planning application (ref: 17/00615/FULMAJ) which was submitted in November 2017 and followed extensive pre-application meetings with officers in 2016 and 2017. A public exhibition was held on the new scheme in October 2017 and the application was taken to planning committee on 9 May 2018 with a recommendation for approval (subject to further consultation on amended plans and the signing of legal agreements). Again it is misleading that this application/revised scheme is not referenced in the Local Plan.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Our representations relate specifically to the Sherwood Lodge site in Bolsover Town Centre. As you will be aware, there is a current application pending with a resolution to grant planning permission for a new foodstore and retail terrace at the site. The applicant is Rothstone Estates who are the developers of the site. The site is owned by Optimisation Developments Limited (ODL).

ODL submitted representations to the Draft Consultation of the Local Plan in December 2016. The representations made by ODL supported and objected to Policy WC4. Policy WC4 was drafted on the evidence base of the Bolsover Retail Study (2010). It identified a need for new convenience retail development in Bolsover to improve the existing retail offer. It also amended the town centre boundary for Bolsover and identified the site of the former Council offices (which had an implemented planning permission for a new Morrisons foodstore and PFS) as being within the boundaries of Bolsover Town Centre. ODL supported this amended town centre boundary.

Document is not Sound

Reason for appearance: Appearance at the Examination
We are requesting participation at the Hearing sessions as we consider this necessary as we wish to discuss the current wording of Policy WC5 and Policy WC6, seek clarity on the Council's evidence base and therefore justification for these policies as they stand in the Publication Consultation of the Bolsover Local Plan.

8323
(Object) Policy WC5: Retail, Town Centre and Local Centre Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Q+A Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Keenan) [11832] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Limes Developments Ltd [11833]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Web

On behalf of our client, we object to this policy because it is inconsistent with national policy. Our concern surrounds the suggestion that ‘Retail development must demonstrate that it is appropriate in scale and function to its location’. The requirement to consider scale has not been a national retail policy test for many years (since PPS4 replaced PPS6 in December 2009). Scale was removed from national policy on the grounds that it was simply an ineffective policy test, and town centres have a sufficient protection through the requirement for an impact test for edge and out of centre proposals.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
On behalf of our client, we object to this policy because it is inconsistent with national policy. Our concern surrounds the suggestion that ‘Retail development must demonstrate that it is appropriate in scale and function to its location’. The requirement to consider scale has not been a national retail policy test for many years (since PPS4 replaced PPS6 in December 2009). Scale was removed from national policy on the grounds that it was simply an ineffective policy test, and town centres have a sufficient protection through the requirement for an impact test for edge and out of centre proposals.
Changes to Plan:
Delete reference to scale in Policy WC5.

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: Retail policy and evidence is a specialist topic and therefore a verbal discussion over the inputs and the implications for policy would assist the examination.

8364 (Support) Policy WC5: Retail, Town Centre and Local Centre Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Para 6.41 & Policy WC5
Although the retail capacity study for north Derbyshire identifies weak demand for additional retail floorspace (in particular comparison floorspace), the plan identifies a number of locations that may be suitable for town centre/retail development on the basis of qualitative need. The borough council SUPPORTS this approach as reasonable and appropriate to improve quality and choice and support local centres across a geographically diverse area. The locally based retail impact assessment thresholds set out in policy WC5 provide a mechanism through which the risk of over-provision having an impact on other centres can be considered. The borough council would wish to be consulted on any planning applications supported by impact assessments with the potential to have an adverse impact on centres within Chesterfield Borough through the development control process.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the draft Bolsover District Local Plan and related documents.

Detailed comments and observations are set out below. Wherever possible, comments have been related to a specific policy or paragraph of the Local Plan publication draft.

Subject to the detailed comments set out below, overall the council is of the view that the plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with national policy as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework.

I can confirm that the borough council has worked pro-actively with Bolsover, North East Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Districts, and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils in preparing a Statement of Common Ground to address Duty to Co-operate issues.

Retail, Town Centre And Local Centre Development
Para 6.41 & Policy WC5
Although the retail capacity study for north Derbyshire identifies weak demand for additional retail floorspace (in particular comparison floorspace), the plan identifies a number of locations that may be suitable for town centre/retail development on the basis of qualitative need. The borough council SUPPORTS this approach as reasonable and appropriate to improve quality and choice and support local centres across a geographically diverse area. The locally based retail impact assessment thresholds set out in policy WC5 provide a mechanism to through which the risk of over-provision having an impact on other centres can be considered. The borough council would wish to be consulted on any planning applications supported by impact assessments with the potential to have an adverse impact on centres within Chesterfield Borough through the development control process.

Should you have any queries about the above comments or require clarification on any points, please do not hesitate to contact me

8587 (Support) Policy WC5: Retail, Town Centre and Local Centre Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Williams Gallagher (Mr Matthew Williams) [12004]
Respondent: Eisinger LTD [12003]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
We support Draft Policy WC5 which continues to set a local threshold for requiring retail impact assessment (500 sqm - in respect of net retail and floorspace across the District) rather than the 2,500 sqm identified by the NPPF - this reflects the fragility of the town centres within Bolsover District and the surrounding districts.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Williams Gallagher act on behalf of Eisinger Ltd (c/o Ellandi LLP), owners of the Idlewells Shopping Centre in Sutton-in-Ashfield Town Centre.

We have reviewed and make comment on the Publication Local Plan owing to its potential to bring about cross-boundary impacts (including impacts on the viability and vitality of town centres outwith Bolsover District such as that of Sutton Town Centre in Ashfield District (which is approximately 2.4 miles east of the edge of the Bolsover District boundary)).

For the avoidance of doubt, the development of the Wincobank Farm site for retail and town centre uses is wholly unacceptable for the reasons set out in our Planning Objection Report dated December 2017 (submitted alongside this representation for ease of reference).

It is within the above context that our representations are made (representations which are largely supportive of the Plan as drafted).

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** In order to ensure our client’s interests are protected and to provide a response to opposing views on policies affecting the future vitality and viability of Sutton-in-Ashfield Town Centre (where necessary).

### 9097 (Object) Policy WC5: Retail, Town Centre and Local Centre Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Peacock and Smith Ltd (Mrs Cara Ware) [12387]
**Respondent:** ODL and Rothstone Estates [12400]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Para 6.44 refers to the 2018 Retail Study and its recommendation that Retail Impact Assessments will be required for all applications outside town centres. This recommendation is carried forward into the second part of Policy WC5 and it is on this basis that we object to Policy WC5.

Para 182 of the NPPF states that a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy. Yet this second part of Policy WC5 has not been positively prepared as it is not meeting the objectively assessed need for new retail development as identified; and it is not consistent with national policy.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Our representations relate specifically to the Sherwood Lodge site in Bolsover Town Centre. As you will be aware, there is a current application pending with a resolution to grant planning permission for a new foodstore and retail terrace at the site. The applicant is Rothstone Estates who are the developers of the site. The site is owned by Optimisation Developments Limited (ODL).

ODL submitted representations to the Draft Consultation of the Local Plan in December 2016. The representations made by ODL supported and objected to Policy WC4. Policy WC4 was drafted on the evidence base of the Bolsover Retail Study (2010). It identified a need for new convenience retail development in Bolsover to improve the existing retail offer. It also amended the town centre boundary for Bolsover and identified the site of the former Council offices (which had an implemented planning permission for a new Morrisons foodstore and PFS) as being within the boundaries of Bolsover Town Centre. ODL supported this amended town centre boundary.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** We are requesting participation at the Hearing sessions as we consider this necessary as we wish to discuss the current wording of Policy WC5 and Policy WC6, seek clarity on the Council’s evidence base and therefore justification for these policies as they stand in the Publication Consultation of the Bolsover Local Plan.

### 9130 (Object) Policy WC5: Retail, Town Centre and Local Centre Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable.

---

**Object** Bolsover - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Mrs Cara Ware) [12387]
Respondent: ODL and Rothstone Estates [12400]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

ODL and Rothstone Estates strongly object to this policy. Again there are a large number of errors in the preceding text that are misleading and/or factually incorrect. Para 6.45 refers to the Council having commissioned a community led district-wide regeneration approach yet neither of our clients have been approached as part of these discussions or have even been made aware of them.

Para 6.51 refers to the Sherwood Lodge site as a 'large potential redevelopment area'. Quite how this site can be referred to as a 'potential site' when there is an extant planning permission for a foodstore, almost 18 months of pre-application discussions with Senior Officers at the Council and an application and resolution to grant planning permission for a retail development is quite simply baffling and clearly untrue.

Para 6.51 continues that 'the developer (Morrisons) is no longer proceeding with the scheme'. However this has never been confirmed by Morrisons. ODL have confirmed in their previous representations to the Draft Local Plan (December 2016) that they 'intend' to bring forward an alternative development but the position is still that there is an implemented planning permission on the site and there is now a resolution to grant planning permission for an amended retail scheme.

Para 6.55 states that there 'have been discussions with the landowners over potential redevelopment schemes'. Again this is factually incorrect as the discussions were as part of a formal pre-application process which led to a planning application being submitted - something that is not referred to at all in the document.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Our representations relate specifically to the Sherwood Lodge site in Bolsover Town Centre. As you will be aware, there is a current application pending with a resolution to grant planning permission for a new foodstore and retail terrace at the site. The applicant is Rothstone Estates who are the developers of the site. The site is owned by Optimisation Developments Limited (ODL).

ODL submitted representations to the Draft Consultation of the Local Plan in December 2016. The representations made by ODL supported and objected to Policy WC4. Policy WC4 was drafted on the evidence base of the Bolsover Retail Study (2010). It identified a need for new convenience retail development in Bolsover to improve the existing retail offer. It also amended the town centre boundary for Bolsover and identified the site of the former Council offices (which had an implemented planning permission for a new Morrisons foodstore and PFS) as being within the boundaries of Bolsover Town Centre. ODL supported this amended town centre boundary.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** We are requesting participation at the Hearing sessions as we consider this necessary as we wish to discuss the current wording of Policy WC5 and Policy WC6, seek clarity on the Council’s evidence base and therefore justification for these policies as they stand in the Publication Consultation of the Bolsover Local Plan.

---

**Object** Policy WC6: Bolsover Edge of Town Centre Allocation - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Our representations relate specifically to the Sherwood Lodge site in Bolsover Town Centre. As you will be aware, there is a current application pending with a resolution to grant planning permission for a new foodstore and retail terrace at the site. The applicant is Rothstone Estates who are the developers of the site. The site is owned by Optimisation Developments Limited (ODL).

ODL submitted representations to the Draft Consultation of the Local Plan in December 2016. The representations made by ODL supported and objected to Policy WC4. Policy WC4 was drafted on the evidence base of the Bolsover Retail Study (2010). It identified a need for new convenience retail development in Bolsover to improve the existing retail offer. It also amended the town centre boundary for Bolsover and identified the site of the former Council offices (which had an implemented planning permission for a new Morrisons foodstore and PFS) as being within the boundaries of Bolsover Town Centre. ODL supported this amended town centre boundary.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** We are requesting participation at the Hearing sessions as we consider this necessary as we wish to discuss the current wording of Policy WC5 and Policy WC6, seek clarity on the Council’s evidence base and therefore justification for these policies as they stand in the Publication Consultation of the Bolsover Local Plan.
In addition to the preceding text to the policy, we have strong objections to the specific wording of the policy, namely:

* Edge of Town Centre Allocation - in the previous draft of the Local Plan, the site was identified as being within the amended town centre boundary. There is no justification or evidence been provided in the document as to why the site's location has changed from a town centre allocation to an edge of centre allocation in this version of the Local Plan.

* Guided by a Masterplan - again there is no evidence or justification as to why a proposal should be guided by a Masterplan for the site.

* Provide for an acceptable two way vehicular access road - no evidence or justification as to why this should be provided despite the lengthy and numerous transport studies that make up the evidence base for the Local Plan.

* Supplementary Planning Document - no evidence or justification as to the necessity of such a document which would only serve to further delay development on this important town centre site.

