

**Agenda**  
**Session 10 – 09.30 Tuesday 16 May**  
**Matters 10 and 11**  
**Strategic Allocations and Settlement Boundaries**  
**Matlock**

The purpose of this session is to examine the strategic allocations and settlement boundaries for Matlock.

Policy S8 sets out a development strategy for Matlock/Wirksworth/Darley Dale. There are three strategic site allocations in Matlock at Gritstone Road (DS4), Halldale Quarry (DS5) and Cawdor Quarry (DS9). The former is for residential development whereas the latter two are for mixed use developments of residential and employment.

Modifications are proposed by the Council to Policies DS4, DS5 and DS8. Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) between the Council and developers have been prepared for Gritstone Road and land at RBS (housing allocation HC2(s)).

Main Modifications MM28, MM54, MM104-107 and MM123-127 are relevant to this matter.

A summary of the **Council's** statement in response to the questions is included within the agenda.

**Issues**

**1. The Matlock Development Strategy**

***Are the allocations in Matlock consistent with the development strategy (Policy S8)?***

The **Council** confirms that Matlock is a 1<sup>st</sup> tier settlement. It is estimated that 27% of the District's housing provision outside the National Park will be in Matlock (commitments and allocations). In addition 3ha of employment land is allocated (Cawdor and Halldale Quarries) and two employment sites are safeguarded by Policy EC4.

**2. Gritstone Road**

***Is the allocation justified having regard to constraints, including accessibility to services, topography, highway network, drainage, habitats and landscape impact?***

***What measures, including new infrastructure, can be put in place to mitigate any adverse impacts?***

***Is the site deliverable in the timescales envisaged by the SHELAA having regard to constraints, infrastructure and viability?***

***Are the criteria within Policy DS4 justified?***

Whilst the **Council** acknowledges that the site is elevated and some distance from the town centre it is stated that accessibility and sustainability can be improved by provision of a shuttle bus and a local centre.

Mitigation is proposed in terms of landscape, highway network and drainage impacts.

The viability and deliverability of the site has been assessed as part of CD19 and the SOCG outlines delivery timescales.

The Council considers that the criteria within Policy DS4 are justified as they require the submission of information that would normally accompany an application.

***Do the constraints on accessing the site by car (including Cavendish Road), foot, cycle and public transport make it unsuitable for allocation?***

***What mitigation can be put in place to improve the accessibility of the site (a shuttle bus and travel planning measures are put forward by the developer)?***

***Are the landscape and visual impact effects acceptable?***

***Are there likely to be any biodiversity issues which would prevent development of the site?***

***Is the risk from surface and ground water flooding capable of being mitigated having regard to geology and other constraints?***

***Are there any implications arising from the presence of the aqueduct for developing the site?***

***Are the requirements for phasing within Policy DS4 clear and necessary, particularly having regard to the timing of the provision of an east-west link road?***

***Should Policy DS4 make specific reference to the provision of a local centre?***

**3. Halldale Quarry**

***Is the allocation justified having regard to the highway network constraints?***

***What measures, including new infrastructure, can be put in place to mitigate any adverse highway impacts?***

***How can the accessibility of the site from the town be improved?***

***Is the site deliverable in the timescales envisaged by the SHELAA having regard to constraints, infrastructure and viability?***

***In particular what are the implications for deliverability of***

***contamination, quarry faces, stability and the mineral resource?***

The **Council** notes that the site has the benefit of an extant planning permission for a mixed use development of 220 dwellings and commercial floorspace. The permission is subject to a travel plan and off-site highway improvements.

The Council acknowledges that the elevated position makes reliance on the private car likely.

The viability and deliverability of the site has been assessed by the District Valuation Office and as part of CD19.

In terms of site constraints, quarry face stability has been assessed. Further assessments of stability and contamination will be required. The quarry has been inactive for some time but Policy DS5 requires development to have regard to the mineral resource.

