

DERBYSHIRE DALES LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

STAGE 2 MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR THE EXAMINATION AND HEARING SESSIONS

Hearings Commence: 16 May 2017 (Stage 2)
Stage 2 Hearings 16-19 May and 23 May

Venue for Sessions: Committee Room, Matlock Town Hall, Bank
Road, Matlock, Derbyshire DE4 3NN

Inspector: Mark Dakeyne BA(Hons) MRTPI

Programme Officer: Carmel Edwards
C/o Derbyshire Dales District Council
Programme Office
Matlock Town Hall,
Bank Road
Matlock
DE4 3NN

Phone: 01629 761175

Mobile: 07969 631930

Email: programmeofficer@derbyshiredales.gov.uk

Website: <http://www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/planning-a-building-control/local-plan-2015-16/local-plan-examination>

DERBYSHIRE DALES LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

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.

Some modifications are proposed by the Council to Policies DS4, DS5 and DS8. The Council has indicated that Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) are to be prepared for some strategic sites setting out the latest position on deliverability and phasing.

Issues

1. **The Matlock Development Strategy**

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

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?

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?

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?

5. Settlement Boundaries

Is the settlement boundary for Matlock justified?

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?

Main Evidence Base

SD03 – Schedule of Modifications

CD25 – SHELAA

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

Participants

DDDC

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. E Wallbank (5980)

Mr David Elsworth (6001)

Mr. M Seddon (6026)
Mr. P Thompson (6126)
Fisher German for Mr. S Haslam & MS C Alcock (6165)
DLP for Chevin Homes Ltd (6222)

Session 11 – 09.30 Wednesday 17 May
Matters 10 and 11
Strategic Allocations and Settlement Boundaries
Wirksworth

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

Policy S8 sets out a development strategy for Matlock/Wirksworth/Darley Dale. There are two strategic site allocations in Wirksworth at Middleton Road/Cromford Road (DS6) and Middle Peak Quarry, (DS7). The former is for mixed use development of residential and employment whereas the latter is for residential development and community facilities.

Some modifications are proposed by the Council to Policies DS6 and DS7.

The Council has indicated that Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) are to be prepared for some strategic sites setting out the latest position on deliverability and phasing.

Issues

1. Land at Middleton Road/Cromford Road

*Is further ecological assessment required before the site is allocated?
Is the site deliverable in the timescales envisaged by the SHELAA having regard to constraints such as contamination, infrastructure and viability?
Are the criteria within Policy DS6, including the requirement for phasing of employment and residential development, justified?*

2. Land at Middle Peak 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, quarry faces, stability and the mineral resource?
Are the criteria within Policy DS7, including the requirement for phasing of employment and residential development, justified?*

3. Settlement Boundaries

Is the settlement boundary for Wirksworth justified?

4. 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 the highway network, health and education?

Do the strategic allocations need to make explicit provision for a new primary school?

Main Evidence Base

SD03 – Schedule of Modifications

CD25 – SHELAA

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

Participants

DDDC

Roger Yarwood for various clients (2164)

DLP for Chevin Homes Ltd (6222)

Mr William Bevan (6240)

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.

The Council has indicated that Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) are to be prepared for some strategic sites setting out the latest position on deliverability and phasing and some modifications will be made to Policy DS8.

Issues

1. The Ashbourne Development Strategy

Are the allocations in Ashbourne consistent with the development strategy (Policy S9)?

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?*

3. Other Housing Allocations

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

4. Settlement Boundaries

Is the settlement boundary for Ashbourne justified?

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?

Main Evidence Base

SD03 – Schedule of Modifications

CD25 – SHELAA

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

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

Participants

DDDC

Osmaston & Yeldersley Parish Council (540)

Roger Yarwood for Mr Wilson (2164)

Mr Illsley (ITCS) (3013)

Mr J Youatt (5588)

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.

The Council has indicated that Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) are to be prepared for some strategic sites setting out the latest position on deliverability and phasing and some modifications will be made to Policy DS2.

Issues

1. The Development Strategy

Are the allocations in Darley Dale consistent with the development strategy (Policy S8)?

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?

3. Other Housing Allocations

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

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?

5. Settlement Boundaries

Is the settlement boundary for Darley Dale justified?

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?

Main Evidence Base

SD03 – Schedule of Modifications

CD25 – SHELAA

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

Participants

DDDC

Roger Yarwood for various clients (2164)

WYG for Ms D Fern (2221)

DLP for Chevin Homes Ltd (6222)

Whitworth Trust (6290)

Session 14 – 13.30 Thursday 18 May

Matters 10 and 11

Allocations and Settlement Boundaries

Rural Parishes

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

Policy S10 sets out a development strategy for the Rural Parishes. There are housing allocations in Brailsford (3), Doveridge (3), Hulland Ward (3), Middleton (1) and Tansley (3). All 3rd tier villages have settlement boundaries.

Issues

1. The Development Strategy

Are the allocations in the Villages (3rd Tier) consistent with the development strategy (Policy S10)?

Is the extent of growth proposed in the villages of Brailsford, Doveridge, Hulland Ward and Tansley sustainable having particular regard to the availability of services and employment?

2. Housing Allocations

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

3. Settlement Boundaries

Are the settlement boundaries of the 3rd tier villages justified?

4. Infrastructure

Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed be provided in the right place and at the right time?

DERBYSHIRE DALES LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Main Evidence Base

CD25 – SHELAA

EX/06 - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions of 14 February

Participants

DDDC

Mr Michael Cannon (453)

Mr. D Sandbrook (827)

Brailsford Parish Council (1336)

Roger Yarwood for various clients (2164)

Session 15 - 09.30 Friday 19 May

Matter 12

Generic Policies

The purpose of this session is to examine generic policies for the protection of the character of the District.

There are a number of generic policies within the LP which seek to protect the character of the District (Chapter 5 of the Plan). Such policies need to be clearly expressed for a future decision maker, positively worded and consistent with national policy.

The Council has indicated that it will put forward a number of modifications to policies within Chapter 5 in response to preliminary questions.

Issues

1. Policies for protecting the Derbyshire Dales Character

Are Policies PD1, PD2, PD3, PD5, PD6, PD7 PD8 and PD10 clearly expressed for a future decision maker, positively worded and consistent with national policy having regard to any modifications proposed?

Main Evidence Base

EX/05 - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions of 14 February

Participants

DDDC

Session 16 – 11.30 Friday 19 May

Matter 13

Implementation and Monitoring

The purpose of this session is to examine the implementation and monitoring provisions of the LP.

Chapter 9 sets out how the LP will be implemented and monitored. Tables 7 and 8 includes indicators and targets for implementation and monitoring.

Some modifications are proposed in response to Preliminary Questions.

Issues

1. Indicators and Targets

Is the Council satisfied that the indicators for implementation and monitoring specific and measurable?

Note – the Council has already confirmed that it is satisfied that the indicators are specific and measurable. Detailed questions are likely to arise following on from earlier hearing sessions so there is no need to respond in general terms at this stage.

2. Review Mechanisms

Is the LP clear as to when a review of the Plan would be triggered due to a failure to meet key targets?

Main Evidence Base

SD11 – Monitoring Report

EX/09 - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions of 15 February

Participants

DDDC

Session 17 – 09.30 Tuesday 23 May

Matter 14

Review

The purpose of the session is to review the findings of the hearing sessions, to confirm what Main Modifications, if any, are proposed to the LP, and discuss how the Examination will proceed hereafter.

Participants

DDDC