Policy WC6 as it is currently written, risks sterilising the site for any future development over the course of the plan period. This policy goes to the fundamental heart of Para 182 of the NPPF and highlights that the Plan cannot be considered as 'sound' as it is not:

* Positively prepared,
* Justified,
* Effective, or
* Consistent with national planning policy.

Para 17 of the NPPF outlines a set of core land-use planning principles which should underpin both plan making and decision-taking. Importantly, one of these states the following:

* Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development [our emphasis] to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.

Furthermore, Chapter 1 of the NPPF 'Building a strong, competitive economy' sets out in Para 19 that:

The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth [our emphasis]. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.

Most importantly, Para 20 add that to help achieve economic growth Local Authorities should:

"plan proactively to meet the development needs of business [our emphasis] and support an economy fit for the 21st century.

Finally, Para 161 of the NPPF states:

Local planning authorities should use this evidence base to assess:

* the needs for land or floorspace for economic development, including both the quantitative and qualitative needs for all foreseeable types of economic activity over the plan period, including for retail and leisure development;
* the existing and future supply of land available for economic development and its sufficiency and suitability to meet the identified needs.

Our representations relate specifically to the Sherwood Lodge site in Bolsover Town Centre. As you will be aware, there is a current application pending with a resolution to grant planning permission for a new foodstore and retail terrace at the site. The applicant is Rothstone Estates who are the developers of the site. The site is owned by Optimisation Developments Limited (ODL).

ODL submitted representations to the Draft Consultation of the Local Plan in December 2016. The representations made by ODL supported and objected to Policy WC4. Policy WC4 was drafted on the evidence base of the Bolsover Retail Study (2010). It identified a need for new convenience retail development in Bolsover to improve the
existing retail offer. It also amended the town centre boundary for Bolsover and identified the site of the former Council offices (which had an implemented planning permission for a new Morrisons foodstore and PFS) as being within the boundaries of Bolsover Town Centre. ODL supported this amended town centre boundary.

**Document is not Sound**

**Reason for appearance:** We are requesting participation at the Hearing sessions as we consider this necessary as we wish to discuss the current wording of Policy WC5 and Policy WC6, seek clarity on the Council's evidence base and therefore justification for these policies as they stand in the Public Consultation of the Bolsover Local Plan.

---

### (Object) Policy WC6: Bolsover Edge of Town Centre Allocation - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]

**Received:** 4/6/2018 via Email

Replace current wording to criteria (f) with:

> 'Undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to inform the Masterplan. The HIA will identify heritage assets, including the ancient entrenchments to the town and associated remains both as designated as a Scheduled Monument and as demonstrated to be of equivalent importance through archaeological investigations and the remaining building on the western side of the site, assess their significance and assess the impact of the development on their significance. Appropriate measures for mitigation and adding value should be identified and set out in the assessment. The HIA must form the basis for approaches to the layout and design of the development across the site. Planning applications for the site should accord with the HIA.'

We would welcome opportunity to discuss in order to reach agreement through a Statement of Common Ground ahead of the EIP.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

### (Object) Policy WC7: Shirebrook Edge of Centre Allocations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Pegasus Group (Leeds office) (Mr Edward Senior) [11947] (unconfirmed)

**Respondent:** ARBA Group (Mr Richard Burns) [10122]

**Received:** 11/6/2018 via Email

Our client ARBA Group is generally supportive of the proposal to include Sites A and B as edge of centre allocated sites under Policy WC7 of the Publication Local Plan. The support for a range of town centre uses including retail, office, leisure, residential or community facilities on Site B is also welcomed, and it is considered that this positively reflects the range of uses supported within Section 2 (Paragraph 23) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

It should be noted that the wording under criteria b) and d) of Policy WC7 is repeated and therefore criterion d) should be omitted.

Our main concern with the policy relates to criterion e), which requires the provision of a replacement play area and a commuted sum to be agreed with the Council. Planning permission was approved in 2012 under the Council's reference 11/00262/FULMAJ for the erection of an A1 retail unit which incorporated both sites A and B. It is noted that as part of that consent, there was no requirement to provide a replacement play area, and only a commuted sum was required as part of the development, which would be used to upgrade existing facilities. It is considered that there should be no change as a result of the sites allocation within the emerging local plan.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Please find enclosed our representation for the Publication Draft Consultation Draft

**Changes to Plan:**

It is considered that Policy WC7 should be reworded to omit criterion d) as this is a repetition of criterion b).

It is considered that criterion e) should be amended to state "Provide a replacement play area and/or a commuted sum to be agreed with the Council".

Paragraph 204 of the states that obligations should only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It is evident from the previous A1 retail approval for the site that this...
objective could also be met through a commuted sum and therefore more flexibility should be applied to the policy.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

### (Support) Policy WC8: South Normanton Town Centre Regeneration Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Alistair Flatman [11852] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: J G Johnson & Needham [11853]
Received: 12/6/2018 via Web

We fully support the proposed allocation of land to the north and west of the existing town centre to facilitate much need expansion of, and investment in, South Normanton. The proposed allocation and supporting text allows for a mix of uses that will allow the town centre to grow and improve whilst, importantly, addressing the current lack of spending (1.2% convenience expenditure) that occurs in South Normanton. This proposed allocation will facilitate development to address this issue and also provide opportunities for complementary residential / leisure / office development in a sustainable location together with possible public realm improvements.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
We fully support the proposed allocation of land to the north and west of the existing town centre to facilitate much need expansion of, and investment in, South Normanton. The proposed allocation and supporting text allows for a mix of uses that will allow the town centre to grow and improve whilst, importantly, addressing the current lack of spending (1.2% convenience expenditure) that occurs in South Normanton. This proposed allocation will facilitate development to address this issue and also provide opportunities for complementary residential / leisure / office development in a sustainable location together with possible public realm improvements.

### (Object) Policy WC8: South Normanton Town Centre Regeneration Site - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]
Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

Whilst there are clearly some concerns regarding the potential conflict between the potential scale and form of development being proposed on this site given its proximity to Rough Close Works, it can be confirmed that EPC-UK would not wish to limit another landowners development aspirations and to object to a planning application. Therefore, in order to address any future potential conflict, and potential inconsistency within the Development Plan, we would wish to suggest some alternative wording of Draft policy WC8 as follows:

"Policy WC8: South Normanton Edge of Town Centre Allocations
As part of the regeneration and redevelopment of South Normanton town centre, the areas as indicated in Figure 6C and defined on the Policies Map are allocated as edge of town centre allocations within the Local Plan. Proposals for the development of this area will be permitted within: Site A) for retail Site B) for retail, office, leisure, residential (including Extra Care accommodation or community facilities) Where they:
a) Contribute towards place-making through the delivery of a high quality designed development that creates an attractive and locally distinctive new urban neighbourhood utilising as appropriate public art
b) Contribute towards the efforts to tackle climate change through its approach to sustainable construction, renewable energy and energy conservation within the sites general layout, design and orientation
c) Comply with the provisions of Policy WC4 and current Health and Safety Executive (HSE) land use planning guidance in relation to the nearby Rough Close Works."

We would also ask that no parts of the land to be allocated for development be sited inside the Inner Consultation Zone.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Policy WC8: South Normanton Edge of Town Centre Allocations

As part of the regeneration and redevelopment of South Normanton town centre, the areas as indicated in Figure...
6C and defined on the Policies Map are allocated as edge of town centre allocations within the Local Plan. Proposals for the development of this area will be permitted within:

Site A) for retail
Site B) for retail, office, leisure, residential (including Extra Care accommodation or community facilities)

Where they:

a) Contribute towards place-making through the delivery of a high quality designed development that creates an attractive and locally distinctive new urban neighbourhood utilising as appropriate public art

b) Contribute towards the efforts to tackle climate change through its approach to sustainable construction, renewable energy and energy conservation within the site's general layout, design and orientation

c) Comply with the provisions of Policy WC4 and current Health and Safety Executive (HSE) land use planning guidance in relation to the nearby Rough Close Works."

We would also ask that no parts of the land to be allocated for development be sited inside the Inner Consultation Zone.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To be available to answer any queries the Inspector may have on our clients niche use and associated HSE legislation (unless our concerns are addressed by way of a minor modification in advance of the Hearing)

8305 (Object) Policy WC9: Hot Food Takeaways - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: SSA Planning Limited (Steve Simms) [11885] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Limited [11886]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Web

No assessment of the impact in terms of jobs, viability or footfall has been made, but all hot food takeaways (HFTs) are assumed to offer little choice and serve the same standard of food.

There is very limited evidence for any correlation between obesity and the proximity of HFTs to schools. There can be no causality mechanism for primary schools.

Effectiveness cannot be monitored, because it is unclear whether poor achievement should result in zone reduction or expansion.

National policy recognises the role planning takes in enabling healthier lifestyles, but seeks to do this by creating, not restricting choice.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)

1. We consider that the inclusion of Policy WC9 criterion (a) and actions (a-b) render the draft LP unsound because the policy fails to meet the criteria set out at NPPF paragraph 182, as follows:

Positively Prepared

2. The draft policy is not based on any objectively assessed development requirement. It effectively assesses the requirement for hot food takeaways within 400 metres of the boundary of a primary or secondary school or colleges as zero, but does so without evidence of either a link between the incidence of childhood obesity and the proximity of hot food takeaways to schools or of any particular distance at which that link is demonstrated. Consequently, the development requirement has not been objectively assessed.

3. In fact, the distance chosen could have the effect of banning hot food takeaways from a large majority of the Borough. Because no assessment has been made of the number of hot food takeaways that might be refused as a result of this or what the social, economic or environmental impacts of that might be, it is not possible to balance these impacts. It is clear that units will remain unlet, centres impacted and jobs will remain uncreated.

4. The policy is negative in its assumptions, implying that all hot food takeaways engender unhealthy eating, which is at best unhelpful in isolation from an understanding of the person eating the food, their health and lifestyle, and at worst is simply subjective. Furthermore, it assumes all hot food takeaways offer little choice and serve the same type and standard of food.

Justified
5. There is no objective evidence for any link between the incidence of obesity and the proximity of hot food takeaways to schools, so it is at best unclear whether an effort to achieve the objective stated based on refusing planning applications for hot food takeaways within 400m of primary and secondary schools or colleges could ever work.

6. The inclusion of primary schools is particularly problematic, as it is clear that children at primary schools are not usually permitted to leave the premises at lunchtime and, given their age, are unlikely to travel to or from school unaccompanied. Outside school time, children's diets are quite properly the responsibility their parents or guardians.

7. Consequently, it is far from clear how refusing planning permission for hot food takeaways within 400 metres of primary schools could ever be justified. This was the view taken by a Planning Inspector in an appeal (APP/P4415/A/11/2159082) against refusal of a restaurant and hot food takeaway in January 2012.

8. A further difficulty of distance radii is that it takes no account of real barriers, physical or perceptual, so that premises on the other side of a line feature such as a canal or busy road could be affected despite in reality being more than a 400m walk away.

9. Diet is clearly a key determinant both of general health and obesity levels. Exercise is the other key determinant which must be considered for a complete picture. Focussing on improving access to open space, sport and recreation facilities would be a far more appropriate strategy for reducing childhood obesity.

10. We consider that it may be possible to justify a restriction on over-concentration or clustering and we may be able to support it in principle, as we consider high concentrations of any one use are unhealthy in retail, but possibly also human, health terms. However, "over-concentration" would n...

Changes to Plan:
Delete Policy WC9 criterion (a) and actions (a-b).
Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: Because little evidence has been offered for the specific policy so far and it may be necessary to examine any evidence later offered.

Support Policy WC9: Hot Food Takeaways - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
The policy relating to restricting the development of Hot Food Takeaways within 400 metres of schools is particularly welcome, and has the potential to make a significant contribution to the health and wellbeing of the population.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

Object Policy WC9: Hot Food Takeaways - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Planware LTD (Mr Benjamin Fox) [12380]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
There is no appropriate reason to restrict A5 uses from local schools or colleges.

It is unsound to introduce such a widespread land use policy to protect the amenity of such uses, which could be dealt with on a case by case basis via conditions. Further to this, the supporting text is outdated and provides a minimal amount of evidence towards the links between hot food takeaways and obesity, therefore such an approach is unjustifiable.

