

Agenda
Session 12 – 13.30 Wednesday 17 May
Matters 10 and 11
Strategic and Other Allocations and Settlement Boundaries
Ashbourne

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

Policy S9 sets out a development strategy for Ashbourne. There are two strategic site allocations in Ashbourne both at the airfield (DS1 and DS8) for mixed use development of residential and employment. In addition there are three other housing allocations.

Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) between the Council and developers have been prepared for Lathkill Drive (HC2(a)), Mirage Hotel (HC2(b)), Ashbourne Airfield Phase 2 (HC2(c) and DS8) and Cavendish Drive (HC2(d)). Some modifications are proposed to Policies DS1 and DS8.

Main Modifications MM54, MM100 and MM119-122 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 Ashbourne Development Strategy

Are the allocations in Ashbourne consistent with the settlement hierarchy (Policy S3) and development strategy (Policy S9)?

The **Council** confirms that Ashbourne is a 1st tier settlement. It is estimated that 31% of the District's housing provision outside the National Park will be in Ashbourne (commitments and allocations). In addition 14ha of employment land is allocated (Airfield) and two employment sites are safeguarded by Policy EC4. The Council considers that the level of housing and employment provision is consistent with the strategy.

Is the allocation at the Airfield (Phase 2) consistent with the development strategy having regard to its location relative to the town centre and services predominantly within a rural parish?

2. Land at Ashbourne Airfield

Are the sites deliverable in the timescales envisaged by the SHELAA having regard to constraints, infrastructure and viability?

Are the criteria within Policies DS1 and DS8, including the requirement for phasing of employment and residential development and community facilities, justified?

The **Council** refers to the extant planning permissions for Phase 1 of the development including for a new access road. Growth Deal funding has been allocated for the link road to be released on completion of a business case, design work and a construction contract. Phase 2 will be able to rely on the detailed work already undertaken which indicates that there are no significant technical constraints. 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 Policies DS1 and DS8 are justified as they require the submission of information that would normally accompany an application. A phasing stipulation is necessary in view of evidence of the need for new employment floorspace.

Do the areas shown on the Policies Maps for Phases 1 and 2 (DS1 and DS8) need to be adjusted to take into account planning permissions granted?

Are the timescales for delivery on Phase 2 realistic e.g. 40 dwellings in 2019/20?

How are Phases 1 and 2 to be accessed?

What provisions are included within the planning permission for Phase 1 for contributions to off-site highway works, education and health?

What are the implications for delivery from the former use of part of the site for the storage of ordnance?

3. Other Housing Allocations

Are the sites deliverable in the timescales envisaged by the SHELAA having regard to constraints, infrastructure and viability?

The **Council** refers to evidence in the SHELAA and viability studies to support delivery. The viability modelling includes an allowance for S106 costs, abnormal development costs and 20% developer profit. Deliverability is supported by the SOCGs.

The SOCG indicates that the site at Lathkill Drive has planning permission. The SOCG for Mirage Hotel does not identify any constraints to development. The SOCG for Cavendish Drive refers to the need to demonstrate a right of access and visibility splays and the high landscape sensitivity of the site.

Is a suitable access achievable for the Cavendish Drive site?

Has the extent of the allocation at Cavendish Drive taken into account the landscape sensitivities of the site (it is noted that the allocation is more limited in extent than the site identified in the SHELAA)?

4. Settlement Boundaries

Is the settlement boundary for Ashbourne 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?

5. Infrastructure

Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed be provided in the right place and at the right time, particularly that relating to the highway network in Ashbourne?

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. In particular a scheme to increase the capacity of the Sturston Rd/Derby Rd junction is proposed. Congestion could still occur but queuing would be on a smaller scale.

Additional school places will be required at primary schools which would require funding by developer contributions. The need for additional health facilities is likely to be met by CIL.

Are the cumulative impacts of the LP allocations and commitments on the transport network in Ashbourne, including the Sturston Rd/Derby Rd junction, less than severe?

Is the LP (and Policy S9 in particular) sufficiently positive in promoting the need for a 2nd by-pass for Ashbourne?

What measures can be implemented to reduce the reliance on travel by private car?

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

Will the South Derbyshire CCG be in a position to formalise its health requirements for Ashbourne through its Estates Strategy such that S106 or CIL can support additional provision?

What mechanisms are in place to ensure that S106 contributions are invested so that infrastructure is delivered at the right time and in the right place? The Town Council refer to action plan(s)

being developed.

Main Evidence Base

SD07 – Duty to Cooperate Statement

CD19 – CD22 – Viability Assessments

CD25 – SHELAA

CD35 – Transport Evidence Base Report

EX/07 - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions of 14 February

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

EX/13 – Schedule of proposed main modifications

Participants

DDDC

DCC

Osmaston & Yeldersley Parish Council (540)

Ashbourne Town Council (1137)

Mr Illsley (ITCS) (3013)

Hill Dickinson for Bamford Property Limited (JCB) (5187)

Mr J Youatt (5588)

PDP for F W Harrison (6212)

Statements

DDDC

Bamford Property Limited

John Youatt

Peter Fox

PDP