



Please ask for Rachel Appleyard
Direct Line: 01246 34 5277
Email committee.services@chesterfield.gov.uk

The Chair and Members of Cabinet

10 December 2018

Dear Councillor,

Please attend a meeting of the CABINET to be held on TUESDAY, 18 DECEMBER 2018 at 10.30 am in Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Rose Hill, Chesterfield, the agenda for which is set out below.

AGENDA

Part 1(Public Information)

1. Declarations of Members' and Officers' Interests relating to items on the Agenda
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Minutes (Pages 3 - 10)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 4 December, 2018.

4. Forward Plan

Please follow the link below to view the latest Forward Plan.

[Forward Plan](#)

Items Recommended to Cabinet via Cabinet Members

Chesterfield Borough Council, Town Hall, Rose Hill, Chesterfield S40 1LP

Telephone: 01246 345 345, Text: 07960 910 264, Email: info@chesterfield.gov.uk

www.chesterfield.gov.uk

Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Growth

5. Chesterfield Borough Council's response to the HS2 Working Draft Environmental Statement (WDES), and the Working Draft Equality Impact Assessment (WDEIA) (Pages 11 - 44)

Deputy Leader

6. General Fund Revenue Budget Summary (Pages 45 - 56)

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'S. Smith', written in a cursive style.

Local Government and Regulatory Law Manager and Monitoring Officer

CABINET

Tuesday, 4th December, 2018

Present:-

Councillor P Gilby (Chair)

Councillors Bagley
Blank
Brunt

Councillors T Gilby
Ludlow
Serjeant

Non Voting Catt
Members

Dickinson

*Matters dealt with under the Delegation Scheme

65 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' AND OFFICERS' INTERESTS
RELATING TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

No declarations of interest were received.

66 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A Diouf, Huckle and J Innes.

67 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED –

That the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 13 November, 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

68 **FORWARD PLAN**

The Forward Plan for the four month period 1 December, 2018 to 31 March, 2019 was reported for information.

***RESOLVED –**

That the Forward Plan be noted.

69 DELEGATION REPORT

Decisions taken by Cabinet Members during November, 2018 were reported.

***RESOLVED –**

That the Delegation Report be noted.

70 MODERN SLAVERY STATEMENT AND CHARTER

The Assistant Director – Policy and Communications submitted a report recommending for approval Chesterfield Borough Council's Modern Slavery Statement. The report also provided details on the Modern Slavery Charter launched by the Co-operative Party and proposed that the Council sign up to the Charter and work towards implementation of the actions.

The Modern Slavery Act 2015 imposed a duty on organisations which supply goods and/or services from or to the UK and have a global turnover above £36 million to publish a statement on slavery and human trafficking each financial year. Local Authorities currently do not need to comply with this duty, however Chesterfield Borough Council volunteered to develop and implement modern slavery statements from 2018/19 onwards to demonstrate the Council's commitment to, and prevention of, exploitation.

The Modern Slavery Statement and Co-operative Party Modern Slavery Charter were attached as appendices to the officer's report.

***RESOLVED –**

1. That the Chesterfield Borough Council Modern Slavery Statement for 2019/20 be approved.
2. That it be recommended to full Council that Chesterfield Borough Council sign up to, and work towards, implementation of the Cooperative Party Charter against Modern Slavery.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

To demonstrate and strengthen our commitment to preventing and reducing the impact of modern slavery.

71 LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2019-20

The Director of Finance and Resources submitted a report seeking approval for the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2019/20.

It was reported that the proposed scheme being recommended for adoption in 2019/20 was unchanged from 2018/19.

***RESOLVED –**

That Cabinet recommends to full Council that:

1. Approval be given to continue with the current Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2019/20. The scheme is based on The Council Tax Reduction Scheme England Regulations 2012 amended to reflect the following local decisions concerning the key principles of the scheme:
 - For those of working age the maximum amount of the Local Council Tax that will be eligible for reduction is 91.5 per cent of their Council Tax Liability.
 - The Council continues its policy of disregarding war pensions for the purposes of calculating income in respect of the Council Tax Support scheme.
 - The ‘taper’, i.e. the rate at which support is withdrawn as income increases, be maintained at 20 per cent.
2. Delegated powers be granted to the Director of Finance and Resources to update the Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2019/20, to reflect such up-ratings of premiums, allowances and non-dependent deductions as may be determined by the Department for Work and Pensions, and other minor technical changes which may be required.
3. Approval be given to continue the current local council tax discounts, which were originally implemented in 2013/14.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

To ensure that the Council is able to continue to operate a localised scheme providing council tax support from April 2019.

72 CHESTERFIELD GROWTH STRATEGY 2019-2023

The Senior Economic Development Officer presented a report seeking approval for the Chesterfield Growth Strategy (2019-2023). The strategy had been considered by Cabinet on 2 October, 2018 and approved for wider consultation.

Four organisations had engaged with the consultation and minor amendments had been made to the strategy in response, including the addition of the foreword.

The report included a summary of the comments received during the consultation and the strategy was attached at Appendix A of the officer's report.

***RESOLVED –**

That Cabinet recommends to full Council that the Chesterfield Growth Strategy (2019-2023) be adopted.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

1. To set out the role of the Council in supporting the growth and regeneration of the Borough.
2. To provide a framework for actions over the period 2019-23 that will deliver the Council's priority of making Chesterfield a thriving borough and contribute towards delivery of the priority of improving the quality of life for local people.

73 CHESTERFIELD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN

The Strategic Planning and Key Sites Manager presented a report on the new Chesterfield Borough Local Plan (2018 to 2033). The report also provided an update on the results of the consultation on the draft Local Plan. Subject to approval by Council, the Plan would be submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, each Local Planning Authority is required to prepare a Local Plan for their area that addresses priorities for development and use of land. The plan must be based on robust evidence and be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Local Plan covers a 15 year period from 2018 to 2033, setting out the overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development and makes sufficient provision for:

- housing, employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- infrastructure;
- community facilities;
- conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, and planning measures to address climate change.

The report outlined the consultation process which would take place following approval by Council on 12 December, 2018. The Local Plan (2018-2033) was attached as an appendix to the officer's report, along with the policies map, statement of consultation and responses to previous consultations.

***RESOLVED –**

That it be recommended to full Council that:

1. The results of the previous stages of consultation and evidence base be considered.
2. The Chesterfield Borough Local Plan be approved for formal consultation under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations and for subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.
3. The Strategic Planning and Key Sites Manager be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economic Growth and the Assistant Director – Economic Growth, to make minor consequential changes to the plan (that do not

materially alter the plan) as may be required to prepare the plan for consultation and subsequent submission.

4. The Strategic Planning and Key Sites Manager be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economic Growth and the Assistant Director – Economic Growth, to prepare the technical submission documents required under Regulation 22 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

To meet the council's duty to prepare a Local Plan under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

74 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED –

That under Regulation 21(1)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 – as they contained information relating to information relating to financial and business affairs.

75 REVIEW OF OUTSTANDING AND RECEIVED S106 PAYMENTS

The Development Management and Conservation Manager presented a report seeking approval for revised arrangements for the collection and writing off of old section 106 (s106) payments and re-allocation of existing funds.

A number of recommendations had been made following the annual audit of the s106 process which required action to be undertaken to ensure procedures were updated and outstanding agreements resolved.

Details of the outstanding s106 agreements were provided and the report explained the actions being proposed to achieve an outcome for each case.

***RESOLVED –**

1. That the revised arrangements for the collection and writing off of old s106 agreement payments be approved.
2. That £3,614.62 from the Percent for Art contributions be reallocated to the Percent for Art maintenance pot.
3. That £22,515 from the Percent for Art contributions be pooled into the pot for the delivery of a Percent for Art scheme at the Saltergate multi-storey car park and associated public realm improvements.
4. That £13,215.59 be re-allocated from Open Space contributions to a general play and open space refurbishment pot but that decisions on how this should be applied be held pending the adoption of the Open Space and Play Strategy for the Council.
5. That £78,336.19 be re-allocated to a general pot for improvements to parking, walking and cycling opportunities within the Borough.
6. That Derbyshire County Council be requested in writing to agree that the £2,662.85 residue from the contribution for highways works in connection with the Outwood Academy development be paid into the same general pot for improvements to parking, walking and cycling opportunities within the Borough.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

1. To progress conclusions to outstanding old agreements where payments have not been made.
2. To progress a solution to old agreements where payments have been made and the funds have not been applied.

This page is intentionally left blank

For publication

Chesterfield Borough Council's response to the HS2 Working Draft Environmental Statement (WDES), and the Working Draft Equality Impact Assessment (WDEIA)

Meeting: Cabinet

Date: 18th December 2018

Cabinet portfolio: Leader and Economic Growth

Report by: Assistant Director - Economic Growth

For publication

1.0 Purpose of report

1.1 To consider and approve the draft Chesterfield Borough Council Response to HS2's Working Draft Environmental Statement (WDES) and Working Draft Equalities Impact Assessment (WDEIA).

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 That Cabinet consider the draft responses to WDES and WDEIA attached as Appendices A & B and, subject to further comments, approve the documents and any other supporting information for submission to HS2 Limited by 21 December, 2018.