The proposed approach in direct conflict with the Framework. The policy attempts to introduce a widespread land use restriction on a specific use class without providing a single map to outline the specific limitations it would have. Without a map it is impossible to indicate the extent of the policies implications on the borough.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representation and supporting document.

Document is not Sound
### (Support) Tourism and the Visitor Economy - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath) [2475]
**Received:** 14/6/2018 via Web

The New Local Plan should take account of the VSCR Destination Plan

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

The recent Visit. Sleep. Cycle. Repeat (VSCR) Destination Plan, (which can be viewed through www.derbyshire.gov.uk/vscr) identifies the potential for the area to become an alternative short-break destination, renowned for leisure cycling and world-class heritage. The Plan outlined a 10 year Action Plan.

Key aspect identified within the plan to grow the visitor economy are:

* The development of key cycling hubs including Pleasley Vale/Pleasley Pit and Creswell Crags-Welbeck-Clumber;
* Improvements to the accommodation offer - it was particularly noted that the accommodation offer should reflect current market trends and be based around new forms of non-serviced accommodation such as camping pods, glamping and Forest Lodges etc a number of potential sites including Pleasley Pit and Poulter Country Parks and Pleasley Vale were identified.
* The development of cycling friendly places - including support for SME's & developing the Cyclist Welcome Scheme
* The development of cycling infrastructure - including the Archaeological Way, Clowne Branch Line which support the completion of the Bolsover Loop.
* Improvements to marketing.

### (Support) Policy WC10: Tourism and the Visitor Economy - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
**Respondent:** Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
**Received:** 13/6/2018 via Email

Support for tourism and the visitor economy is welcome. Such activities could play a key role in the diversification of the rural economy, including the re-use of under-utilised and redundant agricultural buildings.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Please refer to representations

Document is not Legal
Chapter 7 – Sustainable Communities

**8308** *(Object)* Development Envelopes - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Mr Frederick David Ball [11890]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Paper

See attached letter.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
I would ask that the Development Envelope be extended to include this plot of land in Newton.

See attached letter.

Document is not Sound

**8569** *(Object)* Development Envelopes - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

The Small Village of Scarcliffe has both a settlement framework and a Conservation Area. The development envelope does not include all existing built form that contributes to what is in both physical and character terms 'the village'. In particular, to the north of Main Street it excludes the full extent of buildings within Manor Farm and Scarcliffe Hall Farm. The areas currently excluded from the settlement framework include substantial buildings of some age. The settlement framework should be extended to include all of the built form to the north of Main Street.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

**Changes to Plan:**
The settlement framework should be extended to include all of the built form to the north of Main Street.

Document is not Sound

**Reason for appearance:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** The spatial strategy and distribution of development that will be supported by the Local Plan is central to achieving its objectives. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (‘CST’) offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of the objectives of the Local Plan, including the delivery of new housing growth (some CST land being allocated, additional land being available for allocation). To allow effective decision making in respect of the management, development and disposal of those assets, clarity within local planning policy is essential. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

**9085** *(Object)* Development Envelopes - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: IBA Planning Limited (Mr Nick Baseley) [4560]
Respondent: All Foundations (Planning Advisor) [10066]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Further to the Council’s consultation on the above document, my client, All Foundations (UK) Ltd, wishes to make the following representations.

We have previously written to the Council’s Policy Section on 22 June 2016 advising of our client’s need to expand their existing employment site, or to redevelop their existing site for housing as a means to fund the relocation of the existing premises elsewhere.

At the same time, we submitted a formal pre-application enquiry to your Development Management colleagues which highlighted the constraints imposed by the current Local Plan - more particularly, by the extent of the existing settlement envelope and open space designation.

In addition, we have also made representations to the previous Consultation Local Plan in December 2016 (further copy enclosed for ease of reference) seeking the review of the current open space designation to remove the land

137
within my client’s ownership, immediately to the south of Primrose Business Park, to enable the reasonable expansion of the existing business park (to ensure the employment site remains within the settlement), or as part of the redevelopment of the existing employment site as a housing site/allocation as the only means of funding the relocation of the business to alternative employment premises.

In either scenario, as previously stated, my client is entirely flexible in terms of the design/form the development on the land presently beyond the settlement boundary would take so as to avoid visual encroachment and ensure better assimilation within the rural setting.

It was hoped that, as a local business/employer, my client’s development requirements could be satisfactorily incorporated into the new Local Plan to enable the continued sustainable growth of this local business either within Blackwell, or at an alternative location within the District (funded as it will need to be via residential redevelopment) - rather than to lose a valuable source of local employment to a neighbouring authority.

However, this appears to have been overlooked and my client’s land to the south of Primrose Business Park continues to remain within the open space designation.

Accordingly, my client is not able to support the Publication Draft Local Plan in its current form.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See representations and attached site plan.

**Changes to Plan:**
In order to remedy the situation, the Council is requested to remove that additional land owned by my client to the south of the existing business park from the open space designation and include it within the settlement boundary for Blackwell.

Again, as before, my client will be happy to discuss their particular requirements (and how these might be accommodated within Blackwell/the new Local Plan) with you further as a consequence of these representations and in advance of submission of the Local Plan for Examination.

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

### (Object) Policy SC1: Development within the Development Envelope - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC1: Development Envelope - ineffective

Para 7.6 states that 'Policy SC1 aims to encourage suitable development within the district by directing growth towards the most sustainable settlements.' However the policy itself is very negative in approach, especially (b), which is only triggered when there is just one remaining community building or facility - by which point its viability may have already been severely compromised. In fact, the whole policy could be paraphrased as 'development will be permitted if it is acceptable, and not if it is unacceptable', and as such will fail to add anything to the decision-making process.

To be effective, the policy must be much more explicit that it is guiding development proposals on unallocated sites.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
We suggest the following wording.

"Development proposals on unallocated sites will only normally permitted if:
* They are within the development envelope;
* They are appropriate to the scale, design, character and function of the area;
* They maintain or enhance the provision of community buildings and facilities;
* They maintain or enhance the local environment;
* They are compatible with the other policies of this Plan, and with the Neighbourhood Plan if applicable."

**Document is not Legal**
**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our
representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

8877 (Object) Policy SC1: Development within the Development Envelope - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The HBF suggests that the Council also considers providing greater flexibility by varying Policies SS3 and SC1 - Development within the Development Envelope to include sustainable development which is adjacent to as well as within development envelopes.

It is important that the Council recognises the difficulties facing rural communities in particular housing supply and affordability issues. The NPPG emphasises that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided. One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is to "take account of the different roles and character of different areas ... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it" (para 17) and "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities" (para 55). The proposed distribution of housing should meet the housing needs of both urban and rural communities.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC’s, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To further discuss the issues raised.

8244 (Support) Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
Received: 8/6/2018 via Web

We broadly support this policy and consider it to be consistent with national policy so that the plan will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
We broadly support this policy and consider it to be consistent with national policy so that the plan will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

8402 (Object) Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Severn Trent Water Ltd - Derby Office (Mr Chris Bramley) [11926]
Received: 5/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction, Severn Trent are supportive of this policy in particular:

Bullet point F "Adopts sustainable drainage principles and avoids detrimental changes to the characteristics of groundwater drainage and surface water run-off, and protects the capacity of natural surface water drainage systems and access to them for maintenance and improvement." As detailed above the use of SuDS to manage surface water drainage is an approach that Severn Trent support due to the benefits in flood risk management and water quality improvements. However we would note that Paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080-20150323) of the Planning Practice Guidance incorporates the drainage hierarchy, supporting the need to drain surface water to natural outfalls where possible. Severn Trent would strongly support development in line with the drainage
hierarchy due especially in areas where surface water drainage systems are present near a proposed development. Surface water connections to foul sewers are not sustainable and all other options should be considered before a controlled discharge to the foul sewer is considered. The policy does not make any specific reference to paragraph 80 within the Local Plan at this time, but it is felt that this may assist the planner to ensure appropriate SuDS design going forward.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting Severn Trent Water regarding the publication of your Draft Local Plan, Please find attached a copy of our response.

8413

(Support) Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]
Received: 18/6/2018 via Email
We welcome the inclusion of water efficiency within the policy.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
The Environment Agency supports the publication of this Local Plan.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is legally complaint.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is sound.

We have the following comments to make in regard to the policies and sections of the Local Plan when we previously responded to the draft Local Plan.

Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction

We welcome the inclusion of water efficiency within the policy.

8619

(Object) Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Persimmon homes support the overall aim of this policy and it is to ensure proper application of the policies within the NPPF. By implementing this policy, it will enable proposals to be integrated within the setting and meet the needs of the local community in a sustainable way. There is specific support for points a) however, points (f) and (g) appear onerous. On point (f), sustainable drainage principles will be adopted 'where possible (wording to be included as a minimum). The design and land quality may be appropriate for open body attenuation features. Point (g) requires the use of locally sourced materials. Although Persimmon will do this wherever possible, it is not always appropriate.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

Changes to Plan:
On point (f), sustainable drainage principles will be adopted 'where possible (wording to be included as a minimum). The design and land quality may be appropriate for open body attenuation features. Point (g) requires the use of locally sourced materials. Although Persimmon will do this wherever possible, it is not always appropriate.

Document is not Sound
(Object) Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: CPRE Derbyshire (Andrew Wood) [12177]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - ineffective

This is a laudable menu of criteria, but is unspecific and unquantified, and does not link to targets or standards for design or construction. As such it will not be effective.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
See attachment and individual representations.

Changes to Plan:
We would recommend a much shorter, clearer policy, stating:

'The Council will permit proposals for new development which are zero-carbon and fully meet the criteria set out in Policy SS1, during both construction and use.'

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To assist the Inspector in his/her deliberations on the matters raised in our representation, and to give CPRE's view on any issues arising from the consultation and the Inspector's questions that impact on the matters we have raised.

(Support) Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The Coal Authority support this policy and the inclusion of criteria (I), which requires developers to have regard to mineral assets and mineral safeguarding areas and criteria 9m) which requires consideration to be given to coal mining legacy and potential land instability issues.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Representation at Examination: Written representation

(Object) Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

As a statutory consultee for surface water, the LLFA would like to take this opportunity to welcome the inclusion of Policy SC2:Sustainable Design and Construction’ into the PLP, consistent with the LLFA’s requirement to minimise flood risk off site.

The LLFA would like to suggest a minor amendment to change the term Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as the developments may not necessarily be in ‘urban’ areas therefore removing it from the name to avoid confusion. The LLFA suggest updating this as it is referred to this in the SuDS Manual (C753) CIRIA and DEFRA’s Non Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems. For further information please refer to the NPPF, Sustainable Drainage Systems: Written Statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the PPG.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment and representations.

(Object) Policy SC2: Sustainable Design and Construction - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Miss Megan Pashley [9623]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
In relation to these design policies, Gladman refer to paragraphs 59 and 60 of the Framework. Specifically, paragraph 59 which states:

"Design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally."

Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high quality design, planning policies should not be overly prescriptive and need flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. There will not be a 'one size fits all' solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles/objectives.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Having considered the submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development policies. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination.

Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate success.

Please see attachment and representations.

---

**8245 (Support) Policy SC3: High Quality Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
**Received:** 8/6/2018 via Web

We support this policy and consider it to be consistent with national policy. We welcome this policy addressing high quality design and consider the policy to have a number of positive criteria which relate back to the overall vision and objectives. We strongly support the references to creating good quality, attractive and well connected places, the promotion of vibrant mixed used proposals, providing a positive sense of place, creating conditions for active travel choices through connected places, and promotion of health, economic and social well-being. All of these themes are appropriate and consistent with national policy and achieving sustainable development.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
We support this policy and consider it to be consistent with national policy. We welcome this policy addressing high quality design and consider the policy to have a number of positive criteria which relate back to the overall vision and objectives. We strongly support the references to creating good quality, attractive and well connected places, the promotion of vibrant mixed used proposals, providing a positive sense of place, creating conditions for active travel choices through connected places, and promotion of health, economic and social well-being. All of these themes are appropriate and consistent with national policy and achieving sustainable development.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

---

**8620 (Object) Policy SC3: High Quality Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC 3 describes how proposals will be delivered in a high quality manner. Persimmon supports the policy in general however it needs to be considered in the context of ensuring the site remains deliverable and that each proposal will be based on its own merits which considers other points separate from design. As a total sum, all the points raised in the policy may restrict delivery and not ensure the efficient use of land. Cautious approach to the implementation of this policy unless it is simplified or reduced is needed to ensure a sufficient supply of housing.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration
about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

**9024** *(Object)* **Policy SC3: High Quality Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)*

Respondent: Miss Megan Pashley [9623]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

In relation to these design policies, Gladman refer to paragraphs 59 and 60 of the Framework. Specifically, paragraph 59 which states:

"Design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally."

Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high quality design, planning policies should not be overly prescriptive and need flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. There will not be a 'one size fits all' solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles/objectives.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Having considered the submission version of the Bolsover Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development policies. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination.

Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate success.

Please see attachment and representations.

Document is not Sound

**9103** *(Support)* **Policy SC3: High Quality Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)*

Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]
Received: 13/7/2018 via Email

Support paragraphs k, l and m in particular, (including cross reference to Sport England Active Design) which are consistent with the NPPF in terms of promoting and facilitating active travel, sport and physical activity through appropriate design.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound

**9131** *(Object)* **Policy SC3: High Quality Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)*

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable
(Support) Policy SC3: High Quality Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email
Policy SC3: High Quality Development - The provisions for the historic environment within this policy are welcomed

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

8246 (Support) Policy SC4: Comprehensive Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
Received: 8/6/2018 via Web
Waystone strongly support this policy as it demonstrates a realistic and practical approach to the delivery of large, long-term strategic developments. The policy is clear that the necessary infrastructure and facilities and balance of uses on an allocated site will not be compromised, but it gives developers certainty and confidence that it can respond flexibly to any barriers to development.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Waystone strongly support this policy as it demonstrates a realistic and practical approach to the delivery of large, long-term strategic developments. The policy is clear that the necessary infrastructure and facilities and balance of uses on an allocated site will not be compromised, but it gives developers certainty and confidence that it can respond flexibly to any barriers to development.

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

8623 (Object) Policy SC4: Comprehensive Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
Persimmon Homes does not support the inclusion of this policy as it could potentially be used to restrict changes to an existing development which may be required to ensure continued delivery. Changes to existing planning permissions are done for specific reasons and will be required to keep the scheme viable. However, there could be other reasons such as unknown ground conditions at the time of the original permission, and changing market conditions. This policy proposal is unnecessary as other policy’s will ensure sustainable development is approved. the restrictions within this are unnecessary and it should be deleted in its entirety.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy’s that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

Document is not Sound

9132 (Object) Policy SC4: Comprehensive Development - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable

9124 (Object) Policy SC5: Change of Use and Conversions in the Countryside - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable

8581 (Object) Renewable and Low Carbon Energy - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email

Support for renewable energy generation is welcome. The policy unreasonably and unjustifiably however singles out 'large wind turbines' as being unacceptable.

Firstly, the policy does not define what is meant by 'large'. This introduces uncertainty and a lack of clarity to the Local Plan. Wind turbine technology has advanced considerably in recent years, and this has included a greater diversity in the size and type (design) of turbines. It is unclear as to what type (design) or size of wind turbine would fall within the restrictions sought by the policy.

Paragraph 7.33 provides some insight into the reasons for the Cecil seeking to single out 'large' wind turbines for control. That paragraph confirms that a 'Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Study for Bolsover District was completed in May 2009' and this 'identified areas of the district where wind speeds are sufficient to encourage wind turbine activity'. The paragraph continues that 'these areas also have high landscape value and would affect the setting of heritage assets'. It also comments that 'recently government policy has been less favourable towards on-shore wind turbine development where communities oppose schemes on valid planning grounds, and changes to funding have made commercial wind turbines less attractive as investments'. On this basis, the paragraph concludes that '[t]herefore the plan does not identify suitable areas for wind turbine development'.

The 'financial attractiveness' of wind turbines as an investment is not a matter that should guide the Local Plan or inform the detail of policy. Whilst it is correct that feed in tariffs for renewable energy generation have been reduced by government, this does not necessarily equate to wind energy generation being uneconomic across the District.

To impose a blanket restriction on 'large' wind turbines on the basis of area having 'high landscape value' precludes the opportunity to demonstrate that such renewable energy generation could satisfactorily address any potential landscape impacts. This approach is consistent with that set in paragraph 97 of the NPPF which states that 'To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy, local planning authorities
should...have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources'. As currently set out, Policy SC6 takes an unnecessarily negative approach to the opportunities by 'large' wind turbines, however they may be defined.

The approach taken by the Local Plan is further confused with reference to NPPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 5-005-20150618 (Revision date 18th June 2015). This states 'In the case of wind turbines, a planning application should not be approved unless the proposed development site is an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan'. Policy SC6 sets out to excludes only 'large wind turbines'. Paragraph 7.33 of the Local Plan however states that '...the plan does not identify suitable areas for wind turbine development', suggesting a blanket ban on all wind turbines. This compounds the lack of clarity within the Local Plan.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

**Changes to Plan:**
The Local Plan should identify areas that are suitable for wind energy development. Policy SC 6 should be amended to delete '(except large wind turbines)'.

Document is not Sound

**Reason for appearance:** Increasing the proportion of energy that is generated from renewable sources remains a key government objective and will contribute to attaining sustainable forms of development across the District. As a major landowner within the District, assets managed by the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees ('CST') offer the opportunity to play a significant role in the delivery of additional renewable energy generation capacity. It is therefore appropriate and necessary - and beneficial to the Local Plan process including offering clarification and further detail as needed to the Inspector - that CST participate in the Hearing.

### 8395 (Object) Policy SC6: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** National Farmers Union (Mr P Tame) [3615]
**Received:** 18/5/2018 via Paper

In paragraph 7.34 and policy SC 6 our question is which grade of agricultural land can be used for solar panels. We will suggest Grades 3, 4, & 5 can be used for solar panels. The 50 hectares used for solar panels in the district so far will not affect agricultural production in the District much - its 0.01% of farmland here.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
please refer to individual representations

**Changes to Plan:**
In Paragraph 7.34, "The Council will continue to support applications ....on Grade 3,4,and 5 agricultural land"

In Policy SC6 at the end, "Proposals for large scale photovoltaic solar panels on Grades 1 and 2 agricultural land will only be permitted under exceptional circumstances".

Document is not Sound

### 8624 (Object) Policy SC6: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The inclusion of a requirement for new developments to connect to a district or community heating network is not appropriate, justified and is beyond the realms of planning by forcing future purchasers down a particular route for heating. The policy should therefore be amended to remove this requirement.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy’s that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.
Changes to Plan:
The inclusion of a requirement for new developments to connect to a district or community heating network is not appropriate, justified and is beyond the realms of planning by forcing future purchasers down a particular route for heating. The policy should therefore be amended to remove this requirement.

Representations at Examination:
Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: To further discuss issues raised

Policy SC6: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

The Council should not expect major new developments to connect to or be designed to connect in the future to district or community heating networks thereby limiting future consumer choice to that particular provider of heat. This expectation should be deleted.

Full Text:
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC's, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Changes to Plan:
Delete this expectation from the policy.

Criteria (d) - This policy is not sound in respect of the historic environment. Firstly, it implies that proposals which cause harm could be acceptable since 'significant' harm is referred to in the text. The use of the word 'significant' is misleading in itself since it does not use the terminology set out in the NPPF in respect of the historic environment i.e. harm/substantial harm. As such, the policy does not provide for the NPPF tests for the historic environment/public benefit to be taken into account. Secondly, the proposed wording in respect of the historic environment is not adequate or appropriate on the basis that the Plan does not identify suitable areas for wind turbine development. We have no objection to this approach in principle, but it is considered that more robust justification is required to ensure that the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting are conserved or enhanced. Finally, there does not appear to be a definition of a 'large wind turbine' in the Plan glossary so it is not clear what size a large wind turbine would be in relation to the policy.

Full Text:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(8781) Flood Risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage Techniques

Agent: DHA Planning (Mr Jonathan Buckwell) [9557] (unconfirmed)
Respondent: Laing O'Rourke (Sir / Madam) [4525]

There is an extensive part of the eastern part of the proposed allocation site which is incorrectly shown as falling within Flood Zone 3. Earthworks were carried out within the site in 2012 to create development platforms in accordance with an approved flood risk strategy, to ensure that the developable areas do not fall within Flood
Zone 3. The flood risk area shown on the Proposals Map is therefore inaccurate and could lead to potential confusion and uncertainty about the extent to which this area is fully developable.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

Laing O'Rourke remain fully supportive of the proposed allocation and welcome the Council's recognition that the site can make an important contribution towards meeting the District's employment needs during the plan period.

Unfortunately, the proposed allocation at Explore Industrial Park, both in terms of the policy wording and the proposals map, is not fully consistent with the extant planning permission and so it has been necessary to raise objections on both of these points. I would be very happy to discuss these further, prior to Submission, and hope that we can resolve both points swiftly, which would enable Laing O'Rourke to withdraw both objections.

**Changes to Plan:**

Update the flood zone information to remove the area incorrectly shown as Flood Zone 3 and to reflect the actual conditions at the site.

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** It is important to my client that the Proposals Map is correctly drawn in relation to this allocation to ensure that the employment benefits are maximised.

---

**Object** Policy SC7: Flood Risk - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]

**Received:** 18/6/2018 via Email

We welcome the inclusion of our suggestions from a flood risk perspective including reconnection of sites to their floodplains.

We would reiterate our comments to add to the policy 'Development proposals must take account of relevant plans and strategies for example Local Flood Risk Management Strategies or Surface Water Management Plans. The council will require financial contributions on sites where measures to address flood risk or to improve the environmental quality of watercourses have been identified by these Plans and Strategies'.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)

The Environment Agency supports the publication of this Local Plan.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is legally complaint.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is sound.

We have the following comments to make in regard to the policies and sections of the Local Plan when we previously responded to the draft Local Plan.

Policy SC7: Flood Risk

We welcome the inclusion of our suggestions from a flood risk perspective including reconnection of sites to their floodplains.

We would reiterate our comments to add to the policy 'Development proposals must take account of relevant plans and strategies for example Local Flood Risk Management Strategies or Surface Water Management Plans. The council will require financial contributions on sites where measures to address flood risk or to improve the environmental quality of watercourses have been identified by these Plans and Strategies'.

**Changes to Plan:**

Add to the policy 'Development proposals must take account of relevant plans and strategies for example Local Flood Risk Management Strategies or Surface Water Management Plans. The council will require financial contributions on sites where measures to address flood risk or to improve the environmental quality of watercourses have been identified by these Plans and Strategies'.

---

**Support** Policy SC7: Flood Risk - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Severn Trent Water Ltd - Derby Office (Mr Chris Bramley) [11926]

**Received:** 5/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC7: Flood Risk, Severn Trent are supportive of this policy in particular:

Bullet point D "There is no net increase in surface water runoff for the lifetime of the development on all new
development. Run off rates for development on greenfield sites should not be exceeded, and where possible should be reduced from existing. Run off rates for development on previously developed land should be reduced from the current rate of surface water runoff where feasible. Surface water runoff should be managed at source wherever possible, avoiding disposal to combined sewers." In the response above for Policy SC2 we identified that we are supportive of the Drainage Hierarchy, in particular the need to direct surface water away from combined sewers on previously developed land and to ensure surface water on new development is not connected to a combined sewers. We would note that where alternatives to a connection to a surface water sewer or indeed combined sewer are available these outfall options should be considered prior to determination of the drainage system.

Bullet point E "Part of the development site is set aside for surface water management, and uses measures to contribute to flood risk management in the wider area. Such measures should supplement green infrastructure networks, contributing to mitigation of climate change and flooding, as an alternative or complementary to hard engineering." To facilitate good SuDS design and ensure that sufficient space is provided to enable long term maintenance of the proposed SuDS features the allocation of land for this use is key at all stages of planning and Severn Trent are therefore supportive approach.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting Severn Trent Water regarding the publication of your Draft Local Plan, Please find attached a copy of our response.

