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Local Plan for Bolsover District: Matters, Issues and Questions

Draft Schedule of Matters for Discussion

Matter 1: Legal Compliance, including the Duty to Co-operate

Issue 1: Overall, has the Local Plan been prepared in accordance with the relevant legal requirements?

Q1. Has the Local Plan been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme [LDS]?

Q2. Has the Local Plan been prepared in accordance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement [SCI] and met the minimum consultation requirements in Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) [Local Plan Regulations]?

Q3. Is the Local Plan legally compliant with respect to Sustainability Appraisal [SA]?

Q4. Is the Local Plan legally compliant with respect to the Habitats Regulations and any requirement for Appropriate Assessment [AA]?

Q5. Is the Local Plan legally compliant with respect to climate change?

Q6. Is the Local Plan legally compliant with national policy, the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) [PCPA] and the Local Plan Regulations for the preparation of the plan?

Q7. Does the Local Plan make it clear, as required by Part 4, paragraph 8(5) of the Local Plan Regulations, which parts of the existing development plan it will supersede?

Q8. Should the plan periods for the Local Plans in the Derbyshire and Bassetlaw HMA authorities be aligned?

Q9. Should the Local Plan align with the County Council’s Strategic Statement on Planning and Health?

Issue 2: Is the Local Plan’s preparation compliant with the Duty to Co-operate [DtC] imposed by Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) [PCPA]?

Q10. What has been the nature and timing of the co-operation and on which issues?
Q11. Who did the Council co-operate with?

Q12. Are there any failures in the DtC?

Q13. Is there any identified unmet need in neighbouring authorities which could have been accommodated in Bolsover District under the DtC?

Q14. Were any standing arrangements/protocols/memorandums of understanding in place?

Q15. How has the co-operation influenced the preparation of the Local Plan?

**Matter 2: Soundness of the Local Plan**

**Issue 3: Is the general approach and coverage of the Local Plan justified and effective?**

Q16. Is the Council’s approach to the promotion of sustainable development effective? [Policy SS1]

**Issue 4: Is the approach to the Green Belt justified, effective and consistent with national policy?** [Policy SS10]

Q17. Has the Council’s Local Green Belt Review [EB33 and EB34] been undertaken in a robust manner?

Q18. How would development of the sites removed from the Green Belt affect Green Belt purposes?

Q19. Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to support the removal of sites from the Green Belt?

Q20. Should the Local Plan reaffirm the commitment to the maintenance of the role of the Green Belt in both Policies SS9 and SS10?

Q21. Would the changes proposed to the Green Belt lead to Clowne and Barlborough coalescing?

Q22. Is Policy SS10 consistent with national policy? In particular, should Policy SS10 refer to the ‘purposes’ rather than ‘purpose’ of the Green Belt?

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

**Housing Requirement** [Policy SS2]

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

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

Q25. Does the OAHN have sufficient regard to the economic aspirations of the Sheffield City Region and D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)?

Q26. Have employment trends been taken into account?

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

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

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

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

Q31. Should the housing requirement include an allowance to accommodate unmet need from Sheffield City or North East Derbyshire District?

**Housing Distribution**

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

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

Q34. Are the 3 Strategic Sites at Bolsover North, Clowne Garden Village and the Former Whitwell Colliery Site located in the appropriate place to assist in the delivery of the Council’s spatial strategy? [Policies SS4, SS5 and SS6]
Q35. Should the spatial strategy and distribution of development allow for more development in less sustainable rural locations? [Policy SS3]

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

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

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

Q39. Is Policy SS9 effective in enabling sustainable development and previously developed land to come forward for development in the countryside?

Q40. Should criterion b) of Policy SS9 be amended to replace ‘and’ with ‘or’?

**Housing Supply during the Plan period**

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

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

Q43. The Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 indicates how 4,551 dwellings would be completed in the plan period – is the Council reliant on other sites coming forward to meet its housing target and, if so, should these be included in the trajectory, or is this made up of actual completions from 2014/15 to 2017/18 which equates to 1,123 dwellings?

Q44. Does the Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 accurately reflect the likely start dates, build out rates and completions of the allocated sites?

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

Q46. Are the proposed changes to the Housing Trajectory put forward by the Council in respect of the allocated sites appropriate and supported by substantial evidence?