3.0 **Background**

- 3.1 The purpose of the two consultation draft responses (attached as Appendix A and Appendix B) are to set out the Council's official position in response to HS2's Proposed Scheme within the Borough which are due to form part of the deposit Hybrid Bill sometime in 2020.
- 3.2 The WDES/WDEIA consultations are an iterative process. The Council's responses, (alongside of those of its partners), will form an instrument of official dialogue between itself and HS2, to try to resolve any possible conflicts between the design, construction, and operational area of the line and the areas/communities the Proposed Scheme comes into contact with, prior to the final ES submission with the Draft Hybrid Bill. It is beholden on the Authority to make comments in order to protect its position should a petition be necessary.
- 3.3 HS2's WDES covers the whole of line 2b, the Western leg to Manchester and the Eastern leg to Leeds. It is divided up into 28 community areas, with extensive mapping and narrative produced for each area. These correlate with the area of works rather than any conventional boundaries. Chesterfield is covered in three of these area reports: LA10 (Tibshelf to Shuttlewood), LA11, (Staveley to Aston), both of which concerns the proposed Staveley IMD and the spur between the depot and the main HS2 line with a junction near Woodthorpe; MML01 Report, concerning the plans to electrify the Midland Mainline between Danesmoor and Brierley Bridge. A very small portion of the Borough is within MML 02 Report Unstone Green to Sheffield Midland Station.
- 3.4 For each area there are maps and tables covering all the major issues that would need consideration in any major planning application. At an estimated £55 Bn, HS2 is likely to become the largest construction project in Western Europe, unsurprisingly the amount of environmental detail requiring

scrutiny is immense. These maps and charts are divided into two sets: the land-take up during construction and the land take-up during the operational phase after 2033. Somewhat frustratingly the maps are from a fixed point in time dating back to Spring 2018, (Control Point Two). This means that the Council will need to make comments on issues it believes HS2 has in hand but must protect its position to do so in the future.

- 3.5 The WDEIA is a single report that covers the entire line 2b in one volume and 1 map book. The main purpose is to identify population concentrations or communities with a disproportionately high number of people with protected characteristic groups, as well as areas where the Proposed Scheme comes into contact with communities in the 20% most deprived communities in the country. Community assets and facilities in these areas which are adversely impacted by HS2 proposals should receive additional support and perhaps enhanced mitigation measures. It is unfortunate that the HS2 areas do not correspond with boundaries such as super output areas or LA wards.
- 3.6 The Council's individual response is has connections with a number of other partnership and board responses including the EM HS2 Growth Strategy Mitigation Board, Derbyshire County Council, Sheffield City Region and Chesterfield & Staveley HS2 Growth Board. Several of the comments can be cross referenced to a corollary of supporting statements in other documents. There are a number of issues of regional concern that extend beyond the map areas above that are included in our response.

4.0 **Consultation Response Overview**

- 4.1 The consultation responses are in three broad sections. The first of these are the major strategic issues which the Borough has been working with HS2 on since the scheme as first

announced and intensively so since July 2017 when the route first became announced. These include

- Maximising the positive impact of the Midland Mainline Electrification;
- Helping to establish congruence with the Master Plans for the improvement of Chesterfield Station;
- Ensuring that the IMD footprint does not curtail plans for the wider regeneration of the Staveley Works Corridor;
- Ensuring there is adequate provision for the Chesterfield Staveley Regeneration Route OAR to be achieved;
- Ensuring the plans to extend and improve the Chesterfield Canal are not curtailed by HS2
- Ensuring that HS2's plan of works and construction practices do not adversely affect wider connectivity and economic activity in Chesterfield and its environs
- Ensuring the prosperity and potential benefits are directed to the communities of most need and where possible adverse effects on them are well catered for.

4.2 The second group of representations the Authority may require a more detailed response on matters of design and environmental consideration. In each of these areas the Council has worked with other partners to identify issues which it believes an on-going and constructive dialogue with HS2 is required. These issues broadly follow the following headings:

- Air Quality
- Climate Change/ sustainability issues
- Community issues
- Ecology and biodiversity
- Health
- Historic environment
- Land quality / Landscape and visual
- Socio-economics
- Sound, noise and vibration

- Traffic and transport, highway design and Traffic Safety
- Waste and material resources
- Water resources & Flood Risk

4.3 Finally there are a third group of considerations where the Council believes there is insufficient information available from HS2 for it to make the kind of observations required in 4.2 In some areas this is an unfortunate consequence of e timings. The majority of these concern the work on the Midland Mainline which has only just commenced. However there are some areas where the methodology has not been satisfactory or the work yet to be concluded. It is perhaps these where critical comment is rightly directed.

4.4 Officers take the view that it is important for the Borough's response to adopt a supportive tone and ensure HS2 (and others in Government) are in no doubt that the Council encourages and supports the Proposed Scheme. There is a school of thought that if too much protestation is made - the hard fought economic gains from attracting HS2 could be put in jeopardy. Against this there is a need for the Authority to articulate legitimate issues of concern on behalf of the communities it serves. In this the Council should point out areas where it believes the Proposed Scheme has fallen short. There is also a need to work hard to find the balance between HS2 and other localised projects and future development opportunities. The alignment of the Chesterfield Staveley Regeneration Route is a particular case in point and Appendix Three is a letter provided by HS2 to support the HIF bid. There is a need to welcome the sentiment but to leave room to work out the optimum solution.

5.0 **Financial Implications**

5.1 The overall response to WDES and WDEIA has no has no direct financial implications for the Council, although petitioning HS2 and working towards solutions may potentially have such an

implication. The impact of this will be determined by the scale of the work in hand and whether the Authority is working singularly or in partnership with other agencies.

6.0 Consultation

6.1 The implications for Chesterfield Borough brought about through the Delivery of HS2 have been the subject of a Scrutiny Committee and some of the issues raised within have been the subject of this process. Officers were invited to an open event on the 30th November and comments have been logged. A short presentation on the drafts of Appendix A and B will also be available at the meeting.

7.0 Risk Management

Description of the Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigating Action	Impact	Likelihood
There is a risk that the Council's approach to WDES / WDEIA is deemed too critical or places unrealistic demands of the Proposed Scheme	H	M	The work needs to be a careful synthesis between competing objectives. Additionally it may be best for other partners to lead on the response to points which are highly contentious.	L	L
There is a risk of a less effective impact delivered from the delivery	H	M	The WDES response clearly sets out the opportunities for	L	L

of the optimum solutions for economic growth if HS2 are not formally steered towards shared solutions .			HS2 to work with the Council in supporting the growth and regeneration opportunities which could be created by the Proposed Scheme.		
The ability of the Council to petition for enhanced mitigation for any members of the community whose quality of life is severely diminished by the Proposed Scheme would be hampered if the consultation response was inadequate or not made	L	L	The response ensures this will not be the case as all areas of the Council have inputted into the narrative.	L	L

8.0 Equalities Impact Assessment

8.1 Appendix B is the Council's response to the Working Draft Equalities Impact Assessment. HS2 Have already taken note of the need and duty to ensure the Proposed Scheme will not have a disproportionate impact on the groups listed and are committed to trying to ensure that a potentially positive impact on particular groups such as those in the lowest ranked 20% of the SOA in the indices of deprivation comes

about through the scheme. Appendix B illustrates areas where HS2 should and could go further than the proposed scheme to further mitigate or enhance protected characteristic groups and communities.

9.0 **Alternative Options Considered**

9.1 The alternative option is for the Council not to submit a response to WDES/ WQEIA, perhaps deferring the task to others such as Derbyshire County Council or the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy Mitigation Board, who have already been active in this process. However this option is not considered appropriate primarily for the reasons set out in the risk assessment. If the Council wishes to continue to lead the HS2 delivery process then it should be on the front foot in making its own independently constructed consultation response.

9.2 The Chesterfield & Staveley HS2 Delivery Board is also mandated to make a response. The Chair of this board is the Leader of the Council. The Council could confer its right to make a response to that Board. This option would be less satisfactory as there may be subtle differences between the points that need to be made.

10.0 **Recommendations**

10.1 That Cabinet consider the draft responses to WDES and WDEIA attached as Appendices A & B and, subject to further comments, approve the documents and any other supporting information for submission to HS2 Limited by 21 December, 2018.

11.0 **Reason for Recommendation**

11.1 To progress the HS2 Growth Strategy and safeguard the widest level of community interest.

Decision information

Key decision number	856
Wards affected	All wards will benefit from the Growth HS2 could bring to Chesterfield however the significant physical impact will be felt in: Barrow Hill and New Whittington; Brimington North; Lowgates and Woodthorpe; Middlecroft & Poolsbrook; Hollingwood & Inkersall (IMD) Hasland; St Leonards; St Helen's Ward; Brimington South; Moor; Dunston and Old Whittington (MMLe)
Links to Council Plan priorities	Making Chesterfield a thriving borough Improving the quality of life for local people

Document information

Report author	Contact number/email
Jonathon Little	01246 345106 Jonathon.little@chesterfield.gov.uk
Background documents These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when the report was prepared.	
High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester and West Midlands to Leeds) Working Draft Environmental Statement Volume 1 Introduction and methodology; Vol. 2 Community Area Report Community Area Reports LA10; LA11s, MML01 and MML02 ; High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester and West Midlands to Leeds) Working Draft Environmental Statement Volume 2	

Community Area Map Books LA10; LA11, MML01 and MML02;
October 2018 Rail (Crewe to Manchester and West Midlands to
Leeds) Working Draft Environmental Statement October 2018

Chesterfield Economic Assessment 2017;
SNC Lavalin Report on Behalf of East Midlands Councils;

Appendices to the report

Appendix A	Council Response to HS2's WDES
Appendix B	Council Response to HS2's WDEIA



CHESTERFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL DRAFT RESPONSE TO HS2'S WORKING DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT (WDES) October 2018.

Introduction

Chesterfield Borough Council has developed a positive and constructive relationship with HS2 Limited since it has been determined that the Proposed Scheme will include a substantive Infrastructure Maintenance Depot at Staveley and at least one HS2 stop per hour at Chesterfield Station by virtue of an electrified Midland Mainline route from Stonebroom through to Sheffield. Long may that continue as we try to work through the delivery of this amazing and transformative opportunity for the Borough.

The Council has a duty to examine and respond to the detail of the WDES and indeed point out where sufficient detail is lacking. It does so as part of an iterative process, fully believing that in the fullness of time, most if not all of the issues addressed in this document can be resolved without the recourse to Panel or Petition during the Hybrid Bill process, (though it reserves the right to do so). The Council recognises the substantial work that HS2's Team has put into the Proposed Scheme and has seen correspondence from HS2 Limited in support of other related projects and growth propositions in the Borough. These give strong assurance that mutually supportive and workable solutions exist or can be found for any areas where there is still much more to be done.