---

**8626 (Object) Policy SC7: Flood Risk - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

Persimmon Homes support the overall principle of not increasing flood risk elsewhere and that the management of surface water will ensure that flood risk is minimised; also accounting for climate change. To ensure that this policy is met, a wide range of management solutions should be supported including a mixture of hard and soft engineering infrastructure. the solution will generally reflect the constraints of the site and the design proposed. this may require a variety of drainage solutions. therefore, the policy should be amended to reflect this; strengthening the possibility that SuDS might not be the best solution to manage the surface water on the site.

With regards to more general infrastructure provision (e.g. foul); the developer should not be obligated to contribute to statutory undertakers who have a legal duty to provide these services to residents. The new residents will pay charges to these suppliers ensuring the funding exists. The Council should be working closely with these providers that the appropriate infrastructure is operating efficiently and new development can be accommodated for.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

Document is not Sound

---

**8353 (Support) Policy SC8: Landscape Character - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Web

Natural England supports the policy on Landscape Character for Bolsover District.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Natural England supports the policy on Landscape Character for Bolsover District.

---

**8974 (Support) Policy SC8: Landscape Character - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received: 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers support Policy SC8: Landscape Character, which makes reference to the Derbyshire Landscape Character Assessment and the more recent work undertaken by DCC to identify Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity (AMES).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see attachment and representations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Object</strong></th>
<th>Policy SC8: Landscape Character - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 4/6/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SC8: Landscape Character - Historic England recommends that Historic Landscape Character data also be referred to in the policy since it is a useful set of data which can be interrogated to inform development proposals, particularly in relation to the re-creation of the local landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Object</strong></th>
<th>Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 15/6/2018 via Web</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is reference to 7 SSSIs in the introduction of the Local Plan Document and then 6 SSSI’s in this section. It is important that all relevant designated sites have been correctly assessed and numbered to avoid confusion and potential wrong assessments at planning application stage when the document is formally adopted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is reference to 7 SSSIs in the introduction of the Local Plan Document and then 6 SSSI’s in this section. It is important that all relevant designated sites have been correctly assessed and numbered to avoid confusion and potential wrong assessments at planning application stage when the document is formally adopted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to Plan:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The correct number of SSSIs should be put in both the introduction and the Biodiversity and Geodiversity section. We recommend that <a href="http://magic.defra.gov.uk/">http://magic.defra.gov.uk/</a> be used to check.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document is not Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation at Examination: Written representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Object</strong></th>
<th>Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: DHA Planning (Mr Jonathan Buckwell) [9557] (unconfirmed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Laing O’Rourke (Sir / Madam) [4525]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Wildlife Site designation currently overlaps with a significant part of the proposed development area. Significant ecological mitigation works were required (and have been completed) in relation to the proposed masterplan development at EIP, in order to allow employment development to take place throughout the proposed allocation area. The Local Wildlife Site boundary should take this into account and be drawn to exclude the proposed allocation area in order to avoid confusion and uncertainty about the extent to which this area is fully developable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing O’Rourke remain fully supportive of the proposed allocation and welcome the Council’s recognition that the site can make an important contribution towards meeting the District’s employment needs during the plan period. Unfortunately, the proposed allocation at Explore Industrial Park, both in terms of the policy wording and the proposals map, is not fully consistent with the extant planning permission and so it has been necessary to raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
objections on both of these points. I would be very happy to discuss these further, prior to Submission, and hope that we can resolve both points swiftly, which would enable Laing O’Rourke to withdraw both objections.

**Changes to Plan:**
Redefine the Local Wildlife Area extent so that the overlap with the correctly drawn proposed employment allocation is removed.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** It is important to my client to ensure that the policy is positively worded and sufficiently flexible in relation to this allocation to ensure that the employment benefits are maximised.


Respondent: Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
Received: **15/6/2018 via Web**
Natural England supports this policy.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Natural England supports this policy.


Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]
Received: **25/6/2018 via Email**
The Derbyshire Wildlife Trust strongly support the policy on Biodiversity and Geodiversity.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.


Agent: Heaton Planning Ltd (Mr Joel Jessup) [12226]
Respondent: Tarmac Trading Ltd (Mr John Bradshaw) [12398]
Received: **15/6/2018 via Email**
We consider that the Publication version Bolsover Local Plan is not consistent with national policy in its wording of Policy SC9 to conserve biodiversity / geodiversity / ecological assets, and that the partial designation of a biodiversity / geodiversity / ecological feature that would be protected under Policy SC9 on a live mineral site is not justified and could not be an effective designation due to the consented mineral operations. Therefore, the Publication version Bolsover Local Plan, in its current, form, is considered unsound.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please see attachment.

**Changes to Plan:**
We consider that to address the issues discussed in our submission, the proposed Wildlife Corridor and Stepping Stones designation at Bolsover Moor Quarry should not be included within the Bolsover Local Plan.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** To make the points made in this representation.


Respondent: Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
Received: **15/6/2018 via Web**
Natural England supports the inclusion of this policy for the protection of trees, woodland and hedgerows, we also particularly support the inclusion of wording that specifies the importance of ancient woodland and the need to protect them from development.
Natural England supports the inclusion of this policy for the protection of trees, woodland and hedgerows, we also particularly support the inclusion of wording that specifies the importance of ancient woodland and the need to protect them from development.

**Support** Policy SC10: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]
Received: 25/6/2018 via Email
Derbyshire Wildlife trust strongly support the policy on trees, woodland and hedgerows.

**Object** Policy SC11: Environmental Quality (Amenity) - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

**Support** Policy SC12: Air Quality - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Web
Natural England further recommends that this Policy should reference Air Quality impacts on the environment, more specifically the potential impacts on European designated sites (SPAs/SACs) and nationally designated sites (SSSIs) and the need to ensure any planning application that is liable to increase potential air pollutants should consider the impacts on these sites too.

**Support** Policy SC13: Water Quality - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Web
Natural England supports the Policy for Water Quality. This Policy could be strengthened by referencing how there is a need to protect habitats from water related impacts and seek enhancement, especially for SSSIs, but also local sites and potentially European (N2K) sites. Plans should positively contribute to reducing flood risk by working with natural processes- there can be links with Green Infrastructure policies and SuDs.
local sites and potentially European (N2K) sites. Plans should positively contribute to reducing flood risk by working with natural processes- there can be links with Green Infrastructure policies and SuDs.


Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]
Received: 18/6/2018 via Email

We welcome the rewording of this policy to ensure water quality improvement is driven through new development by ensuring developments that have a negative impact on water quality will not be permitted.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
The Environment Agency supports the publication of this Local Plan.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is legally compliant.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is sound.

We have the following comments to make in regard to the policies and sections of the Local Plan when we previously responded to the draft Local Plan.

Policy SC13: Water Quality

We welcome the rewording of this policy to ensure water quality improvement is driven through new development by ensuring developments that have a negative impact on water quality will not be permitted.


Respondent: Severn Trent Water Ltd - Derby Office (Mr Chris Bramley) [11926]
Received: 5/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC13: Water Quality, Severn Trent are supportive of this policy, in particular:

The paragraph that states "Where adequate capacity does not exist, there will be a requirement that facilities are adequately upgraded prior to occupation of the development." The continued development required to meet the housing demand will result in upgrades and alterations to the local drainage network to enable some development sites to be accommodated. Severn Trent Water would like to take this opportunity to encourage early engagement from developers and planning authorities. This approach will enable us to appropriately plan for growth and deliver network improvements in a co-ordinated, timely and efficient manor to minimise the impact of delays to development and local residents.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting Severn Trent Water regarding the publication of you Draft Local Plan, Please find attached a copy of our response.


Respondent: Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

This policy also covers the requirement for water capacity to be adequately upgraded (if necessary) before occupation. Although alternative solutions exist, the above comments (in respect of SC 7) are relevant again here and that statutory undertakers should be working with the Council to ensure this does not delay development sites allocated within this Local Plan.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.
The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

### (Support) Contaminated and Unstable Land - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
**Received:** 4/6/2018 via Email
**Para 7.80** - The reference to the potential for historical interest on contaminated is welcomed and supported.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

### (Support) Policy SC14: Contaminated and Unstable Land - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Environment Agency (Mr Joe Drewry) [10061]
**Received:** 18/6/2018 via Email

We welcome the additional wording added to this policy to ensure future maintenance and monitoring at sites that require remediation.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
The Environment Agency supports the publication of this Local Plan.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is legally complaint.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Local Plan is sound.

We have the following comments to make in regard to the policies and sections of the Local Plan when we previously responded to the draft Local Plan.

Policy SC14: Contaminated and Unstable Land

We welcome the additional wording added to this policy to ensure future maintenance and monitoring at sites that require remediation.

### (Support) Policy SC14: Contaminated and Unstable Land - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The Coal Authority supports the inclusion of this policy which requires the risks posed by land instability issues to be properly considered and remediated where necessary.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

### (Object) Policy SC14: Contaminated and Unstable Land - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
**Received:** 4/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC14 refers to the natural and built environment only which does not include potential archaeology (including industrial archaeology). As such it is recommended that 'natural and built environment' be revised to
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

**Object** Policy SC15: Hazardous Installations - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]
Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

For the reasons set out within earlier submissions made to the draft emerging Local Plan, there are concerns that draft policy SC15 is not fit for purpose given its ambiguity. In order to overcome our concerns and secure a coherent Plan we would suggest that the Council make reference to the provisions of appropriate site specific policies for hazard sites including policy WC4, and a minor modification be made to the wording of Policy SC15 as follows:

"Policy SC15: Hazardous Installations
Planning permission will be granted for development within the Health and Safety consultation zones provided that the risks arising from the presence of the hazardous substance are acceptable in relation to the nature of the proposed development, and the development is compliant with the provisions of other referable Local Plan policies, including policy WC4."

**Support** Safeguarding Mineral Resources - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

Paragraphs 7.86 - 7.90

The Coal Authority supports the inclusion of these paragraphs which set out commentary on mineral resources and safeguarding issues and provides signposting to the Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Plan.

**Representation at Examination**: Written representation
(Object) The Historic Environment - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

It is noted that revisions to historic environment policies have been made since the Regulation 18 consultation and there is some inconsistency evident in these which will need to be addressed as they are not sound at this stage. There is a particular imbalance in how the NPPF harm test is set out in the individual policies, or not, and it is recommended that the policies are revisited and revised. Telford and Wrekin's Adopted Local Plan (January 2018) includes individual policies for assets rather than a generic historic environment policy and this may be of interest and/or use in respect of the Plan's expectations for harm and substantial harm considerations. We would be happy to discuss this further and agree any revised wording ahead of the EIP.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Object) The Historic Environment - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Is there any merit in outlining in the introductory text what will happen in policy terms should the Cresswell Crags World Heritage Site situation progress during the life of the Plan?

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Support) The Historic Environment - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

The local references highlight the important historic landscape qualities and heritage in the area well and are supported.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Object) The Historic Environment - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Take exception to the use of the word 'preserved' for all assets - this is relevant to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas due to legislative terminology but it is recommended that other assets, including non-designated, refer to 'conserve' instead in line with NPPF terminology.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.
Changes to Plan:
It is recommended that other assets, including non-designated, refer to 'conserve' instead in line with NPPF terminology.

Support) The Historic Environment - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email
The supporting text for the Historic Environment section pp124- 129 inclusive is generally welcomed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

Object) Conservation Areas - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]
Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (Mr W Kemp) [2699]
Received: 13/6/2018 via Email
Paragraphs 7.98 and 7.99 (Conservation Areas and management plans)

Recognition within paragraph 7.99 that 'Designation of an area as a conservation area does not mean that no change or development will be allowed' is welcome, as is the statement that 'Policy SC16 aims to ensure that conservation areas do not become no-go areas for development, but that new development complements the existing character of these special townscapes'. Our concerns regarding the lack of a comprehensive set of Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans across all Conservation Areas within the district, as set out in the response to Objective D, remain.