***What are the implications of Policy MP17 of the Minerals Local Plan in that it indicates that the MPA will resist proposals which would sterilise certain mineral deposits?***

***Notwithstanding the assessments already undertaken are the constraints relating to stability and contamination likely to be sufficient to prevent or delay development coming forward?***

***What measures can be incorporated to prevent additional traffic using country lanes in the vicinity, including those in the National Park and should these measures be included within Policy DS5?***

***Can the site deliver the affordable housing and necessary infrastructure contributions required by Policy DS5 and other policies of the LP?***

4. **Cawdor Quarry**

***Is the allocation justified having regard to the highway network constraints?***

***What measures, including new infrastructure, can be put in place to mitigate any adverse highway impacts?***

***How can the accessibility of the site from the town be improved?***

***Is the site deliverable in the timescales envisaged by the SHELAA having regard to constraints, infrastructure and viability?***

***In particular what are the implications for deliverability of contamination, quarry faces, stability and the mineral resource? Should the size and scope of the allocation be increased ensure that the site comes forward?***

The **Council** refers to the planning history of the site and the existence of an extant permission and a current application.

Highway improvements have already been made and further measures are proposed to improve accessibility.

The Council considers that it has taken a more cautious approach to deliverability than the landowners.

There is evidence of landfill operations on the site but the intention is to leave these in situ. There are no safeguarded mineral resources. Stabilisation works will be carried out to quarry faces.

The current application proposes a greater number of dwellings and business and retail floorspace than the allocation but extends into open fields beyond the allocation to which there are significant objections.

***Are there any implications arising from the history of unimplemented permissions for the deliverability of the site? Notwithstanding the assessments already undertaken are the constraints relating to stability and contamination likely to be sufficient to prevent or delay development coming forward? What measures can be incorporated to prevent additional traffic using country lanes in the vicinity, including those in the National Park, and should these measures be included in Policy DS9?***

5. **Settlement Boundaries**

***Is the settlement boundary for Matlock justified?***

The Council state that the boundary is intended to reflect the extent of the settlement's existing and proposed built-up area using criteria set out in paragraph 4.23 of the LP.

***Are there any locations where the settlement boundary could be amended without causing significant harm whilst increasing development opportunities e.g. along Old Hackney Lane/Upper Hackney where allocations are proposed?***

6. **Infrastructure**

***Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed be provided in the right place and at the right time, including that relating to transport, the highway network, health and education?***

The Council indicates that transport and education infrastructure will form the majority of essential projects to support the proposed growth. Highway works and traffic management will limit the effects of additional traffic. Additional school places will be required at primary schools. The need for additional health facilities is likely to be met by CIL.

***What specific highway works and traffic management are likely***

***to be necessary to mitigate the impact of growth in Matlock, (reference is made to the Crown Square and Matlock Green junctions)?***

***Is there scope for the town's primary schools to expand to provide necessary school places?***

***Will the North Derbyshire CCG be in a position to formalise its GP practice requirements for Matlock through its Estates Strategy such that S106 or CIL can support additional provision?***

#### **Main Evidence Base**

SD07 – Duty to Cooperate Statement

CD19 – CD22 – Viability Assessments

CD25 – SHELAA

CD35 – Transport Evidence Base Report

EX/08 - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions of 15 February

EX/13 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications

#### **Participants**

DDDC

DCC

Mr Paul Hibbitt (404)

Wolds Action Group (993)

Roger Yarwood for various clients (2164)

Mr Frederick Burgess (3499)

Mr S Briddon (3592)

John Church for Executors of former Gervase Smith Nurseries Ltd (4792)

Mrs. S Briddon (5175)

Ken Wainmain for Richard Hobday (5279)

WYG for William Davis (5317)

Matlock Civic Association (5323)

Mr Paul Roe (5781)

Mr J Wallbank (5980)

Mr David Elsworth (6001)

Graham Hall on behalf of Mr. M Seddon (6026)

Mr. P Thompson (6126)

Fisher German for Mr. S Haslam & Ms C Alcock (6165)

PDP for Wildgoose Homes (6212)

#### **Statements**

DDDC

Wolds Action Group

Roger Yarwood

Frederick Burgess

WYG

Matlock Civic Association

Paul Roe

Julian Wallbank

Paul Thompson

Fisher German

PDP

Martin Seddon

David Elsworth