

Agenda
Session 13– 09.30 Thursday 18 May
Matters 10 and 11
Strategic and Other Allocations and Settlement Boundaries
Darley Dale

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

Policy S8 sets out a development strategy for Matlock, Wirksworth and Darley Dale. There are two strategic site allocations in Darley Dale at land to the rear of former RBS and Stancliffe Quarry (DS2 and DS3) and three other housing allocations. A strategic gap between Matlock and Darley Dale is protected by Policy PD10.

Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) between the Council and developers have been prepared for the Old Hackney Lane sites (HC2(h) and HC2(i)) , land to the rear of RBS (HC2(j) and DS2) and Normanhurst Park (HC2(k)). Some modifications are proposed to Policy DS2.

Main Modifications MM28, MM49, MM54 and MM101-103 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 Development Strategy

Are the allocations in Darley Dale consistent with the settlement hierarchy (Policy S3) and development strategy (Policy S8)?

The **Council** confirms that Darley Dale is a 2nd tier settlement. It is estimated that 10% of the District's housing provision outside the National Park will be in Darley Dale (commitments and allocations). The Council considers that the level of housing provision is consistent with the strategy.

2. Land at Stancliffe Quarry

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 ecological constraints, contamination, rock faces, stability and the mineral resource?

Are the criteria within Policy DS3 justified?

The **Council** refers to the sustainable location of the site and the low

level of objection. The ecological constraints can be taken into account in development proposals. Potential contamination is not considered to represent a significant problem. A recent change in ownership has limited the scope for technical assessment but the viability studies (CD19-22) indicate that the site is deliverable. There is a mineral resource which is acknowledged by Policy DS3.

What are the implications of the mineral resource and Policy MC17 for the delivery of the site taking into account that the site is still being worked and has significant mineral reserves?

How have abnormal costs such as contamination and stabilising rock faces been taken into account in the viability analysis in Appendix 6 of CD19?

Are the trajectories contained within the SHELAA realistic e.g. delivery of 25 dpa from 2020/21?

What evidence is there to support the assumption that the site will deliver 100 dwellings having regard to constraints such as woodland and quarry faces ?

Taking into account abnormal costs will the site be able to deliver affordable housing and S106 contributions as required by Policy DS3?

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.

Planning permission has been granted for 9 dwellings on HC2(i).

How do the allocations at Old Hackney Lane and Normanhurst Park relate to the settlement boundaries?

Is Old Hackney Lane capable of accommodating additional traffic flows (with mitigation)?

4. Strategic Gap

Is a strategic gap policy necessary taking into account other policies of the plan?

Is the extent of the strategic gap justified?

The **Council** notes the development pressures along the A6 and the potential for the erosion of the gap between Matlock and Darley Dale. Safeguarding of the gap has been a long term planning policy endorsed by previous Inspectors. The Landscape Sensitivity Study

(CD49) refers to the open spaces protected by Policy PD10.

Does the landscape harm that would arise from development within the strategic gap outweigh the benefits of developing in a relatively sustainable location?

Has and will the significance of the strategic gap been eroded by recent development and proposed allocations?

Does the extent of the strategic gap need to be modified to take into account recent permissions?

Are there other means by which the important areas of open land between Matlock and Darley Dale could be protected whilst bringing forward sustainable development e.g. Area Action Plan?

Is the inclusion of areas in the Darley Dale settlement boundary and to the west of the settlement within the strategic gap justified having regard to the terms of Policy PD10 e.g. land near Whitworth Park?

5. Settlement Boundaries

Is the settlement boundary for Darley Dale justified?

The **Council** states 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?

What is the justification for excluding developed areas to the south-west of the railway on Church Road from the settlement boundary?

Should the area known as the Wood Yard be protected by Policy EC4?

Should 'settlements' close to Darley Dale be included within the settlement boundary e.g. Churchtown, Darley Hillside, Farley, Hackney?

6. Infrastructure

Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed be provided in the right place and at the right time? In particular do the policies support provision of a new medical centre?

The **Council** indicates that transport and education infrastructure will form the majority of essential projects to support the proposed growth. Primary schools are at capacity. Policies DS2, DS3 and S11 require developer contributions from the strategic and other

allocations.

Planning permission has been granted for a new medical centre and funding has already been secured.

Main Evidence Base

CD25 – SHELAA

CD19 – CD22 – Viability Assessments

CD35 – Transport Evidence Base Report

CD49 – Landscape Sensitivity Study

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

EX/13 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications

Participants

DDDC

Roger Yarwood for various clients (2164)

Stone Planning Services for Ms D Fern (2221)

PDP for Wildgoose Homes (6212)

DLP for Chevin Homes Ltd (6222)

Whitworth Trust (6290)

Statements

DDDC

Roger Yarwood

Stone Planning Services

PDP

Whitworth Trust