Paragraph 7.98 notes that there are 27 conservation areas designated in the District but only that 'A large number of these conservation areas have had conservation area appraisals and management plans prepared for them', i.e. the Council has not completed conservation area appraisals and management plans for all of the Conservation Areas. In the absence of up-to-date conservation area appraisals and management plans it will be difficult for the Council to discharge its duties effectively (on the basis of justified evidence) under, for example, 'Policy SC16: Development Within or Impacting upon Conservation Areas'. Policy SC16 states, amongst other matters, that 'Development proposals within or impacting upon Conservation Areas will be permitted where they preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting'. Up-to-date conservation area appraisals and management plans are an essential part of ensuring such decision making is based on sound reasoning, with both applicants and decision makers benefitting from clarity on those elements that make the Conservation Area 'special'.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations

Changes to Plan:
The Council should be required as a matter of urgency to undertake and complete a review of the District's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans and ensure complete coverage across all Conservation Areas is achieved forthwith. Where no longer justified, Conservation Areas should be 'de-designated' or otherwise amended to better reflect their current special character and appearance.

Document is not Sound


Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8305]
Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email
The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.
Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination

Reason for appearance: To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable.

8522

(Object) Policy SC18: Scheduled Monuments and Archaeology - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

As for listed buildings, cases of 'substantial harm or total loss' of a Scheduled Monument should be exceptional and only allowed where the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss. This is in order to be consistent with heritage policies in the NPPF.

9150

(Object) Policy SC18: Scheduled Monuments and Archaeology - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC18: Scheduled Monuments and Archaeology - Para.2 - It is recommended that it be made clear that the information referred to in this paragraph will be required as part of an application (or pre-application if there are 'in principle' concerns), rather than by condition, and should be undertaken by a suitably qualified person.

As such it is recommended that the Para.2;2nd sentence be extended to read ‘...or field evaluation of the site which should be submitted as part of a development proposal and should be undertaken by a suitably qualified person’.

9148

(Object) Policy SC19: Bolsover Area of Archaeological Interest - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC19: Bolsover Area of Archaeological Interest - criteria 1 - If the Council wishes to pursue the separate policy for Bolsover, we submit that where ground disturbance is involved an archaeological desk based assessment, or Heritage Impact Assessment, may not be sufficient to provide adequate information for consideration. It is recommended that if Policy SC19 is retained as the Plan progresses then criteria 1 should be reworded as follows:

'Planning applications involving ground disturbance should be accompanied by the results of an archaeological desk based assessment, heritage impact assessment or other site evaluation assessment method, as appropriate to the scale and type of development. The assessment should be undertaken by a suitably qualified person.'
fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Obj) Policy SC19: Bolsover Area of Archaeological Interest - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: **Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]**  
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Policy SC19: Bolsover Area of Archaeological Interest - It is not clear why there is a separate archaeology related policy for Bolsover. If a Plan contains an appropriately robust archaeology related policy then there should be no need for anything further to avoid duplication in the Plan making process.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.
Chapter 8 – Infrastructure, Transport, Community and Recreation Provision

8315  
(Support) Green Infrastructure - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)  
Respondent: Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath) [2475]  
Received: 15/6/2018 via Web  
Figure 8a Needs to include an accurate route for the Archaeological Way, see attachment  
Full Text: (Show Full Text)  
Figure 8a Needs to include an accurate route for the Archaeological Way, see attachment

8304  
(Object) Policy ITCR1: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)  
Respondent: Mr Marc Pearson [9827]  
Received: 14/6/2018 via Web  
I feel there is very few details or information regarding the environment in the local plan and believe it needs to include much more in terms of supporting the natural world. The natural world is as much in dire straits locally as it is nationally and feel that local authorities have a big part to play in its recovery.  
Full Text: (Show Full Text)  
I feel there is very few details or information regarding the environment in the local plan and believe it needs to include much more in terms of supporting the natural world. The natural world is as much in dire straits locally as it is nationally and feel that local authorities have a big part to play in its recovery.  
As well as doing all you can in terms of managing what land you own and which you are responsible for, for example by implementing a management plan for road verges (currently are managed in an irresponsible way in terms of biodiversity). Little changes could make a big difference, such as changing the time or frequency of cutting or even the cutting height.  
You can also help by influencing developers and local builders or by encouraging developers who build in a sustainable and environmentally friendly way. This environmentally friendly way can already be seen locally in Clowne, I have been involved in advising a local builder on ways to support wildlife and the natural environment.  
He is currently building the houses adjoining Linear Park, already incorporating 15 swift bricks in his first 6 builds, planting native hedging plants and sowing native meadow seeds (PHOTO’S).  
He will also be including Hedgehog holes in all boundary fencing, as well as nesting boxes for a variety of birds including declining species such as House Sparrow in addition to the swifts. Included will also be bat boxes, places for amphibians and reptiles and even a bank for Kingfisher nesting opportunities. His development even has a small mention in the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust Magazine (Article Attached)  
Influencing local developments to do all they can for nature should be high on the agenda in light of the recent plan for 1800 houses and various other development in the north of Clowne.  
As you can see from the attached articles and links, developers have been or are starting to make a change in the way developments are happening with the help of Wildlife NGO’s, I feel this could and should be something Bolsover District Council should be taking on-board and running with and maybe even being at the forefront of a new way of nature friendly developments in Derbyshire.  
As well as liaising with local NGO’s such as Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, I feel the local community should be involved in developing and maintaining these wild areas for generations to come in partnership with Bolsover District Council. Good examples of this already happening in Clowne are the initiative to install Swift boxes in council houses that are being renovated on Mansfield Road and the council estate to the north east, as well as the ongoing work to maintain Linear Park for the good of wildlife and the local community.  
Attached are articles from magazines this year from Derbyshire Wildlife Trust and RSPB, below is a link to Barratt Homes website showing the vision and plans they have for greener developments.  
https://www.barratthomes.co.uk/New-is/Green/  
Changes to Plan:  
As above, changes need to be made in many of the section of the local plan and not just this section.  
Document is not Sound  
Representation at Examination: Written representation

8343  
(Support) Policy ITCR1: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)
### Support Policy ITCR1: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Web

Natural England supports this policy. Reference could also be made to the importance of the water component of green infrastructure known as Blue Infrastructure.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Natural England supports this policy. Reference could also be made to the importance of the water component of green infrastructure known as Blue Infrastructure.

---

### Support Policy ITCR1: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The borough councils SUPPORTS the approach to strategic green infrastructure set out in policy ITCR1 and is committed to working jointly with Bolsover District and other partners where infrastructure crosses boundaries and makes connections between settlements.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the draft Bolsover District Local Plan and related documents.

Detailed comments and observations are set out below. Wherever possible, comments have been related to a specific policy or paragraph of the Local Plan publication draft.

Subject to the detailed comments set out below, overall the council is of the view that the plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with national policy as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework.

I can confirm that the borough council has worked pro-actively with Bolsover, North East Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Districts, and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils in preparing a Statement of Common Ground to address Duty to Co-operate issues.

Green Infrastructure Policy ITCR1 Green Infrastructure Network

The borough councils SUPPORTS the approach to strategic green infrastructure set out in policy ITCR1 and is committed to working jointly with Bolsover District and other partners where infrastructure crosses boundaries and makes connections between settlements.

Should you have any queries about the above comments or require clarification on any points, please do not hesitate to contact me.

---

### Support Policy ITCR1: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]
**Received:** 25/6/2018 via Email

DWT strongly support the policy on Green infrastructure.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

---

### Object Policy ITCR2: The Multi-User Trails Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Notts Ramblers + Sherwood Forest Project (Stephen Parkhouse) [11806]
**Received:** 26/5/2018 via Web

1. Add proposed multiuser route in Hodthorpe & Belph parish linking to Worksop BW24 as part of a route from NCR6 at Rhodesia to Pleasley.

2. Change the status of Littlewood Lane, Shirebrook to multiuser route.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Missed off the Belph part of the multiuser route from Worksop (NCR6) to Pleasley. Route will connect this part of...
a route from NCR6 at Rhodesia (Worksop) to
a. Pleasley where it joins the Teversal and Silverhill Trails to link to NCR67 at Tibshelf
b. and the cross Mansfield cycle route to Rainworth (NCR6) - Bridleway upgrade claims are in at Pleasley
Vale (Notts & Derbys), Langwith & Cresswell Crags/Belph. Littlewood Lane between Mansfield Woodhouse and
Shirebrook is now a bridleway as is Red Lane, Belph.
c. plus a link from Langwith across Cuckney Hill to Hazel Gap (NCR6) - we have already added the former rail line
to Church Warsop as a bridleway. - claims in for Meden Vale & Cuckney.

Changes to Plan:
1. Show a proposed multiuser route extending proposed route 5 along Red Lane Hodthorpe & Belph B15 14/1 and
   B15 13/1or 16/1 bridleways as proposed route to link along Green Lane Hodthorpe to Worksop BW24.
2. Change the status of Littlewood Lane, Shirebrook to multiuser route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8247</th>
<th>(Support) Policy ITCR2: The Multi-User Trails Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]</td>
<td>Received: 8/6/2018 via Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waystone support Policy ITCR2 which in relation to Clowne Garden Village will assist with creating a good network of footpath and cycle links through the site connecting residential areas with employment and recreational areas and providing links with the wider town. This policy is positive and aspirational and is consistent with national policy in terms of providing sustainable development particularly within the social role of planning and reflecting the needs of the District's communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Text: (Show Full Text)</td>
<td>Waystone support Policy ITCR2 which in relation to Clowne Garden Village will assist with creating a good network of footpath and cycle links through the site connecting residential areas with employment and recreational areas and providing links with the wider town. This policy is positive and aspirational and is consistent with national policy in terms of providing sustainable development particularly within the social role of planning and reflecting the needs of the District's communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation at Examination: Written representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for appearance: As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8321</th>
<th>(Support) Policy ITCR2: The Multi-User Trails Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath) [2475]</td>
<td>Received: 15/6/2018 via Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ITCR2 - clarification of detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Multi-user Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Archaeological Way from Wood Lane to Frithwood Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Multi-user Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Archaeological Way - Frithwood Lane to Crags Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be an additional proposed trail to link the Archaeological Way to the Clowne Branch Line - ie most likely to be Duchess Street to Gypsy Lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Text: (Show Full Text)</td>
<td>Policy ITCR2 - clarification of detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Multi-user Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Archaeological Way from Wood Lane to Frithwood Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Multi-user Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Archaeological Way - Frithwood Lane to Crags Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be an additional proposed trail to link the Archaeological Way to the Clowne Branch Line - ie most likely to be Duchess Street to Gypsy Lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8479</th>
<th>(Object) Policy ITCR2: The Multi-User Trails Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]</td>
<td>Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 14/6/2018 via Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is noted from the Proposals Map extract included below that the Council have highlighted the location of existing public footpaths and proposed locations for a number of others, including some small additions within the consultation zones associated with Rough Close Works. We remain concerned with the implementation of any proposals which will result in an increase in people or persons within close proximity of our clients site, and particularly within the Inner Consultation Zone. We appreciate the importance of enhancing access to rural locations and improving connectivity, but that must not take place at the expense of the viability of an existing employment site, nor with an increased risk in public safety. Furthermore, any increased usage of public footpaths within the consultation zones could potentially result in an inconsistent (and therefore unsound) plan, given that the provision of additional footpaths or an increased usage of footpaths could well fall foul of the tests set out in draft policy WC4.

**Full Text:**

**Changes to Plan:**

In reviewing the footpath proposals and the content of policy WC4, attention is once again drawn to the following classification for distances of particular uses around hazard sites:

"Class A distances should be used for bridleways, footpaths, footways and waterways used by more than 20 people in any 24-hour period. Class A distances should also be used for a road used by more than 20 and no more than 500 vehicles every 24 hours."

We would therefore kindly request that that Proposals Map be amended, and for any additional public footpaths to be sited such that they are in compliance with the above requirements.