The Council also recognises that the published Volume 2 material on which this response is largely based reflects the Proposed Scheme designs as they were at CP2, in Spring of 2018 and fully expects to see further amendments in future published versions. In the case of the electrification of the Midlands Mainline, the Council recognises that the plans are at an even earlier stage and that there is still much work to be done. As a result of the way this design process has unfolded, it is unfortunate, but necessary that the Council will need to place as a matter of public record some considerations and design approaches that HS2 Ltd should re-assess prior to the Hybrid Bill's submission.

The Council's response is divided into 3 Sections:

- Section A - Strategically important considerations and issues of concern;
- Section B - Borough level environmental considerations;
- Section C – Issues where the Council requests that HS2 present further information, as the current WDES is inadequate to determine whether the Proposed Scheme is the most appropriate way forwards.

Excepting regional & national matters the response directly relates to Vol. 1 Introduction and methodology; Vol. 2 Community Area Report LA09: Stonebroom to Clay Cross; Vol. 2 Community Area Report LA10: Tibshelf to Shuttlewood; Vol. 2 Community Area Report MML01: Danesmoor to Brierley Bridge and Vol. 2 Community Area Report MML02: Unstone Green to Sheffield Station. The Council's response to HS2 Ltd 's Whole Route Working Draft Equalities Assessment is presented in a separate companion document.



Section A: STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS AND MAJOR ISSUES REQUIRING RESOLUTION

General Comments

CBC is disappointed by the limited amount of time given (10 weeks) to respond to the thousands of pages of consultation, particularly as the Phase 2b Hybrid Bill submission has been put back to mid-2020. We would welcome further formal opportunities to influence designs moving forwards. We have been encouraged by the effort that HS2 has made to contact individual communities and householders where the designs have most impact but believe more should be done. The WDES volumes and maps are extremely dense. Local authorities have constrained resources and some sections of the community could struggle with the complexity and format of the documents. The arbitrary nature of some of the community area boundaries used by HS2 Ltd, basing them on engineering works areas and contract lots, has also added some unnecessary confusion.

Notwithstanding the issue of time-lag between publication of materials and actual progress on the designs, there is a genuine concern that elements of the process to date lack solid audit trails. Some solutions and information from the Local Authority and its partners has been submitted on more than one occasion, without apparent impact on the designs. In certain instances out of date base-line information or mapping evidence has been pointed out to HS2 which has yet to be addressed in a publicised form. We would urge HS2's next iteration of the designs to reflect these weaknesses and particularly to allay concerns that the only solutions coming forward will be those which save the most money. In many instances the terminology seems to underplay the significance of the feature or effect in question. The long term economic growth that underpins our support for HS2 should be based on the designs which create most opportunity and special attention must be given to the cumulative effects the project will generate, particularly in the communities most directly affected.

A1. Ensuring that HS2's plan of works and construction practices do not adversely affect wider connectivity and economic activity in the East Midlands and the area of the Northern Growth Zone in particular.

Inevitably building HS2's route will have an impact on the strategic road network e.g. the M1, M42, A38, A52 during and after construction. The number of realignments of the existing strategic road network (especially to the Junctions of the M1 in particular, 27,28, 29 and 30), together with impacts on local road networks needs to be carefully managed and better understood. WDES lacks significant detail, in particular the absence of traffic assessments and transport modelling, which has made it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions on parts of the proposals. We would urge HS2 to undertake further work to plan and organise a programme which helps our priority economic sectors, particularly logistics and distribution, and minimises the adverse effects to one of the most competitive areas of the local economy. We would urge careful planning and staggered timing of various stages of the construction to allow the economy to continue to function. A linear approach to junction re-modelling may compound the time period of maximum disruption or cause adverse traffic congestion on



surrounding routes. We believe that HS2 needs to engage more fully with meaningful dialogue with key statutory bodies such as Local Transport Authorities, Highways England and all major business representational bodies in the development of the proposals moving forwards. This approach should be extended into areas like Staveley and the routes into and out of Sheffield along the MMLe, especially where new bridges are proposed to carry the new railway (over or under) or temporary diversions and road closures are proposed for long periods during the construction phases.

We would welcome consideration of the impact of construction and operational phases on transport connectivity and the inclusion of measures to ensure community access to active and sustainable travel is maintained and where possible enhanced during design, including connectivity to the HS2 network.

A2. Maximising the positive impact of the Midland Mainline Electrification (MMLe),:

One of the most vital and substantive impacts of HS2 in Chesterfield comes from the electrification of the Midlands Mainline and the attraction of at least one stopping HS2 service per hour between Sheffield and London. We understand that a £300 million fund has been made available from DfT to achieve this. CBC has worked with EM and Sheffield City Region to demonstrate just how positive the economic case for this service is to both HS2 and the northern Derbyshire Economy. An economic assessment of the benefits of an additional stop has been undertaken jointly by the partnership which has been provided. This illustrates that the doubling of HS2 services to 4 trains an hour proposed in the WDES further reinforces the strategic case for more of these services to stop at Chesterfield, be it the Leeds Birmingham service or an additional London service.

Unfortunately the WDES documentation on MML lacks any detail as to how this part of the Proposed Scheme is to be delivered. Much further work is required. It is extremely early in the process to speculate about the timetabling implications for the services post 2033 and there are concerns from some quarters that the HS2 service may compromise other services that cumulatively make Chesterfield the 6th busiest station in the East Midlands and one of the best connected locations by rail in the country. We urge HS2 to work with us to make sure the competitive advantages of the Chesterfield rail offer grow once HS2 becomes operational. The Borough Council is having a further piece of work produced to model the improvements required to the network to accommodate 2 stops per hour. We would seek to obtain guarantees that any works include sufficient additional capacity to the Midland Mainline north of Clay Cross to accommodate HS2 as well as the existing local and regional services, plus any future enhancements to these or to local infrastructure. We look forward to the emerging details and to an opportunity to share any future modelling work so that HS2 and local partners can devise a programme of engineering works and an indicative timetable to best serve the area.



A3 Helping to establish the Master Plans for the improvement of Chesterfield Midland Railway Station;

The Borough Council has put a significant amount of work into preparing a comprehensive Masterplan for Chesterfield Station. We have appreciated the help HS2 have provided thus far and particularly the engagement in our consultation process. The latest version of our Masterplan sets out an ambitious but achievable vision to fully capture the benefits of HS2 through a combination of infrastructure and regeneration projects. This synthesises development of Chesterfield's adjacent Northern Gateway and Waterside regeneration projects and will have significant synergies with the future development of Chesterfield College and University of Derby St Helena's campus. Considerable economic growth and value uplift can be achieved in a locality that has yet to fully recover from past economic changes and moreover, could insulate the area from future transitions to the economy as referenced in HS2 studies.

The important role of Chesterfield as a visitor destination and as a gateway to a wide variety of other areas of visitor appeal across the north Midlands, including the Peak District, Clumber Park and Sherwood Forest, should be recognised. The principle of destination and dispersal is embedded in the East Midlands Growth Strategy and is referenced in the Sheffield City Region Draft Strategy. Given that 50% of HS2 travellers will probably be leisure users, Chesterfield Station's role will be a critical element in ensuring the wider economic and social benefits of HS2 are maximised.

A Local Development Framework document covering the Station Area is being proposed as a policy for inclusion in the Chesterfield Local Plan Core Strategy to be issued for consultation in January 2019. Supporting site development appraisals and phasing plans have been produced, and steps have already been taken towards the assembly of key parcels of land required in order to put this vision into practice. Derbyshire County Council has already taken an 'in principle' decision to exercise compulsory purchase powers in pursuit of the Masterplan if required and the work is currently being supported by grant funding from D2N2 and SCR LEP's and potentially from the HIF application.

We believe that the WDES consultation is an opportunity missed for HS2. There are some alignment issues and modest platform improvements which have been suggested but have scant detail to work off. We have appreciated being party to initial discussions and so far we have worked well with HS2 but we seek to gain assurances that this work will be in partnership with HS2 moving forwards?

In this sense we would have expected to see the economic potential of growth in and around Chesterfield reflected in the consultation document and equally have some early commentary about the likely visual and environmental impacts of the proposed line as it approaches the town centre. Equally we are unsure about the scale of works and land requirements and how they relate to the emergent Master Plan. We need to understand more about the proposed scheme and hope that moving forwards HS2 Ltd and Network Rail will work with us. We reserve the right to make further comments at some point in the future to ensure that key Masterplan deliverables are achieved.



The station approach road (currently known as the Hollis Lane Link Road), which aligns closely to the Midland Main Line, and future related development must be deliverable. Equally we have produced work on the future aspirations for the modification/ modernisation of the station itself and seek assurances that more detail and further partnership working will be forthcoming moving forwards.

A4 Ensuring that the IMD footprint does not curtail plans for the wider regeneration of the Staveley Works Corridor;

The regeneration of the Staveley Works Area (SWA) remains a long standing objective of a range of partners in northern Derbyshire. The Council has formed an SWA Board which now reports into the HS2 Delivery Board to guide and co-ordinate development. The former SWA comprises c.200ha of largely derelict land between the settlements of Staveley, Brimington and Barrow Hill in the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor (SRVC). Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) own c.150ha of the SWA, St Gobain c.50ha, with smaller areas owned by Derbyshire County Council (DCC) and Rhodia and Ominvale. Recent development opportunities have highlighted neighbouring areas of land such as the Suon Site and land adjacent to Barrow Hill Round House that will benefit if an integrated approach is taken to the redevelopment of an area which has significant brownfield challenges, created by its industrial and minerals extraction past. Bringing this former industrial land back into economic use is of paramount importance. We were therefore delighted when HS2 confirmed that their northern leg Infrastructure Maintenance Depot and Rail Head would be based there as it has the capacity to accelerate development and bring forwards up to 250 much needed jobs. However fitting the 22 HA IMD site into the existing plans published in the draft Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor Area Action Plan, (preferred options) 2012, has remained challenging and is one where we have appreciated the dialogue with HS2.