---

1 Amended to 4,585 dwellings in the updated Housing Trajectory in Appendix B of Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply [PP2]

2 a) Land off Langwith Road and Mooracre Lane, Bolsover; c) Land between Shuttlewood Road and Oxcroft Lane, Bolsover; e) Land at Brookvale, Shirebrook; f) Land at Station Road, Langwith Junction, Shirebrook; g) Land to the rear of 1 to 35 Red Lane, South Normanton; h) Land at Rosewood Lodge Farm, Alfreton Road, South Normanton; j) Land
Q47. Are the housing sites allocated in the Local Plan deliverable and/or developable having regard to Footnotes 11 and 12 in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 [NPPF]?

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

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

Q50. Should an allowance be made for windfall sites?

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

**5 Year Housing Land Supply**

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

Q53. What evidence is there to show that those sites included in the 5 year housing land supply are deliverable?

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

Q55. The table in Appendix B of the Council’s 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report, dated 4 July 2018, indicates that housing allocation v) Land east of Pleasley Pit, Pleasley will deliver 9 dwellings in 2018/19 and 8 dwellings in 2019/20. This differs from the Housing Trajectory in Appendix 5.1 of the Local Plan which shows that this site will deliver 9 dwellings in 2019/20 and 10 dwellings in 2020/2. The Council’s Position Paper relating to Residential Land Supply confirms that the former is correct, but does

________________________
to rear of 169-207 Creswell Road, Clowne; l) Land at High Ash Farm, Mansfield Road, Clowne; m) Land north of Chesterfield Road, Barlborough; n) Land rear of Skinner Street, Creswell; o) Land south of Creswell Model Village, Creswell; q) Land south of Overview Moor, Tibshelf; and, r) Land west of Spa Croft, Tibshelf.
not recommend a change be made to the Local Plan Housing Trajectory. Should it do so?

**Site Allocations**

**Strategic Sites:**

*Bolsover North* [Policy SS4] [950 dwellings]

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

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

Q58. Are there any constraints to development?

Q59. Are the proposed changes to the Housing Trajectory put forward by the Council in respect of this Strategic Site appropriate and supported by substantial evidence?

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

Q61. Should Policy SS4 include reference to the proposed SPD or would this be better located in the supporting text?

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

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

Q64. Is the boundary of the site shown on the Policies Map correct? Does it accord with the site granted outline planning permission and shown in Figure 4B: Bolsover North – Approved Masterplan (page 42)?
Q65. Has the Section 106 Agreement been signed by the outstanding landowners (anticipated by December 2018)?

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

**Clowne Garden Village [Policy SS5] [1,000 dwellings]**

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

Q68. Is the proposed housing allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it:
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q69. Are there any constraints to development?

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

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

Q72. Has the Council considered the development of a smaller site in this location as a Reasonable Alternative?

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

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

Q75. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on highway safety; flood risk; wildlife, woodland and hedgerows; heritage assets, including the Southgate House Conservation Area (part of which is included within the northern section of the site boundary on the indicative masterplan – Figure 4C); landscape and village character; agricultural land; local services and facilities; and sewage infrastructure?
Q76. Is the site in the right location?

Former Whitwell Colliery Site [Policy SS6] [200 dwellings]

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

Q78. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it:
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q79. Are there any constraints to development?

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

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

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

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

Housing Allocations: [Policy LC1]

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

Land at Brookvale, Shirebrook [560 dwellings]

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

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

Q87. Are there any constraints to development?

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

Q89. What percentage of the dwellings would be expected to be provided as affordable housing?

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

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

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

Q92. Are there any constraints to development?

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

Q94. Has the application for the approval of reserved matters been determined [expected Autumn 2018]?

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

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

Q96. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
Q97. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable in accordance with the housing trajectory? In particular, is it:
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q98. Are there any constraints to development?

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

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

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

Land at Croftlands Farm, Pinxton [50 dwellings]

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

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

Q104. Are there any constraints to development?

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

Q106. What percentage of the dwellings would be expected to be provided as affordable housing?
**Affordable Housing** [Policy LC2]

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

Q108. What evidence is there to support the requirement for an affordable housing provision of 10% in residential developments comprising 25 dwellings or more in Policy LC2?