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination

**Reason for appearance:** To be available to answer any queries the Inspector may have on our clients niche use and associated HSE legislation (unless our concerns are addressed by way of a minor modification in advance of the Hearing)

---

**(Object) Policy ITCR2: The Multi-User Trails Network - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]

**Received:** 25/6/2018 via Email

Support, but with concerns specific to impacts on two Local Wildlife Sites.

Whilst Derbyshire Wildlife Trust generally support the policy on Green Networks we have concerns regarding the construction of multi-user tracks (20 and 21) through two Local Wildlife Sites located between Clowne and Creswell (BO096 and BO098). These sites are extraordinarily rich in wild flowers, butterflies and other wildlife and would be adversely impacted by construction of 3m wide tracks. Whether it is absolutely necessary to a) have both routes where possibly one would do and b) for them to be 3 metres wide should be scrutinised. We would advocate that the fragile nature of these sites as linear wildlife havens is at the forefront of thinking on the development of these route-ways as effective and meaningful mitigation, enhancement and compensation is likely to be needed to avoid a net loss in Biodiversity.

**Full Text:**

**Please refer to representations.**

---

**(Object) Policy ITCR4: Local Shops and Community Facilities - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

**Respondent:** NHS Property Services (Ms Evelyn Jones) [11914]

**Received:** 14/6/2018 via Email

NHSPS object to Policy ITCR4 because:

- the disposal of unneeded and unsuitable properties is a key funding component of the NHS', and the government's strategy for meeting ongoing healthcare requirements, the policy is not positively prepared;
- the necessity of strategic estates planning for public service providers, such as the NHS, has not been properly taken into account when selecting the most appropriate strategy, and therefore, the plan is not justified;
- national policy requires that plans ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community. On the basis that the policy would limit the NHS' ability to meet healthcare needs, the plan is not consistent with national policy.

**Full Text:**

**Please refer to representations.**

Full representations are attached.
### Changes to Plan:
Insert new criterion 'b' to policy which reads,

It can be demonstrated the change of use is part of an agreed programme of social infrastructure reprovision (in health for example) to ensure continued delivery of social infrastructure and related services; or

**Document is not Sound**

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Object) Policy ITCR4: Local Shops and Community Facilities - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> The Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke) [5222]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 14/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trust is supportive of this policy, which seeks to maintain community facilities including cultural facilities within the local area. Within the marketing evidence we would recommend additional text to set out that efforts should include a reasonable rent or sale price for the existing use of the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This change will improve the robustness of the policy, and to help it achieve its objective of protecting existing facilities where a need remains.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to Plan:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the marketing evidence we would recommend additional text to set out that efforts should include a reasonable rent or sale price for the existing use of the facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Support) Policy ITCR5: Green Space and Play Provision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Bolsover Countryside Partnership (Mr A Heath) [2475]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 15/6/2018 via Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ITCR5 will help to address the long-standing issue of provision and quality of greenspace across the district and will hopefully provide a practical mechanism for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ITCR5 will help to address the long-standing issue of provision and quality of greenspace across the district and will hopefully provide a practical mechanism for improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Object) Policy ITCR5: Green Space and Play Provision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon supports the inclusion of public open space embedded in developments in line with fundamental place making principles. However, improving open spaces that are off-site is not supported as there is not a direct connection between the development and off-site green space that may be impacted by the proposal. This is further exacerbated by the presumption that improvements to existing green space are also requested. This is further explored in the commentary under Policy II1 and can easily hinder the viability of sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notwithstanding this, the figures raised pose difficulties for the smaller sites. Depending on the circumstances, there could be significant amounts of open space required depending on the local population and open space provision within 400m. These figures need to be justified and provision should be based on new population added rather than an assessment made on existing population numbers and the developer potentially be required to fix a deficit unrelated to the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

**Object** Policy ITCR5: Green Space and Play Provision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]
**Received:** 13/7/2018 via Email

Support thrust of the policy which seeks to secure new and enhanced provision, including for sports pitches, but consider requires minor wording adjustment to be consistent with NPPF Paragraph 73 and thereby support the delivery of provision to meet identified needs. Specifically, it is considered that the walking distances quoted are too restrictive in so far as they relate to playing pitches as users of pitches and the spatial distribution of pitches are likely to be based on wider catchment areas and investment in a site beyond the distances quoted may better serve to deliver identified need in some circumstances.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Changes to Plan:**
Add text to clarify that the walking distances are only one factor that will be taken into account and that for playing pitches the evidence of need informed by the Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy will be used to consider the most appropriate site for new or enhanced provision.

**Representation at Examination:** Written representation

**Reason for appearance:** To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable

**Object** Policy ITCR5: Green Space and Play Provision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Agent:** Charlotte Stainton [8395]
**Respondent:** Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

**Reason for appearance:** To explain why development in the smaller settlements is necessary to create a sound plan which is NPPF compliant & to demonstrate that the development approved under 12/00269/OUTMAJ is sustainable and deliverable

**Support** Protection of Green Space - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Web

Natural England recommends referencing the previously discussed Green Wedges at the preferred options stage and the importance of accessible natural green space as above.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
We welcome the commitment to maintain and enhance the six designated "Green Wedges" to preserve the landscape, wildlife corridors and open spaces for the local community. The importance of accessible natural greenspace can often be underestimated. Not only does accessible natural greenspace enhance quality of life, it also has significant health benefits. Natural England has published guidance and standards on accessible natural greenspace as outlined below.

Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt)

Natural greenspaces are important to our quality of life, providing a wide range of benefits for people and the environment. Evidence shows that access to natural greenspaces for fresh air, exercise and quiet contemplation, has benefits for both physical and mental health. Research provides good evidence of reductions in levels of heart disease, obesity and depression where people live close to greenspaces.
In addition to their potential ecological value, greenspaces also help us adapt to changes in climate through their role in reducing the risk of flooding and by cooling the local environment. Where trees are present they also act as filters for air pollution.

Natural England has published information on access to good quality natural greenspace "Nature Nearby: Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance" to help make this a reality. It describes the amount, quality and level of visitor services that may be required. ANGS standards indicate that everyone, wherever they live, should have accessible natural greenspace:

* of at least 2 hectares in size, no more than 300 metres (5 minutes' walk) from home;
* at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home;
* one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home; and
* one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home; plus
* a minimum of one hectare of statutory Local Nature Reserves per thousand population

(Object) Policy ITCR6: Protection of Green Space - Publication
Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Agent: WYG (Leeds office) (Mr Mike Ashworth) [11997]
Respondent: Homes England (Ms Gill Hay) [11998]
Received: 14/6/2018 via Email

The site known as Land at Talbot Street, Pinxton, has the opportunity to provide new and enhanced facilities for the community including Greenspace. Therefore, it should not be negatively looked upon in terms of its development potential due to having existing allocated Green Space within its boundary.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)

This representation questions the soundness of the Bolsover Local Plan Publication Draft and recommends the inclusion of an additional housing allocation at Pinxton to ensure that the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The inclusion of an additional deliverable housing allocation would assist with boosting significantly the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF and contribute towards the Local Plan being positively prepared. In its absence, we consider that the Plan would be unsound and lack a reliable, deliverable housing supply for Pinxton, consistent with the overall strategy.

Changes to Plan:
We consider that the identification of GreenSpace within the Policy Map should be considered alongside the allocation and potential development solution for this Site. It may then be appropriate to vary the boundary of the Green Space allocation to address this point.

(Object) Policy ITCR6: Protection of Green Space - Publication
Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattley) [4563]
Received: 13/7/2018 via Email

Support the aim of protecting green space, which is taken to include playing field land. However, consider the policy wording needs changing as the current wording says "development proposals will be supported where they do not have...loss of" (modified wording is suggested under question 4).

Additionally, the wording is not considered to accord with NPPF paragraph 74 as the text which says "unless the proposal was of greater overall benefit to the local community than existing or realistic potential uses of the greenspace’ could potentially allow loss of outdoor sports facilities that are still needed and not replaced by equivalent or better provision’.

There should be consistency with the terminology as it varies between green space and greenspace.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Please refer to representations.

Changes to Plan:
Modify the wording of first paragraph to read "Development proposals will be supported where they do not result in the loss of existing....." to accord with NPPF paragraph 74.

Modify the wording of second paragraph to read ‘…unless the proposal is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss." to accord with NPPF paragraph 74.

Apply the term Green Space consistently.

Document is not Sound
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation at Examination: Written representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9102</strong> Policy ITCR7: Playing Pitches - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong> Policy ITCR7: Playing Pitches - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Catttle) [4563]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 13/7/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the aim of the policy but consider wording adjustment necessary to align with NPPF Paragraph 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In particular, the wording says: &quot;Development proposals will be permitted where they do not have an adverse effect or loss of Playing Pitches...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And also says: &quot;Proposals resulting in a loss will need to provide a replacement facility&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified wording is included under question 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to representations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to Plan:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify the wording of first paragraph to read: &quot;Development proposals will be supported where they do not have an adverse effect upon or result in the loss of playing pitches or playing field land as identified..... associated documents. Proposals resulting in a loss will need to deliver a replacement provision equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.&quot; to accord with NPPF paragraph 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document is not Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation at Examination:</strong> Written representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9105</strong> Policy ITCR8: New and Existing Indoor Sports Facilities - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong> Policy ITCR8: New and Existing Indoor Sports Facilities - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Andrew Grayson) [12388]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Mr Darren Ridout) [5191]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 15/6/2018 via Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This policy is considered sound as it recognises the general need for the delivery of new indoor sports facilities across the District and subsequently supports proposals for such development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development proposals for land to the south of Colliery Road, Creswell seeks, through partnership working, to facilitate the delivery of an indoor sports/recreation facility. This is to directly compensate for the recent loss of the sports facility in Creswell and will provide significant community benefit to Creswell's residents. Also, delivering against the identified need for sports facilities outlined in Policy ITCR8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to representations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document is not Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document does not comply with duty to cooperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation at Examination:</strong> Appearance at the Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for appearance:</strong> As a major landowner within the District, Welbeck manages a diverse portfolio of land and property, including employment and housing sites. As such The Estate plays a significant role in the development of the District and seeks to maintain its positive role within its communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8248</strong> Policy ITCR9: Local Transport Improvement Schemes - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong> Policy ITCR9: Local Transport Improvement Schemes - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 8/6/2018 via Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This policy identifies a number of transport improvement schemes to facilitate the growth planned and we consider this to be a positive approach. We support this policy which contributes to a positively prepared sound plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Text:</strong> (Show Full Text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This policy identifies a number of transport improvement schemes to facilitate the growth planned and we</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consider this to be a positive approach. We support this policy which contributes to a positively prepared sound plan.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination  
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

---

### 8961 (Support) Policy ITCR9: Local Transport Improvement Schemes - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email  

The County’s work with the District Council has been supplemented with a number of transportation assessments submitted in support of a number of planning applications, which are understood to be subsequently consented sites. This has in turn both informed the site allocations within the PLP including Policy ITCR9: Local Transport Improvement Schemes, ITCR9 makes provides for the granting of planning permission in cases where the proposal would not prejudice the delivery of a number of (listed) schemes. These schemes are in turn identified on the Policies Map and set out in detail in Appendix 8.1, which lists the schemes together with indicative layout(s). Whilst this is helpful, however, the PLP appears to be bereft of any actual policies that would ensure their delivery.

Beyond that, however, it is considered that the PLP does not present any insurmountable issues in terms of the Plan’s test of soundness in relation to highways matters. The County Council’s Officers are reasonably satisfied that the Highway Authority should, with the assistance of the District Council, be able to address the Inspector’s ‘Matters of Clarification’ on highways matters and that the Local Plan should in due course meet its test of soundness, at least in terms of the Inspector’s likely highways and transportation considerations.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
Please see attachment and representations.

---

### 8341 (Support) Policy ITCR10: Supporting Sustainable Transport Patterns - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Highways England (Mr Adrian Chadha) [11500]  
**Received:** 8/6/2018 via Email  

As such we acknowledge and welcome Policy ITCR10, which states that development proposals which are likely to have significant amounts of movements will need to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
As such we acknowledge and welcome Policy ITCR10, which states that development proposals which are likely to have significant amounts of movements will need to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment.