The above plan showed an illustrative development masterplan prepared with stakeholders (including landowners) to lead to the comprehensive development of the corridor including a new spine road, part of the Chesterfield Staveley Regeneration Route (CSRR) running centrally through the site. Although the SRVCAAP was subsequently set aside, the Chesterfield Borough Local Plan: Core Strategy (adopted in 2013) identifies the SWA as a 'strategic site' and provides for mixed use development in line with a comprehensive redevelopment masterplan by way of 'Policy PS5 Staveley and River Rother Valley Corridor'. This policy provides for the site to deliver up to 2,000 dwellings and c.50ha of employment land. The Chesterfield Canal Corridor and its programme of reinstatement is also a critical part of the proposition.

Notwithstanding the issue around the publication of potentially out of date CP 2 maps for the Proposed Scheme, we remain seriously concerned that the overall land-take for the Depot and its allied mitigation proposals does not integrate well with the rest of the plan. Overall HS2's designs are too isolated from the existing plans and we believe that it could be much better integrated and help to achieve a more valuable economic asset for HS2 and accelerate our proposals if some of the suggestions made by ourselves and partners were incorporated into the designs. The CSRR is covered separately in the section below.



The most significant issue is overall land take. The plans shown create phasing and final development issues for our partners which could impact on the viability of plans. Some of the land anticipated for employment and housing is shown on the HS2 proposals for works including mitigation measures such as planting and balancing ponds. We have previously suggested that these features be reduced or absorbed into the Masterplan and urge HS2 to do so. The placement of the balancing ponds below the goites or even a scheme which saw water filtered cleanly back into the water system would be much more beneficial and would release land for development that makes the site a much more viable proposition. Similarly other pockets of developable land could be sterilised by the footprint. We understand there are some options that would be mutually beneficial and urge HS2 to work with the SWA Board to do so. Taking this land away is detrimental to the viability of the corridor and we would urge a re-think on this point.

We do not believe that the capping of the IMD with a further 3 M of clay is the best option for the remediation of the site. There are some detailed studies which have been produced by Rhodia that show that elements of the soil on site could be washed and re-used to balance other areas of development in the corridor. This should save money for both HS2 and could help lessen the visual impact of the depot and the associated mitigation. It would help to alleviate the viaduct and re-modelling of Hall Lane and potentially have some bearing on the solutions for the Canal. There would also be a positive impact on junctions of rail at grade and we therefore urge HS2 to consider these options and continue to work with us to find mutually compatible designs.

We also ask that HS2 consider incorporating some of the training and staff development proposals into our plans for a Rail Skills and Innovation Centre at Barrow Hill. We believe that the presence of quality learning and training facilities less than a quarter of a mile from the IMD would deliver efficiencies and early jobs into the area and potentially reduce the footprint of the Depot. We therefore urge the company to work with us on these emerging designs and functions.

A5. Ensuring there is adequate provision for the Chesterfield Staveley Regeneration Route OAR to be achieved;

One of the most welcome pieces of information received in our pursuit of the HIF grant to deliver the benefits of HS2 in Chesterfield was a letter from the Managing Director of HS2 2b, to the Secretary of State, confirming that HS2 are confident that a line of route can be accommodated within the existing footprint of the IMD. This underpins the spirit of co-operation and progress that has been present between partners and HS2. We would however urge HS2 to work with us further to ensure the detail of the road is mutually beneficial and economical to both parties.

The CSRR is a longstanding public policy objective dating back to 1927. As such, a comprehensive redevelopment masterplan, including the provision of the CSRR, was prepared in 2017 by CST/Rhodia and Saint-Gobain/Omnivale in liaison with CBC and DCC to



inform applications for mixed use development in the former SWA. DCC are further working at considerable risk to design a road through the whole corridor to draw down HIF and possible developer contributions to build it.

Whilst being exceedingly grateful for the support above we believe HS2 need to acknowledge three further points:

- a.) The Line of Route shown on the accompanying plan and OAR has forced partners to look to bring the road further south than would ideally be the case. This has meant the road having to take a more expensive alignment, particularly as it has had to cross one of the more heavily polluted areas of the corridor. If the road could travel on a tighter alignment further to the north this would create savings.
- b.) We have previously suggested that both parties could generate considerable savings if the road could be used for both its primary purpose and be the service road for the IMD. This may require some re-configuration but equally could save several million pounds;
- c.) If neither option a.) or b.) were forthcoming the Council would need to consider asking for Section 106 or Section 278 contributions towards the road.

Chesterfield Borough Council believes a promising approach to collaboration has started, but much more remains to be done through further engagement to ensure that the needs of all parties can be met in full.

A6. Ensuring the plans to extend and improve the Chesterfield Canal are not curtailed by HS2

As with issue A5.) encouraging discussions and information exchanges have taken place, and a positive response has been made from Ministers following a question raised in Parliament. But the well documented issues around the alignment of the Chesterfield Canal remain unresolved at the time of drafting this response. The impact on Chesterfield Canal is to potentially stifle attempts to reinstate it in two locations. The site adjacent to the proposed Infrastructure Maintenance Depot is particularly affected. The HS2 link line to the depot crosses the route for the proposed canal at this point and the proposed vertical alignment is not compatible. There are also implications for the adjacent Trans Pennine Trail. There are significant concerns that the WDES underestimates the impact on the long term project to reinstate the Chesterfield Canal from Staveley. The current proposals are not compatible with the infrastructure already in place and if there is no alternative design a different route for the canal will be required. The Borough is therefore encouraging HS2 Ltd to continue to work with local partners to come forward with meaningful measures to mitigate the impact on the proposed reinstatement of the Chesterfield Canal and the Trans Pennine Trail. We would also encourage a constructive dialogue around the plans to use land around the Staveley Marina for works compounds to ensure the completed re-instatement improves the canal basin.



No mention is made of the required crossing of the restoration route of the Chesterfield Canal which presently extends in navigable form to a location just 15m from the existing rail corridor boundary. The canal is undergoing active restoration and this has been advised repeatedly to both HS2 and DCLG for over five and a half years. Water level in the restored canal section has been set to allow sufficient clearance to pass beneath the existing rail track level. Provision should be made for maintaining continuity of the canal beneath the proposed rail line to facilitate its ongoing restoration and this requirement appears to have been omitted from current draft HS2 design.

Realignment of FP47 as shown would introduce an unacceptable gradient on approach to the rail bridge. A ramped infill would sever the restoration route of the Chesterfield canal unless FP47 bridge is extended or replicated to link with the existing route on the north side of the canal 'cutting'. The diverted line of FP50 will require an additional bridge crossing of the recently restored length of the Chesterfield Canal immediately to the east of Eckington Road bridge. Advance works should include the earliest possible provision of a new facility for crossing of the Chesterfield canal beneath the proposed IMD line to avoid further and protracted delay to the ongoing restoration which has to date been delayed and blighted by HS2.

The landscape mitigation area includes the towpath of the Chesterfield Canal. Inclusion in the mitigation area will sever access for the public and does not take into account the management and maintenance requirements of the canal infrastructure.

The area identified south of the Staveley spur as new public realm/community facility is inappropriate for two reasons. Firstly this area is already in the public realm, is a regeneration site development by DCC Markham Vale Employment Growth Zone project as part of the Canal restoration, so will therefore not contribute to 'new' community facility by HS2. Secondly the Staveley Town Basin area has been developed in order to provide income to sustain the Chesterfield Canal in perpetuity. Seizure of this land by HS2 will therefore reduce the overall public realm viability of the whole canal section causing significant sunk cost losses to local partners as well as on-going additional liability costs.

Staveley West Embankment and its toe drain are shown encroaching into the toe of the support embankment to the Staveley Loop Road (Ireland Close). The toe of this proposed embankment also extends over and buries the outfall drain located immediately alongside the road embankment on its north side and serving as outfall and drain facility for the restored Chesterfield Canal.

Closure of FP11 (only part as shown) will sever linkage northward for the remainder of FP11 and for FP12. Arguably an alternate extension needs to be provided outside the boundary of the IMD to link to Hall Lane, or FP11 and FP12 should be entirely closed to public use and the river bridges removed.

A7 Ensuring the prosperity and potential benefits are directed to the communities of most need and where possible adverse effects on them are well catered for.



This point relates to the disparity between the Community Area outlined in WDES for Volume 11 and the areas which require the jobs and benefits from the IMD and the wider area. One of the principle concerns is for Barrow Hill. The community is not affluent and many residents rely on a tunnel and footbridge connecting with Staveley. The Volume 11 proposals identify the segregation of this route and a diversion along the busy Hall Lane, which will also be subject to considerable works during the construction phases. The Council believes this unsatisfactory and request further dialogue on this issue.

The communities of Staveley, Poolsbrook, Middlecroft and Brimington all receive some dis-benefits from the HS2 construction and potentially its operation. There is a need to ensure appropriate levels of mitigation are delivered to these communities and potentially the new residential areas along the SWA Corridor. A report originally prepared for Talgo is attached with this response. This highlights some of the alarming social deprivation issues that affect the communities surrounding the depot. These communities will undoubtedly benefit from the additional employment and economic activities that the depot brings but there is also a need for HS2 to deliver further mitigative measures to help relatively poor communities receive more support than is currently apparent through the WDES information. One such opportunity would be to ensure the IMD is not raised unnecessarily higher, and could in fact be lowered. Other measures are highlighted in Section 2.

Not enough is known about the MMLe proposals to understand whether some of the more deprived areas of urban Chesterfield will have to bare any adverse impact and the Council reserves the right to add additional commentary in the future.