**Type and Mix of Housing** [Policy LC3]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Occupational Dwellings in the Countryside** [Policies LC8 and LC9]

Q116. Is Policy LC8 justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings in the countryside?
Q117. Are the criteria included in Policy LC9 justified and effective in respect of the removal of agricultural and other occupancy conditions?

Issue 6: Is the Local Plan positively prepared, justified and effective in respect of transport?

Q118. Should Policy ITCR10 include the requirements set out in the supporting text to this policy?

Q119. Policy ITCR11 refers to planning permission being granted where there is appropriate provision for vehicle and cycle parking as outlined within the Local Parking Standards SPD. Regard should be had to Regulations 5 and 6 of the Local Plan Regulations which prescribe, in effect, that the following is a Local Plan, rather than any form of supplementary planning document:

'(a) any document prepared by a local planning authority ... which contains statements regarding one or more of the following –

(i) the development and use of land which the local planning authority wish to encourage during any specified period;
(ii) the allocation of sites for a particular type of development or use;
(iii) any environmental, social, design and economic objectives which are relevant to the attainment of the development and use of land mentioned in paragraph (i); and,
(iv) development management and site allocation policies, which are intended to guide the determination of applications for planning permission;

(b) where a document mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) contains policies applying to sites or areas by reference to an Ordnance Survey map, any map which accompanies that document ...’

Paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that supplementary planning documents should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery. Paragraph 154 says that Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Policy ITCR11 defers important policy matters to the new Local Parking Standards SPD, namely the standards of parking provision for most types of development, which should be before the Examination for testing. How should this matter be addressed?
Issue 7: Is the Local Plan positively prepared, justified and effective in respect of employment?

**Employment Requirement** [Policy SS2]

Q120. Does the requirement for 92ha of employment land meet the economic development needs of the District? Is it based on an appropriate assessment?

Q121. Is Policy SS2 sufficiently clear in respect of the employment land requirement?

Q122. Should the target be expressed as a minimum?

**Employment Distribution** [Policy SS3]

Q123. Does the distribution of employment in the Local Plan reflect the spatial strategy of focusing development on the more sustainable settlements, whilst also supporting regeneration needs and tackling deprivation?

Q124. Is the distribution of employment development around the District appropriate? Are there sufficient employment sites available of the appropriate nature and in the right place to meet anticipated needs?

**Employment Land Supply** [Policy WC1]

Q125. Have sufficient sites been allocated in the Local Plan to meet the target of 92ha of B class employment land?

Q126. Is the overall level of employment provision of just under 92ha of B1, B2 and B8 employment land sufficient to meet the needs of the District?

Q127. Should the sites at Sports Direct, Brook Park, Shirebrook [9.75ha]; Beaufit Lane, Brookhill Industrial Estate, Pinxton [1.23ha]; Land off Midland Way, Barlborough [1.5ha]; and Castlewood Business Park, North [7.13ha], totalling 19.61ha, be included as allocations given that they have been developed? If these sites are removed the supply would be reduced to around 72ha. Would this be sufficient to meet the employment land target?

Q128. Has the employment site selection process been based on a sound process of SA and the testing of reasonable alternatives?

Q129. Are the sites allocated for employment uses deliverable?

Q130. What evidence is there to show when the development of these sites would occur?
**Site Allocations - Employment**

**Strategic Sites:**

_**Clowne Garden Village Strategic Site [20ha] [B1, B2 & B8]**_

Q131. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

Q132. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable? In particular, is it:
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q133. Has full consideration been given to the relationship between the housing and employment elements of the Strategic Site? Would the comprehensive development of this site be guided by a masterplan?

Q134. Is this site in a sustainable location?

Q135. The Position Paper relating to Employment Provision [PP3] shows that 17ha of employment plateaux is anticipated to come forward between 2021 and 2027 [paragraph 4.16]. When would this employment land be developed? When would the remaining 3ha of employment land be developed?

_**Coalite Priority Regeneration Area [31ha]**_

Q136. Is Policy SS7 sound given that it refers to an ‘approved masterplan for the site or any subsequent approved document’? Should the policy clearly set out the requirements for the development of this site?

Q137. Should Policy SS7 set out more clearly the types of development that would be acceptable on this site?

Q138. Has sufficient consideration been given to the impact of the redevelopment of this site on flood risk, landscape and biodiversity?