---

### 8675 (Object) Policy ITCR11: Parking Provision - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

**Respondent:** Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]  
**Received:** 15/6/2018 via Email  

This policy attempts to make the SPD guidance local policy, giving the local parking standards further planning weight. The local parking standards SPD does not appear however to be a document available to review however it needs to be rigorously tested to ensure it is deliverable and acceptable in planning terms once produced. In light of this, the parking standards should be encapsulated into local plan policy as it can have a significant impact on design and viability of a proposal.

Irrespective of this, if the Council proceeds with this policy it needs to reflect the wider location of the proposed site and the relative connectivity of it. It should also show compatibility with the policy ITCR10 which requires a travel Plan to support sustainable modes of transport. In highly accessible locations, the parking provision should be relaxed, due to the other transport methods available to avoid the dichotomy of supporting car ownership while trying to encourage sustainable travel.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed
housing. This representation will go through the different policy’s that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.
Chapter 9 – Implementation and Infrastructure Delivery

8365 **(Support) Policy II1: Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: *Education Funding Agency (Mr John Pilgrim) [9740]*  
Received: *31/5/2018 via Email*

The ESFA notes that the Council has decided not to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy at present. The ESFA supports the Council’s approach, as set out in Policy II1: Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions to ensure developer contributions address the impacts arising from growth, and contribute towards the delivery of social infrastructure including schools.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
The Education and Skills Funding Agency welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the development of planning policy at the local level.

See attached submission.

8676 **(Object) Policy II1: Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Respondent: *Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]*  
Received: *15/6/2018 via Email*

Persimmon Homes acknowledges that infrastructure is impacted by development and there is a duty within law to provide planning obligations. planning policy and guidance sets out clearly how this legislation should be applied and in summary relates only 'where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition' and 'whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations' (NPPF para 203.) The policy as currently drafted goes beyond this by suggesting development pays for infrastructure that is strategic in nature and is not a direct result from the development and mitigating the impacts. This is infrastructure that the Council (and County Council) generally would want to pursue rather than done to mitigate development. This policy needs to made clearer and that contributions will only be sought to mitigate the impacts of development, thereby reflecting the national policy.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation's largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy's that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly 'NPPF', which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

Document is not Sound.

9136 **(Object) Policy II1: Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)**

Agent: *Charlotte Stainton [8395]*  
Respondent: *Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Mr R Rusling) [10072]*  
Received: *15/6/2018 via Email*

The policy references have changed in some instances but the representations made on behalf of Ackroyd and Abbott in response to the Consultation Draft Local Plan have not been addressed.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)  
Please refer to representations.

Document is not Sound.
9147 **(Support)** Policy II1: Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Policy II1: Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - We welcome the inclusion of heritage conservation in relation to planning obligations and also the commitment to an SPD on S106 planning contributions

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

8677 **(Object)** Policy II2: Employment and Skills - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Persimmon Homes Nottingham (Mr Chris Gowlett) [11330]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

This requires an 'Employment and Skills Plan' for all major developments. Persimmon Homes supports the objective which is to give local communities the opportunity to receive training and employment through our construction activities. However, this does not appear to be enforceable as a policy and there will be times when it is not possible to meet. This will be especially pronounced in rural areas. Further to refuse an application or potential enforcement for non-compliance with this policy when it has no bearing on the supply of housing would be unreasonable, and not supportive of the overall aims of the NPPF. The developer and by extension who is building out the plots is considered not material to the determination of planning and therefore this policy should be removed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with Persimmon homes on the draft Bolsover District on the draft Bolsover District Local Plan. As one of the nation’s largest house builders, with significant future development activity planned in the Bolsover region, the local plan is of key importance to us in ensuring we can operate and deliver much needed housing. This representation will go through the different policy’s that are relevant and can impact on our ability to deliver in an efficient and viable manner.

The Draft Local Plan considers the national planning context, particularly ‘NPPF’, which is positive as it seeks to ensure sustainable development is promoted within a positive planning context. There needs to be consideration about the direction of travel within the national context particularly with the future changes to the NPPF and this has to be recognised within the local plan. Of particular importance is the calculation of housing need.

8883 **(Object)** Policy II2: Employment and Skills - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Email

The Council should not be seeking to approve Employment and Skills Plan on significant (defined as housing developments of more than 30 dwellings) developments. The effectiveness of the policy is not clear if an Employment and Skills Plan was not approved is planning consent refused. Until the Council has provided advice and guidance necessary to assist applicants to meet this proposed policy requirement Policy II2 should be removed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the above mentioned consultation. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC’s, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in...
England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following representations and appear at future Examination Hearing Sessions to discuss these matters in greater detail.

**Changes to Plan:**
Remove Policy II2 from the plan.
Document is not Sound

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** To further discuss issues raised.
Chapter 10 - Monitoring

8249 (Support) Defining how the Plan will be Monitored and Reviewed - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
Received: 8/6/2018 via Web
Waystone support the monitoring mechanisms which ensure the plan is sound and effective

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Waystone support the monitoring mechanisms which ensure the plan is sound and effective

Representation at Examination: Appearance at the Examination
Reason for appearance: As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

8342 (Support) Defining how the Plan will be Monitored and Reviewed - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Natural England (Lincoln office) (Andy Stubbs) [11558]
Received: 15/6/2018 via Web
Natural England supports the monitoring and review of the Local Plan, some possible indicators for biodiversity and green infrastructure have been suggested.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
We welcome that all significant effects of the plan (as identified in the Sustainability Appraisal) appear to have monitoring proposed for them but it is not yet clear how these indicators will work in practice, and in particular whether they will monitor the effects of the plan or just wider changes.

Whilst it is not Natural England’s role to prescribe what indicators should be adopted, you may wish to refer to examples of how other local planning authorities approach this issue.

Biodiversity:
* Plymouth Council report on the following:
  a) Number of LDF documents or planning approvals that generated any significant biodiversity impacts on sites of acknowledged biodiversity importance.
  b) Percentage of the planning approvals likely to have an impact on wildlife, which the Council negotiated provisions for a net gain in biodiversity.
  c) Number of planning applications refused or withdrawn in part due to their lack of consideration of biodiversity impacts.

Landscape:
* Protection of greenbelt from inappropriate development (Walsall AMR. Although for greenbelt, this approach could be readily adapted to protected and or wider landscapes)

Green infrastructure:
* To work towards ensuring that the city's population have access to a natural greenscape within 400 metres of their home. (Plymouth AMR)
* Length of greenways constructed (Walsall AMR)
* Hectares of accessible open space per 1000 population (Walsall AMR)

We note within Appendix 2 that consultation with Derbyshire Wildlife Trust be made when monitoring impacts on biodiversity. Natural England should be referenced as consultees for any issues relating to SSSIs.
Chapter 11 - Appendices

9146 **Object** Appendix 10.2 - Indicators and Targets Table - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

It is not clear why the targets and review triggers for Policies SC18 and SC19 are very different.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

9183 **Support** Policies Map - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Waystone Limited (Mrs Alison Barnfield) [4531]
Received: 8/6/2018 via Web

We support the Policies Map for the Northern Area and in particular we strongly support the allocation indicated on the Map for Clowne Garden Village. The designations and allocations around the Clowne Garden Village site are clearly shown and accurately reflect the proposed policies for the site.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
We consider that the Publication Draft Local Plan has been positively prepared and specifically the allocation of Clowne Garden Village by Policy SS5 is fully supported.

**Representation at Examination:** Appearance at the Examination
**Reason for appearance:** As promoter / lead developer of proposed strategic site.

8406 **Object** SA & HRA - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Plans, Policies and Programmes - At a National level it is suggested that the Historic England Advice Notes on Site Allocations in Local Plans, and Sustainability Appraisals are taken into account. In addition, it is clear from other sections of the SA that Heritage at Risk (HAR) Registers and the Historic Environment Record (HER) have been considered in the SA process but are not mentioned in the PPP section.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

9138 **Support** SA & HRA - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Section 3.12 Baseline Information: Cultural Heritage - The Key Sustainability Issues are welcomed and we note that HAR and HER are mentioned at this point.

**Full Text:** (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.
(Support) SA & HRA - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Table 4.1 - SA Framework - The Guide Questions for SA Objective 14 Cultural Heritage are noted and welcomed.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Object) SA & HRA - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Section 5.4: Strategic Land Allocations - The assessments of Table 5.3 in respect of SA Objective 14 are noted and fit with the concerns we have raised in respect of the Strategic Site policies within the Plan. As set out in the Plan comments, we would be happy to meet with the Council further to discuss the issues raised.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Object) SA & HRA - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Section 5.5: Land Allocations - Table 5.13 Housing Allocations - The assessments of Table 5.13 in respect of SA Objective 14 are noted and fit with the concerns we have raised in respect of the site land at Rosewood Farm, Alfreton Road, South Normanton within the Plan comments. As set out in those, we would be happy to meet with the Council further to discuss the issues raised.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.

(Object) SA & HRA - Publication Local Plan for Bolsover District (May 2018)

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Rosamund Worrall) [9741]
Received: 4/6/2018 via Email

Para 5.5.30 - In respect of SA Objective 14 Historic England agrees that relevant policies could assist with cultural heritage issues. However, the SA as well as the Local Plan refers to the natural and built environment only and does not refer to the historic environment so archaeology is not addressed at present. In addition, and as per our comments on the Plan, it is our view that the specific historic environment policies are not sound at this stage. Furthermore, the SA identifies that the Bolsover Town Centre site has the potential to adversely affect the historic environment which we agree with and have put forward that this be addressed more clearly in the relevant Local Plan Policy WC6.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.
Table 5.18: Results of the Cumulative Effects Appraisal - Historic England does not agree with the significant positive effect identified for the Sustainable Communities chapter of the Plan in relation to SA Objective 14 due to the historic environment related policies not being sound at this time. It is anticipated that this issue can be resolved through discussion and agreeing a Statement of Common Ground.

Full Text: (Show Full Text)
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Plan and its associated SA. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Historic England would wish to make the following comments as shown on the attachment.
Appendix

List of rep IDs of representations that have been submitted using a standardised form, and therefore excluded from the table to avoid repetition and an excessively long document. Each representation can be viewed in full via the electronic consultation system.

Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village. Supporting representations from various members of The Wickets and Ridgeway Residents Association:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8376</th>
<th>8377</th>
<th>8379</th>
<th>8383</th>
<th>8384</th>
<th>8387</th>
<th>8388</th>
<th>8389</th>
<th>8390</th>
<th>8391</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8397</td>
<td>8398</td>
<td>8399</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8403</td>
<td>8407</td>
<td>8409</td>
<td>8412</td>
<td>8415</td>
<td>8418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8419</td>
<td>8421</td>
<td>8422</td>
<td>8424</td>
<td>8426</td>
<td>8427</td>
<td>8428</td>
<td>8429</td>
<td>8430</td>
<td>8433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8434</td>
<td>8435</td>
<td>8436</td>
<td>8437</td>
<td>8438</td>
<td>8439</td>
<td>8440</td>
<td>8441</td>
<td>8442</td>
<td>8443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8444</td>
<td>8445</td>
<td>8447</td>
<td>8448</td>
<td>8451</td>
<td>8452</td>
<td>8453</td>
<td>8454</td>
<td>8456</td>
<td>8457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8458</td>
<td>8459</td>
<td>8460</td>
<td>8461</td>
<td>8462</td>
<td>8463</td>
<td>8464</td>
<td>8465</td>
<td>8466</td>
<td>8467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8468</td>
<td>8470</td>
<td>8472</td>
<td>8474</td>
<td>8477</td>
<td>8480</td>
<td>8481</td>
<td>8483</td>
<td>8484</td>
<td>8486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8487</td>
<td>8488</td>
<td>8489</td>
<td>8490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy SS5: Strategic Site Allocation - Clowne Garden Village. Objecting representations, predominantly from local residents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8255</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8266</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8286</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>8302</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8327</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8349</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8469</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8511</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8567</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8601</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8617</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8634</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8644</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8654</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8664</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8664</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

177