

## DERBYSHIRE DALES LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

### SESSION 14, MATTER 10 & 11 ALLOCATIONS AND SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES - RURAL PARISHES

#### Hearing statement on behalf of Mrs. S. Wood (1081)

1. I am Roger Yarwood. I have set out my background and qualifications in a separate appendix to an earlier hearing statement.
2. I represent a client with land suitable for housing development in Tansley.
3. I submit that:
  - That constraints render it unlikely that the "strategic" sites in Matlock and Darley Dale and Wirksworth will be deliverable within a reasonable timescale and the reliance on those sites to deliver the housing need in Matlock, Wirksworth and Darley Dale is not a realistic approach.
  - As a consequence, other sites should be allocated to help meet any resulting shortfall.
  - Several smaller sites, including sites which I and others have put forward for allocation, would give more certainty of delivery and provide better choice.
  - Settlement boundaries are in general too tightly drawn to the extent that good development opportunities will be stifled.
4. The expectation that Local Plan will deliver over 2000 dwellings on the 7 strategic sites in Matlock, Wirksworth and Darley Dale is unrealistic. The reliance on former quarry sites to deliver a substantial element of this provision demonstrates that the Council is unduly optimistic in its expectations of meeting its OAN target (even at the reduced level as proposed in Main Modification MM23).
5. Despite being granted permission for housing development over 16 years ago Cawdor Quarry remains undeveloped and this experience demonstrates the difficulty in developing former quarries. Yet, despite this history, the Council is now largely reliant on the development of even more quarry sites to secure the necessary housing land.
6. The site put forward for development at Tansley on behalf of my client, Mrs. Wood (SHLAA 214) has good access to employment sites, community facilities and public transport. Yet less sustainable sites have been allocated in relatively remote locations

with a far more dramatic and adverse impact on the landscape. The site is in a more sustainable location than many of the allocated sites.

7. A recent appeal, following refusal of planning permission for housing on this site (ref. 3152291), was dismissed, but the Inspector rejected the Council's case that the proposed access to the site was unsafe and dismissed the appeal solely on the basis of impact on the landscape. Notwithstanding this appeal history, I submit that the impact on the landscape attributable to the development of this site would be far less significant than that which will result from the development of many of the allocated sites.
  
8. This site was discounted from consideration without proper scrutiny. In failing to consider this site for allocation, the Council assessment merely states:  

*"The site is not adjacent and is unrelated to the existing settlement. It does not follow the existing built up settlement pattern of the village of Tansley"*

I submit that this is a flawed assessment. This site is well related to the village being as close to the community facilities as the other allocated sites in Tansley and much more conveniently located to benefit from public transport links to local centres. It is opposite housing development forming part of the settlement. Sites with a far weaker relationship to their nearest settlement have survived this filtering process and have been allocated for housing development. Even the Appeal Inspector did not put this forward as a reason for opposing the grant of permission.
  
9. Together with other sites put forward by my other clients and some sites put forward by other agents, allocation of my client's site at Tansley would bring flexibility in housing provision, provide choice and give greater certainty over delivery.
  
10. I submit that further flexibility and choice would be secured by a less tightly drawn settlement boundary. The Council, regrettably appears to have approached the drafting of settlement boundaries from the standpoint of excluding as much land as possible.
  
11. If the settlement Boundary for Tansley had been logically defined, this site would have been adjacent to the Boundary.