Q139. Is the proposed allocation of this site as a Priority Regeneration Area justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
Q140. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable? In particular, is it:
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q141. Should the Former Coalite Works Strategic Regeneration Site [31ha] be allocated for employment given that it benefits from planning permission for employment uses?

*Employment Allocations:* [Policy WC1]

*Explore Industrial Park, Steetley* [10.7ha] [B2/B8]

Q142. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

Q143. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable? In particular, is it:
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q144. Would B1 uses be appropriate on this site?

Q145. When is it anticipated that the submission of an application for the approval of reserved matters would be forthcoming?

Q146. When is it anticipated that development would commence on site?

Q147. Is the extent of the allocation accurately shown on the Policies Map?

*Land between Brickyard Farm and Barlborough Links, Barlborough* [3.45ha] [B1/B8]

Q148. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
Q149. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable? In particular, is it:
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q150. Which uses is the site appropriate for? [Paragraph 6.13 states it has opp for B1/B2/B8, but Policy WC1 states B1/B8]

Q151. What was the nature of the approved reserved matters application referred to in the Position Paper relating to Employment Provision [PP3]?

Wincobank Farm, South Normanton [14ha] [B2/B8]

Q152. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

Q153. Is the proposed allocation deliverable and/or developable? In particular, is it:
   a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
   b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
   c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q154. Is the development of a retail park on part of this site appropriate?

Q155. Would a hotel, restaurant, retail, leisure and café uses be appropriate on this site?

Q156. What evidence does the Council have to support its assessment that the site will come forward during the plan period? When is it anticipated that development will commence on this site?

Protection of Existing Employment Areas [Policy WC2]

Q157. Is the approach to the protection of existing employment areas in the policy effective and justified?
Q158. Should Bolsover Business Park and Intake Way be protected solely for employment uses or should retail uses be allowed to support high quality employment development on these sites?

Q159. Does the Local Plan provide sufficient opportunities for the expansion of existing businesses?

Support for the Rural Economy [Policy WC3]

Q160. Is the support given to sustainable rural employment and diversification in villages and within the countryside consistent with national policy, justified and effective?

Rough Close Works, Normanton [Policy WC4]

Q161. Should the policy include the definitions of the various distances required by Health and Safety Legislation?

Issue 8: Is the retail development strategy positively prepared, justified and effective?

Q162. Does the Local Plan accurately reflect the position in respect of retail commitments across the District? [paragraphs 6.40, 6.51 and 6.55]

Q163. Is the Council’s approach to the assessment of quantitative and qualitative need for retail floorspace sound? [Policy WC5]

Q164. Does the Local Plan define a hierarchy of town and local centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes? [Policy WC5]

Q165. Is Policy WC5 positively prepared and consistent with national policy in respect of the requirement that retail development must demonstrate that it is appropriate in scale and function to its location and the thresholds for Retail Impact Assessments for edge of centre or out of centre developments?

Q166. What evidence is there to support the requirement in Policy WC9 that hot food takeaways should not be located within 400m of any school or college?

Q167. Should the Local Plan include a policy or policies in respect of shopfronts, advertisements and security grilles/shutters in order to safeguard the historic character of settlements?
**Edge of Town Centre Allocations**

*Bolsover Edge of Town Centre Allocation [Policy WC6]*

Q168. Is Policy WC6, as drafted, sound – in particular, with regards to its reference to the site as 'edge of town centre'; the requirement for its development to be guided by a Masterplan; the provision of a 2-way vehicular access road; and the preparation of an SPD?

Q169. Should the policy be amended to include a requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment to be undertaken?

*Shirebrook Edge of Town Centre Allocations [Policy WC7]*

Q170. Is Policy WC7, as drafted, sound – in particular, with regards to the repetition of criteria b) and d); and the requirement to provide a replacement play area and provide a commuted sum?

*South Normanton Edge of Town Centre Allocations [Policy WC8]*

Q171. Should Policy WC8 include a reference to any proposed development also complying with Policy WC4, given the site’s proximity to the Rough Close Works?

**Issue 9: Is the Local Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy with regards to the historic environment and landscape character?**

Q172. How would the current Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document fit with the Local Plan?

Q173. Should Objective D: Historic Environment (page 28) be amended to include reference to the setting of heritage assets?

Q174. Does the Local Plan use the correct terminology set out in the relevant Act or the NPPF when referring to particular heritage assets in Policies SC16, SC17, SC18, SC19, SC20 and SC21?