Section B ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES & COMMUNITY IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

In this section the response follows the Chapter headings within WDES. It would be repetitive to reconfigure all the responses detailed by other partners such as Derbyshire County Council in their substantive response to WDES. Some of chapters in WDES are issues where the County Council is the lead service. Council officers both here and at Derbyshire County Council who are specialists in the specific topic areas have been examining the volumes in considerable detail. Independent technical advice has been procured by the EM Mitigation Board in the form of a Mitigation Scoping Report commissioned from SCL Lavalin. We are aware of many of these issues and support Derbyshire County and EM HS2 Growth Partnership Council's detailed response to Volume 1 (Introduction to the project and the methodology used on the WDES); Volume 3 which deals with route wide effects, and Volume 4 (off route effects), in so far as they relate to Chesterfield Borough. We would also refer HS2 to the comments received from the above partners. The Borough Council has therefore limited its response to the issues that will have most impact on the communities we serve in Volumes 10 and 11.

This general approach has one major exception: the issue of protection of the Chesterfield Canal restoration route. A collection of concerns been raised on several occasions over the past five and a half years with HS2 Ltd, DfT and DCLG but remains unaddressed by the current design. The Trust is based in the Borough and it is felt important to urge HS2 Ltd to produce additional work to ameliorate the concerns of the Trust along the whole restoration route including the sensitive issues to the north and east of the Borough at Norwood and under the M1.

We acknowledge the work done by HS2 to date and wish to underpin the statements made in our introduction and Section A, about the level of detail presented at this stage and our general welcoming of the benefits of the Proposed Scheme to the Borough. We acknowledge that a major Proposed Scheme of this nature cannot be constructed without some unwelcome impacts but look forwards to working with HS2 Limited to attempt to mitigate the most significant of these. In the meantime we wish to put on record the following points:

i.) There are a number of important terrain features of our area that have been omitted from consideration and should not have been. There is no mention of recently created woodland, wetland and grassland areas created as part of the Markham Vale regeneration project which are accessible to the public. The same is true for the Staveley Town Basin and the planned mixed-use development proposed as part of the Markham Vale project. The impact on Poolsbrook Country Park has also been down-played.

ii.) The areas of suggested new wetland and woodland advised at CT-06-634 (E6 to H5) already exist and will first be lost to HS2 before their re-creation. The wetland area contains surface water attenuation ponds serving the two existing industrial plots located to the south of the existing branch line corridor. We ask HS2 Limited to amend future drawings to correct this.



iii.) A footpath diversion shown as 'FP64' is a substantive issue as it effectively severs public right of access alongside the east fringe of the River Doe Lea flood corridor. The provision of a pedestrian underpass should be considered where a short fragment of the existing path is shown as being closed by HS2 at CT-06-634 (E6-E7) so that users can pass beneath the proposed rail embankment and continue along the east fringe of the floodplain to link with FP Staveley 31.

iv.) The balancing pond suggested at CT-06-634 (D4 to D5) is sited at location of an existing subsidence flash entirely within the River Doe Lea Floodplain and arguably can only be created through loss of river flood storage. Consequent to its location it may not be available for containment of railway drainage runoff when the river is in flood. This proposed pond is also sited on the line of existing public footpath (Staveley 31) shown as closed. It is unclear why the access track to this pond is located in the position shown when an existing access track runs parallel for most of its distance. This point applies to other proposed access tracks along this section of the HS2 route. It is noted that HS2 advise in the draft EIA that the entire floodplain will be lost to development at Staveley and Poolsbrook Flash sites though it is unclear where alternate floodwater storage is to be provided upstream of the site.

v.) It is not clear why Lowgates Road bridge requires such substantive track clearance or raising above existing ground level but there is little shown land-take or impact on adjacent premises or businesses.

vi.) Despite previous assurance from HS2 regarding prevention against future encroachment to development plots, the current preliminary embankment design for Staveley East Embankment clearly appears to show encroachment onto previously prepared and/or recently sold and subsequently developed industrial plots at Markham Vale North (Seymour) CT-06-634 (E7 to H5). In respect of the new business developments at Markham Vale, the proposals still show land taken from the Ferdinand Bilstein development and other adjacent plots for use by HS2, these are developments which have already taken place and need correction. The proposals do not include for a new rail overbridge at Seymour Link Road. The proposals indicate that two satellite construction compounds are to be located adjacent to the B6419 (see Map CT-06-635 D2 to D6). These are located on a proposed extension to the Markham Vale North development for industrial use. The two temporary material stockpile areas located adjacent to the B6419 (see Map CT-06-635 D2 to C4) are located on a proposed extension to the Markham Vale North development for industrial use.

vii.) A619 Lowgates Road Overbridge Satellite Compound.

A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. The topography presents a highway problem since the existing rail line is located in a deep cutting which severs the proposed compound site. Pedestrian footways exist on each side of local highways; bus stops are located immediately adjacent to the site; access to cycle network/ Bridleway adjacent to Ireland Close is approximately 200 metres to the west of the site; and most amenities of Staveley are within approximately 750 metres of the site.



This is a split site either side of the proposed HS2 line the western side having direct frontage to Fan Road where creation of a compound access with appropriate exit visibility sightlines should be achievable although this may require temporary relocation of an existing bus stop. Access to the eastern side would need to be taken via the same route crossing over the proposed HS2 line.

vii.) Staveley West Cutting Satellite Compound.

A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There are no pedestrian footways in vicinity; the only bus stops within a reasonable distance are located on Lowgates (A619) and accessible only by cycle network/ bridleway immediately adjacent to, with a short length passing through, the site. All amenities of Staveley Town Centre are located within 1 mile of the site by road.

Whilst this site has direct frontage to Ireland Close (A6192) the public highway is at a lower level than the proposed compound and this may result in access gradient issues. Subject to gradient being satisfactorily addressed, it should be possible to create an access with Ireland Close at a point where adequate forward and exit visibility sightlines are achievable. However, should this not be the case, it's considered that introduction of temporary measures for the duration of the Works would be likely to prove acceptable. The existing cycle/ Bridleway is affected by the site.

viii.) Staveley IMD South Chord Viaduct Satellite Compound.

A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There are no pedestrian footways in the vicinity, the closest is roughly 200 metres to the south on the opposite side of Hall Lane; bus stops are 600 – 700 metres to the south on Hall Lane; the Cycle network/ Bridleway is approximately 500 metres to the south accessed via Hall Lane; no PROW are affected. All main amenities of Staveley are within 1 mile of the site.

This site is separated from the closest public highway by an existing rail line and 'land potentially required during construction' therefore creation of an access would require either a structure to cross the line or a (temporary) closure. In the event that crossing the rail line can be overcome, creation of an acceptable access may require land beyond that demonstrated as being 'potentially required during construction'. That said, it may be possible to introduce temporary measures to form an access for the duration of the Works. Notwithstanding, realignment of Hall Lane is demonstrated and, in the event that this work precedes the creation of the depot, access to the site should be incorporated within the design of the diverted road.

ix.) Staveley IMD Satellite Compound.

A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. A pedestrian footway linking to the south only from proposed Depot Access; bus stops are 400 – 500 metres to the south on Hall Lane; the cycle network/ Bridleway is approximately 300 metres to



the south accessed via Hall Lane; no PROW affected. All main amenities of Staveley are within 1 mile of the site.

This site is separated from the closest public highway by 'land potentially required during construction' and land demonstrated as being allocated as 'Depot'. It's assumed that access would be taken via that proposed to serve the proposed Depot which, it would appear, requires modifications to the existing public highway (Hall Lane). Detailed layout designs complying with current design guidance will need to be submitted for the Depot access/ Hall Lane modifications for Constructional Approval prior to access being taken

x.) Works Road Rail Systems Satellite Compound.

A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There is a narrow pedestrian footway on one side of the existing highway, this being on the opposite side of the road to the eastern compound and same side of the road to the western compound. Bus stops are approximately 350 metres to the south of the eastern compound on Works Road; the cycle network is approximately 650 metres to the south of the eastern compound and accessed from Works Road; PROW are likely to be affected by the eastern compound. The limited amenities of New Whittington are within 1½ miles with more extensive amenities of Staveley approximately 2 miles from the site. This is a split site with the east and west parts approximately 350 metres apart each on the southern side of Works Road/ Whittington Road. Both sites are separated from the closest public highway by 'land potentially required during construction'.

The closest highway to the eastern site is Works Road where the highway is located within a cutting with substantial retaining walls to each side. There is no footway or margin on the proposed compound side of the carriageway. In addition, visibility sightlines would be compromised by the existing carriageway alignment. Given the short duration of time this compound is proposed to operate, it may be possible to introduce temporary traffic management measures to accommodate an access; however, significant engineering works would also be required.