Q175. Should the Local Plan set out the policy implications should Creswell Crags be nominated and inscribed as a World Heritage Site during the plan period?

Q176. Is the Local Plan and its policies consistent with national policy in respect of the test of harm in respect of heritage assets?

Q177. Is the assessment of the impact of development proposals on conservation areas reliant on the presence of up-to-date conservation area appraisals and management plans? [Policy SC16]
Q178. Is Policy SC17 consistent with national policy in respect of development affecting listed buildings and their settings?

Q179. Is Policy SC18 consistent with national policy in respect of development affecting scheduled monuments and archaeological sites?

Q180. Is a separate policy relating to the Bolsover Area of Archaeological Interest justified and, if so, would it be effective? [Policy SC19]

Q181. Should reference to Historic Landscape Character data be referred to in Policy SC8?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Issue 11: Is the Local Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of the natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity?**

Q189. Does the Local Plan adequately support the natural environment? [Policies SC8, SC9 and SC10]
Q190. Should Objective C: Countryside, Landscape Character and Wildlife (page 28) be amended to include reference to protecting and enhancing sites designated for their biodiversity interests, particularly SSSIs?

Q191. Does the Local Plan accurately reflect the number of SSSIs within the District? [7 are referenced in the introduction and only 6 in para. 7.55]

Q192. Is Policy SC9 consistent with national policy in respect of biodiversity and geodiversity?

Q193. Are the Local Wildlife Site designations shown correctly on the Policies Map?

**Issue 12: Is the Local Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of the countryside?**

Q194. Is the inclusion of Important Open Breaks consistent with national policy? [Policy SS11]

Q195. Is the extent of the Important Open Breaks appropriate? Have they been designated on the basis of a robust assessment and evidence? [Policy SS11]

Q196. Should greater use be made of the Important Open Breaks to maintain openness between South Normanton and the neighbouring settlements? [Policy SS11]

Q197. Is Policy SC5: Change of Use and Conversions in the Countryside overly restrictive?

**Issue 13: Is the Local Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of climate change, renewable energy, flood risk and water management?**

Q198. Should the Plan include a specific policy on climate change in the Plan?

Q199. Is the Local Plan’s approach to renewable energy justified, effective and consistent with national policy? [Policy SC6]

Q200. Is it appropriate for Policy SC6 to expect major new developments to connect to, or be designed to connect in the future to, district or community heating networks?

Q201. Is Policy SC7 effective, justified and consistent with national policy in respect of flood risk and the management of surface water?
Q202. Is Flood Zone 3 accurately shown on the Policies Map?

**Issue 14: Does the Local Plan provide adequate environmental protection in respect of environmental quality (amenity), air quality, water quality, land contamination, land stability and hazardous installations?**

Q203. Is Policy SC11 consistent with national policy in respect of the requirements for development likely to cause, or experience, a loss of residential amenity?

Q204. Is Policy SC12 consistent with national policy in respect of the assessment of the impact of new development and increased traffic on air quality?

Q205. Is Policy SC13 consistent with national policy in respect of the requirements for major planning applications to be accompanied by evidence of the impact on water quality?

Q206. Should Policy SC14 refer to the historic environment as well as the natural and built environment?

Q207. Is Policy SC15 effective and consistent with national policy in respect of hazardous installations? Should it include a reference to Policy WC4?

**Issue 15: Is the Local Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of design?**

Q208. Is Policy SC2 consistent with national policy in respect of the requirements for sustainable design and construction?

Q209. Is Policy SC3 consistent with national policy in respect of seeking a high quality design for development proposals?

Q210. Should Policy SC3 include reference to a footnote in respect of the incorporation of opportunities for sport and physical activity? Should any requirements be set out in the policy?

Q211. Is Policy SC4 consistent with national policy in respect of the delivery of large developments?

**Issue 16: Is the Local Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of Implementation and Monitoring**

Q212. Is Policy II1 consistent with national policy in respect of the role of developer contributions?
Q213. Is Policy II2 justified and consistent with national policy in respect of its requirement for developers to submit for approval an Employment and Skills Plan on significant development sites?

Q214. Is the monitoring of the Local Plan, along with the indicators, targets and triggers for review, set out in Chapter 10 – Monitoring appropriate?