It is possible that a satisfactory access may be created to the western site using the land identified as being 'potentially required during construction' although, due to the change in speed limit across the frontage of this land, this would be likely to involve significant clearance of existing boundary hedges in order to achieve adequate visibility sightlines. Alternatively, again due to the perceived duration of use of this site, it may be possible to introduce temporary traffic management measures to accommodate an access.

xi.) Clarity is sought on the functions and duration of these Compounds. It remains unclear which of the main and satellite compounds in this area, if any, would remain in place for the rail systems works. The wording here would seem to suggest that the Staveley site will be fulfilling this role for the whole eastern leg of the scheme and this work will last much longer than the construction works compounds.



xii.) In consideration of the plan for construction traffic neither Erin Road or Seymour Link Road are mentioned and we seek clarity as to whether construction traffic will use these two roads ?

xiii.) The construction phase drawing CT-05-631-R1 shows that the potential area used for HS2 construction includes considerable lengths of the land used by Brimington FP1 / Staveley Staveley FP1 (which double as the Trans Pennine Trail and the Cuckoo Way), between Troughbrook Road at Hollingwood and Hall Lane at Staveley. The construction area also takes in a crucial access point onto the TPT at Mill Green, Staveley. This route is a crucial public access corridor for walkers and cyclists, both for leisure and commuting use. It must remain accessible throughout the construction period, or alternative suitable provision made for regular users.

xiv.) There is a general concern about the pathways in the area. It would be helpful to appraise the vulnerable user path connectivity in the area as a mitigation quick win. Solutions for short sections of missing paths that would significantly improve permeability across this community area, particularly to connect built trail at Seymour to connect across the IMD line to Poolsbrook Country Park, and a replacement route for the section of the Clowne Branch Line (under construction) to be lost for the IMD line with connections from the Oxcroft Line.

xv.) There are nine Local Character Areas that could be significantly affected within the Staveley to Aston area. We share DCC's expressed concerns in the way these areas have been defined and then evaluated. A number of the areas in the Borough do not reflect the work that has been done to restore these landscapes from their previous coalfield legacy. By simply pulling out areas of poor condition it is inevitable within the context of the methodology that these areas will then score low with regard to their overall sensitivity and susceptibility to change. This leads to an under-estimation of effects and significance, and as a consequence does not inform high standards of design and mitigation, in other words poor quality areas could lead to poor quality development.

xvi.) We understand that DCC as the Highways Authority are extremely disappointed by the lack of engagement and the limited information provided prior to the WDES going into publication. We strongly suggest that this matter is addressed as a matter of some urgency. There needs to be further work done on sustainable travel planning for local communities affected by the developments. A more joined up approach would be of benefit to all communities. Some of the local roads affected on the periphery of the Borough are important to the local economy, connectivity, public transport and community and we draw particular reference to DCC's comments on the impacts on the A6175 Health Road; A617 Mansfield Road; significant re-alignment and stopping up of existing highway network on B6418 Chesterfield Road, Buttermilk Lane and Woodhouse Lane.

xvii.) We would like to see more detail on the air quality mitigation issues. The WDES does acknowledge that there may be adverse effects on the local communities during the site preparation/demolition/construction phases, however, this will be temporary and will be considered in more detail on the Environmental Statement. Mitigation measures refer to industry standard codes of best practice (CoCP – code of construction practice) and ensuring



that all construction vehicles meet the Euro 6 standards. If Euro 6 standards change, this needs to be reflected in the Environmental Statement. It would be helpful to understand much more about this situation before the publication of Volume 5. The WDES report does provide an assessment of the impacts and likely significant effects on air quality identified to date arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme within the Staveley to Aston area. Oxides of nitrogen (NOx) including nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), fine particulate matter⁴⁸ (PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}) and dust have been considered in the assessment. Emissions of all or some of these air pollutants are likely to arise from construction activities, demolition, site preparation works and the use of site haul routes. Emissions would also arise from road traffic during construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme. We endorse the view that assessment and mitigation in line with recently developed East Midlands Air Quality Network; Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Developers using the DfT Threshold Criteria for Transport Assessments^{[to assess impact and mitigations. We would recommend monitoring and assessment during the pre-construction, construction and operational phases to ensure accurate assessment of baseline and impacts rather than using synthetic modelling as has been detailed.}

xviii.) Currently the Borough has one AQMAs within respective areas which is on the A619 at Brimington just off the scope of the map. It is hoped that this will have been addressed by the CSRR prior to the construction phase commencing. It must be noted that AQMAs will be subject to change and whilst areas may not currently have AQMAs in operation currently the increase in traffic created by construction may result in decreases in air quality at local levels, therefore requiring the declaration of AQMAs.

xix.) We would welcome the inclusion of green walls and associated greening infrastructure to support mitigation of air pollution and improve visual appearance of man-made structures. Such measures will also support irrigation and reduce flooding.

xx.) The Noise & Vibration section reports on the initial assessment of the noise and vibration likely significant effects arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme within the Staveley to Aston area on:

- o 'residential receptors'; people, primarily where they live, in terms of individual dwellings and on a wider community basis including any shared community open areas¹⁶⁸; and
- o 'non-residential receptors'¹⁶⁹ such as:
community facilities including schools, hospitals, places of worship and 'quiet areas'¹⁷⁰;
- o and commercial properties such as hotels.

We believe more could and should be done to some sensitive properties along the route particularly once the noise assessments are complete.

xxi.) Bank House Farm has been identified as a 'Noise Important Area' (as defined in the DEFRA 2014 national noise action plans) and possibly being eligible for noise insulation. We are in agreement with this.



xxii.) Map SV-01-381 shows Woodthorpe Hall Farm on the boundary of the contour line of the 'operational noise contour map'. What is not clear from the WDES is the noise criteria used to measure (is it a 5, 10, 15 or 60 minute LAeq?).

xxiii.) The WDES does acknowledge that noise and vibration are possible issues during the site preparations/demolition/construction phases. What is not clear is how these issues will be mitigated. Suggestions within the WDES include temporary re-housing residents during the construction phase; other suggestions include using modern equipment and providing insulation. Generally we recommend that hours of site preparation/demolition/construction are limited to 7:30am to 6:00pm Monday to Friday and 9:00am to 5:00pm on a Saturday. We would normally recommend that no site preparation/demolition/construction work shall take place on a Sunday or Public Holiday. HS2 Ltd. have proposed that tunnelling and directly associated activities (such as removal of excavated material, supply of materials and maintenance of tunnelling equipment) will be carried out on a 24-hour day, seven days a week basis. Where reasonably practicable, material will be stockpiled within the site boundary for removal during normal working hours. Mitigation measures will need to be implemented to ensure minimal disruption

xxiv.) - The Volume of LA11 contains a section of the report presents the baseline conditions that exist along the Proposed Scheme in the Staveley to Aston area in relation to land quality, and contamination and reports the likely impacts and significant effects identified to date resulting from construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme. Consideration is given to land that potentially contains contamination and land that has special geological significance, either from a scientific, historical, mineral exploitation or mineral resources point of view including geological sites of special scientific interest (SSSI) and local geological sites (LGS), and areas of designated mineral resources. Consideration is also given to petroleum (including gas) prospects and licensing.

xxv.) - The WDES acknowledges that there will be 'made ground' along the proposed scheme and whilst locations of possible sites of historical contamination is known, precise depths or contaminants are unknown at present. We recommend that further information is provided in site investigation reports, remediation reports and verification/validation reports. There is much information and moving forwards we encourage closer working with SWA land owners to identify appropriate issues and strategies.

xxvi.) For mining sites, a potential for significant adverse effects has been identified associated with the uncertainty around mine gas and mine water in historical workings. For the working draft ES, the CoCP does not address this in detail, but is being further developed in consultation with authoritative consultees to develop mechanisms for mitigating any significant adverse effects.

xxvii.) The WDES does recognise that the construction of the IMD could impact on the quality of nearby water sources such as the River Rother and the Chesterfield Canal. Liaison with the Environment Agency will be necessary.



xxviii.) The Council is a land owner and manages a number of industrial units off Fan Road, Ireland Close and Stephenson Road. We would appreciate an understanding of the interaction between these business and HS2 Ltd and discuss possible impacts in advance of the final EIA.

lxxx.) The Council owns and maintains an overbridge at Barrow Hill as the line approaches the Engine Shed. We would ask for clarity and detail on any impacts to this structure moving forwards.



Section C ISSUES WHERE THE COUNCIL REQUESTS THAT HS2 PRESENT FURTHER INFORMATION, AS THE CURRENT WDES IS INADEQUATE TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE PROPOSED SCHEME IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE WAY FORWARDS.

Currently Chesterfield Borough Council regards the WDES as inadequate due to missing or incomplete information in a number of areas. The two volumes on the MMLe have been identified in this category and we look forward to receiving further information on the Proposed Scheme as this emerges. This is particularly important as the Railway Act 1993, section 122 provides an exemption to the operator of all rail stock and infrastructure from nuisance complaints. This means that if the hybrid bill is passed, the local authority would have no legal powers to investigate complaints about the line and/or operation of the line. We do therefore wish to work closely with HS2 to understand the proposals in more detail.

The two volumes which intercept the Borough 10 and 11, also possess significant information deficiencies. There are a considerable number of areas in the design which are subject to further development. As a result it makes it difficult to provide a meaningful response to this consultation. This is not any different from other Community Areas where there is a similar lack of detail and or subsequent underplaying of possible impact. We ask HS2 to provide more detail on a number of major features in both Community Areas 10 and 11 in line with similar request from colleagues in authorities whose jurisdiction covers other Community Areas. There are also some quite concerning areas where in comparison to other Community Areas the intelligence in Volumes 10 and 11 is severely lacking. We therefore request that HS2 performs further work to rectify these omissions. These include the following:

- a.) The noise assessments for the area around the former Oxcroft Minerals line, joining the main HS2 line near Woodthorpe are deficient/ missing. This also includes the operational area around the IMD. We are unclear about why these have been omitted from Volume 11 but would point out that we anticipate that the line may not necessarily run electric trains and could run diesels or bi-modal units. It is therefore imperative that any noise assessments are run on the basis of worst case (diesel trains) and that night sensitivity issues are addressed when the assessments take place.
- b.) The WDES provides limited information on the Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD); it does make reference to an Environmental Statement that will be released as part of the hybrid bill. At this stage we would expect more information to be available, such as background noise measurements, proposed/modelled noise data and the impact the IMD may have on nearby residential communities such as Barrow Hill and Staveley.
- c.) In terms of Air Quality the WDES states that the operational line of HS2 will have no impact on local residents; we believe this is because it will be on an electrified line and will produce minimal emissions. However if the above is proven correct this information will not be the case for the spur and IMD. There is minimal information on the IMD and Staveley Spur throughout the section and we therefore request that HS2 Ltd. generate additional AQ assessments based on the above worse-case scenario (which is likely to be



heavier bi-modal engines). If there is combustion plant at the IMD there will be an air quality assessment. We would welcome this being produced also.

- d.) The WDES does not make any reference to lighting (either during the construction phase or during the operational phase), either along the track or at the IMD. Tree planting has been proposed around the IMD to provide a visual barrier. Taking our comments into consideration from Section A, we would like to see much more information about position of lighting and lighting columns would be welcome so that we can together aim to minimise disturbance to local residents without diminishing the viability of other parts of the corridor.
- e.) The WDES does recognise that the construction of the IMD could impact on the quality of nearby water sources such as the River Rother and the Chesterfield Canal. Liaison with the Environment Agency will be necessary if it has not already taken place. At this stage, no additional measures are considered necessary to mitigate risks from land contamination during the construction stage beyond those that are set out in the draft CoCP and/or instigated as part of the site specific remediation strategies that would be developed at the detailed design stage if required. These measures would ensure that risks to people and property from contaminants in the ground would be controlled such that they would not be significant. For example, measures might include excavation and treatment of contaminated soils or controls to manage movement of landfill gas and leachate. We request that HS2 Limited provide further information of detail so that we may work together to devise a whole corridor plan.
- f.) We are disappointed that the landscape assessment sections do not contain visual cross sections of the impact on the landscape. The section appears to make suggestions of certain viewpoints where the work will be undertaken but isn't included. Instead the maps and plans presented such as plans LV-02-396 a & b; plans LV-02-397 a & b and plans LV-02-450 a & b are all based on aerial photography from as far back as 2011. Therefore this information omits recent developments at both Markham Vale, Staveley Town Basin, the former Hartington Colliery and Coalite. The changes to the landscape resulting from the major regeneration schemes have not been incorporated although HS2 have been previously informed of this problem.
- g.) Route-wide, local area and site-specific traffic management measures will be implemented during the construction of the project on or adjacent to public roads, bridleways, footpaths and other PRoW affected by the Proposed Scheme as necessary. The details of this have not yet been provided. A route-wide traffic management plan will be necessary. We strongly support the production of this documentation at as early a juncture as possible as the detail will need careful consideration.
- h.) Most of the operational maps, contain generic tree planting as the only form of mitigation. These may be out of character with the areas and lack detail. There are many different options to mitigate the effects and urge HS2 Ltd. to work with us to devise schemes of planting which are in keeping with the surrounding landscape and broader objectives.



- i.) Climate Change is comprehensively addressed for HS2 itself and it is important that more details emerge in order to understand what is proposed once the results and conclusions are presented in the formal ES. However little information is provided about other mitigating potential, such as renewable energy generation particularly at hubs and depots and we would welcome further engagement on this point.

- j.) Supplementary information is given through the published sections on the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs), Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The EMR imposes a requirement to use "reasonable endeavours" to adapt measures to reduce the adverse environmental effects reported in the formal ES provided that this does not add unreasonable cost or delay the construction or operation of the proposed scheme. There is however no definition of what reasonable endeavours means in this case nor is it explained in the glossary and the same is true of unreasonable cost. More clarity is required in both cases of what is meant by the terms used as they are repeated used throughout the suite of documents. Moving forwards these definitions will be of exceptional value as we try to assess a balance in Chesterfield between the exciting opportunities the development brings and any unwelcome localised impacts.



CHESTERFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL DRAFT RESPONSE TO HS2'S WORKING DRAFT EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (WDEIA) October 2018.

Introduction

Chesterfield Borough Council has developed a positive and constructive relationship with HS2 Limited since it has been determined that the Proposed Scheme will include a substantive Infrastructure Maintenance Depot at Staveley and at least one HS2 stop per hour at Chesterfield Station by virtue of an electrified Midland Mainline route from Stonebroom through to Sheffield. Long may that continue as we try to work through the delivery of this amazing and transformative opportunity for the Borough.

The Council has a duty to examine and respond to the detail of the WDEIA and indeed point out where sufficient detail is lacking. It does so as part of an iterative process, fully believing that in the fullness of time, most if not all of the issues addressed in this document can be resolved without the recourse to Panel or Petition during the Hybrid Bill process, (though it reserves the right to do so). The Council recognises the substantial work that HS2's Team has put into the Proposed Scheme and has seen correspondence from HS2 Limited in support of other related projects and growth propositions in the Borough. These give strong assurance that mutually supportive and workable solutions exist for can be found for any areas where there is still much more to be done.

The report is for the whole line and projects an overview which lacks the detailed assessment process of the WDES. Whether this is the correct approach is a matter of conjecture but in so far as this area goes we do not believe the report has captured the importance of Proposed Scheme to the area in terms of the much needed economic opportunities it brings s and the potential impacts on the communities in the areas around the scheme. We believe³ this is in part due to a reliance on engineering based community areas rather than actual wards or super output areas. The Council and its partners has made good partnership links with the Skills and Employment Strategy team in HS2 and we see the WDEIA as an opportunity to address some of the wordlessness and skills deficits that are a factor in perpetuating inter-generational inequalities.

Over leaf is a table of some of the observations we have made in respect to the WDEIA in our Borough. Once again more detail is required in order that the Council can understand how it might work with HS2 to maximise the benefits and minimise the dis-benefits of those most disadvantaged.

We have also included extracts from a recent submission to a major train supplier for HS2 who were considering Chesterfield as a location. This specially commissioned work should help to identify the areas which are most in need in our Borough and particularly the older and younger cohorts of the population around the Staveley area through which the Proposed Scheme will cross. We also intend to attach a list of community facilities in the area which should be considered in terms of mitigation measures.



Finally In the WDES we have made mention of a number of health related issues that could be significant in terms of noise, air quality and possible detrimental access issues to facilities, countryside and residential areas. We believe that this needs to tie into the wider area needs we are proposing in this response.

HS2 Preliminary Equality Impact Assessment Comments and areas for further review

<u>Page number / section</u>	<u>Detail</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Page I Work in progress	Wider equality effects, for example those arising from traffic and transport, sound noise and vibration or health effects will be reported in the formal EQIA.	Mitigation measures to be reviewed when full EIA is received
Page 8 1.2.3	Identify where such adjustments may be required... such as maintaining accessible routes	Any anticipatory adjustments to be reviewed when full EIA is received
Page 10 1.3.2	Identify the presence of PCGs along the route of the Proposed Scheme	For review when full EIA is received
Page 10 1.3.2	Identify measures which.... can further enhance equality...	For review when full EIA is received
Page 13 2.3.1	Error! Reference source not found	Link needs to be corrected in the document
Page 17 4.2.1	The geographical scope covers all LSOAs within or intersected by a 1km buffer..	From an equalities perspective it is likely that the impact on communities may be felt wider than a 1km range. Does the range need to be increased, for example to include the whole of Staveley ?
Page 31 5.2.13	The nominated undertaker would be required to provide information on public open space changes....	For review when full EIA is received
Page 31 5.2.14	The nominated undertaker would be required to maintain, where reasonably practicable, public rights of way....	For review when full EIA is received
Page 31 5.2.18	...identify and provide opportunities to workless people...	We would welcome this as this is prevalent in parts of the northern growth zone.
Page 36 5.3.5	In areas where a substantial proportion of housing would be lost or where there is a relatively high level of housing deprivation, there is the potential for a differential effect for older people, disabled people or children and young people...	Further information is required to detail the exact number of homes which will be demolished / residents impacted by having to leave their homes and therefore obtain detail as to the number/groups of people in the community affected.



Page 46 5.3.51	Where specific equality effects associated with diversion, realignment or closure of roads are identified, they will be reported in the formal EQIA Report	For review when full EIA is received. Any diversions / extended journey times could impact on PCGs
Page 46 5.3.52	Where specific equality effects associated with diversion, realignment or closure of PRow are identified, they will be reported in the formal EQIA Report	For review when full EIA is received. Any diversions / extended journey times could impact on PCGs
Page 47 5.3.53	Where reasonably practicable, public footpaths and routes would be reinstated or convenient alternatives provided.	For review when full EIA is received. Any diversions / extended journey times could impact on PCGs

This page is intentionally left blank

For publication

General Fund Revenue Budget Summary

Meeting:	Cabinet
Date:	18 th December 2018
Cabinet portfolio:	Deputy Leader
Report by:	Director of Finance & Resources

For publication

1.0 Purpose of report

- 1.1 To provide Cabinet with an update on the development of the General Fund Revenue Budget for 2019/20 and future years.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 To note the updated budget projections for 2018/19 and future years (**Appendix A**).
- 2.2 That work continues to refine the draft estimates and to develop budget saving proposals.

3.0 Background

- 3.1 The Council's Budget Strategy is to set a sustainable and affordable budget over the medium term. The budget forecasts

included in this report cover the current and five future financial years.

- 3.2 This report brings together the portfolio totals and the non-portfolio items to produce an overall summary (**Appendix A**) which shows the latest surplus/deficit forecast for each financial year. The budgets are a first draft as the Business Rates income assessment cannot be completed until January 2019.
- 3.3 The Chancellor’s **Autumn Statement** on 29th October made very few changes that would impact on lower tier authorities. No further cuts to Local Government funding for 2019/20 were announced and no changes to the 4 year RSG settlement figures advised last year are expected.
- 3.4 The draft Local Government Finance Settlement will be published in December. It is expected that the regime for 2018/19 will be continued, which for district councils means a referendum will be required for increases of 3% or more. Chesterfield Council has the option to increase the Council Tax by £5 per annum (equivalent to an increase of 3.13%) or 3%.

4.0 Budget Assumptions and Forecasts

- 4.1 The following assumptions have been made in preparing the draft budgets:

Budget Assumptions				
	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23>
Pay inflation	NJC pay award	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Energy inflation	2.3%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%
Business rates increase	2.4%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Vacant posts allowance	£150k	£150k	£150k	£150k
Council tax increase	£5	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%
Fees & Charges Increase Av	+3%	+3%	+3%	+3%
Investment returns	0.93%	1.00%	1.25%	1.25%

4.2 The updated Medium Term Budget Forecast is shown in **Appendix A**. It must be pointed out that many of the figures in the Financing section (the second page of the appendix) are provisional estimates. Unfortunately, some of these figures (e.g. Retained Business Rates Growth and Pooling) are **significant sums which could be subject to wide variations**. At this stage it has not been possible to provide accurate forecasts for these due to:

- a) The Provisional Finance Settlement not being announced and completion of the NNDR1 in January; and
- b) The ongoing uncertainties caused by outstanding Business Rates appeals.

The forecasts at this stage, therefore, come with a significant health warning. The forecasts will be updated over the next few weeks as further information becomes available and any significant changes reported to the Cabinet at the earliest opportunity so that any corrective action can be considered before the final budget report is submitted to the full Council in February 2019.

5.0 2018/19 Revised Budget

5.1 At the start of the year, the forecast surplus was £56k. During the year the budget position has been reported to Cabinet on a quarterly basis. At the end of Quarter 2 the forecast for 2018/19 was a deficit of £130k.

5.2 The latest revised budget for 2018/19 (**Appendix A**) shows a breakeven position.

5.3 The deficit has reduced as follows:

	(£000's)
Quarter 2 Forecast Deficit	(130)
Investment Interest	65
Sporting Exemption (VAT)	57
Gas and Electricity	43
Housing Benefits	97
Refuse Collection Contract	40
Overtime	39
Market Rents	(34)
Rephasing of Contribution from Digital Innovation Reserve into future years	(166)
Holiday Pay	(10)
Other Movements	(1)
Revised Budget	0

5.4 In the remaining few months of the financial year we will continue to monitor budgets and report any changes so that they can be included in the final budget report which will go to the Council in February 2019.

6.0 Budget Forecast 2019/20

6.1 The forecast for 2019/20 in **Appendix A** shows a deficit of **£280k**. The budget assumes that the full amount of the estimated New Homes Bonus allocation (£307k) will be used to support the budget and that the Derbyshire Pooling gain remains at the £300k level. The Business Rates income forecast will require revision before the final budget is brought to Council in February 2019.

6.2 The Living Wage Foundation proposals to increase the living wage are included on an ongoing basis in the budget.

6.3 We have budgeted pay inflation at the agreed NJC pay award level in 2019/20. We have also budgeted for ongoing staff vacancy savings.

- 6.4 The £280k deficit position assumes savings from the ICT Digital Innovation initiative of £250k. **If the scheme slips or savings are not achieved this will have an adverse impact on the deficit for the year.**
- 6.5 The Government RSG Funding Settlement has not yet been confirmed but the expectation is that it will not change significantly from figures announced last year. The Business Rates Pooling Gain figure (£300k) is also provisional at this stage and could be subject to considerable variance depending on the final business rate income forecasts for each of the Derbyshire districts.

7.0 Medium Term Forecasts

- 7.1 The draft estimates in **Appendix A** include the four year funding settlement figures. Retained business rate income is forecast to grow steadily in future years. The assumption on council tax increases is for a £5 per annum increase (an increase of 3.1%) for 2019/20 and to rise by 1.99% per annum each year thereafter.
- 7.2 Business Rates Pooling - It has been assumed that the £300k Derbyshire Pooling gain will continue in all years. The outcome of the Derbyshire wide application to be a pilot authority for 100% business rates retention in 2019/20 is not yet known and has not been included in the budget figures.
- 7.3 The latest forecast deficits are £894k in 2020/21 increasing to £1,328k by 2023/24. This is before the impact of any recurring savings proposals which are yet to be agreed but under development.
- 7.4 The forecasts will be updated when the settlement figures are finalised and as other variances are identified. Growth from business rate income will be reviewed in January 2019. The

scale of the forecast deficits is such that further significant savings will have to be found in future years. We will begin to formulate outline plans over the coming months to enable savings to be delivered in 2020/21.

- 7.5 Our future forecasts are also dependant on our core trading income streams holding up (car parks, leisure, business rents, winding wheel etc.). These income lines are sensitive to changes in the market.

8.0 Reserves

- 8.1 The **General Working Balance** was £1.5m at the start of this financial year. The on-going financial risks associated with the business rates retention scheme and other funding sources would suggest that it would be imprudent to consider reducing the level any further until a more stable financial footing is established.

- 8.2 In addition to the General Working Balance the Council maintains a number of other reserves. Many of the reserves are earmarked and committed for specific purposes, such as property repairs and vehicle & plant replacements.

9.0 Conclusion & Next Steps

- 9.1 This report presents the first draft of the budget for 2019/20 but there are some elements of the budget that are still to be confirmed and other budget variances could be identified during the coming weeks. The latest forecast shows increasing deficits in each financial year from 2019/20.

- 9.2 The Council is developing a 10 year asset management plan. Many assets will require investment and these costs will need adding to future borrowing and the deficit positions.

- 9.3 The full Council will approve the final budget and the Council Tax for 2019/20 at its meeting on 27th February. The Cabinet will have to agree its final budget proposals ahead of the Council meeting. In the meantime, the budget forecasts will continue to be updated as the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement proposals and other budget savings/variances are confirmed. The Budget Workshop sessions for Cabinet Members and the Corporate Management Team will continue to meet in the run-up to setting the budget in order to consider the updated forecasts and agree further savings proposals for inclusion in the Councils final budget.
- 9.4 The outcome of the Governments Fair Funding and changes to Business Rate Funding from 2020/21 is still not fully clear. The impact on any changes could be significant for Chesterfield Councils finances from 2020/21. We have not included any figures at this stage in budgets, though we are working with advisors to understand the possible changes.

10.0 Risk Management

- 10.1 There are a number of significant risks inherent in any budget forecasting exercise and the risks increase as the period covered increases. The most significant budget risks at the moment include:
- Business rate pooling opportunities and threats.
 - Business Rate appeals, valuation changes, etc.
 - New Homes Bonus allocations.
 - ICT savings not being delivered.
 - Fair Funding.
 - Wage and staffing cost pressures.
 - Escalating energy prices and general cost inflation.
 - Achieving income targets for rents, fees, charges and interest.

- Delivering the required budget savings on time and to the value required. It is important that a rigorous risk assessment is undertaken for each saving proposals before they are included in the final budget report.
- The outcome of Brexit and the impact on the Chesterfield economy.
- The introduction of Universal Credit – full implementation. There are unknowns in terms of the extent, timing and funding of these changes.

These and other financial risks will be evaluated more fully in the Budget Risk & Sensitivity Analysis, which will be included in the final budget report in February 2019.

11.0 Legal and data protection implications

11.1 It would be unlawful for the Council to set a deficit budget. Section 33 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 requires the Council to set a balanced budget.

12.0 Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA)

12.1 The budget process and forecasts produced do not require an EIA but any decisions to vary budgets and service provision later in the process might well require EIA's specific to those options.

13.0 Recommendations

13.1 To note the updated budget projections for 2018/19 and future years (**Appendix A**).

13.2 That work continues to refine the draft estimates and to develop budget saving proposals.

14.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 14.1 To keep Members informed on the development of the budget proposals for 2019/20 and to provide an update on the medium term financial forecasts.

Decision information

Key decision number	854
Wards affected	All
Links to Council Plan priorities	To become financially self-sufficient by 2020

Document information

Report author	Contact number/email
Helen Fox	01246 345452 helen.fox@chesterfield.gov.uk
Background documents	
These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when the report was prepared.	
<i>This must be made available to the public for up to 4 years.</i>	
Appendices to the report	
Appendix A	General Fund Revenue Estimates Summary

This page is intentionally left blank

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ESTIMATES SUMMARY

	2018/19		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	Original	Revised	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Per Lead Member reports:							
Leader of the Council	55,850	29,050	29,350	30,200	31,000	32,150	32,110
Deputy Leader of the Council	1,223,910	1,202,610	1,213,040	1,216,360	1,220,160	1,223,910	1,229,570
Cabinet Member for Economic Growth	163,790	229,870	130,780	284,120	301,650	372,510	421,080
Cabinet Member for Town Centre and Visitor Economy	(310,550)	55,610	185,030	164,950	275,940	272,740	373,620
Cabinet Member for Health and Well Being	7,627,940	7,090,410	7,765,620	7,787,410	8,040,460	8,230,960	8,393,220
Cabinet Member for Homes and Customers (GF)	1,920,230	2,010,950	2,068,650	2,164,310	2,286,910	2,424,920	2,524,450
Cabinet Member for Governance	2,760,790	2,718,950	2,971,350	2,895,010	2,961,930	3,048,020	3,109,940
Cabinet Member for Business Transformation	507,190	417,760	468,780	493,580	512,470	532,700	552,020
Portfolios Total	13,949,150	13,755,210	14,832,600	15,035,940	15,630,520	16,137,910	16,636,010
Spirepride surplus	(559,910)	(559,910)	(581,670)	(602,860)	(613,410)	(642,490)	(672,940)
OSD surplus	(255,240)	60,000	(255,240)	(255,240)	(255,240)	(255,240)	(255,240)
Holiday pay	0	60,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Crematorium surplus	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
Transformation Projects	(25,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Savings - "Cease and Reduce" Programme	(25,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0
ICT Digital Innovation Savings	0	0	(227,000)	(231,540)	(592,420)	(825,020)	(1,023,000)
Electricity Inflation	50,000	0	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Historical Leisure VAT Claim	0	0	(56,270)	0	0	0	0
Staff vacancies allowance	(150,000)	0	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
Total Service Expenditure	12,734,000	13,065,300	13,387,420	13,621,300	13,844,450	14,090,160	14,359,830
Interest & capital charges	(2,389,457)	(2,157,880)	(2,949,111)	(3,101,794)	(3,069,034)	(2,985,771)	(2,966,055)
Contrib to/(from) Digital Innovation Reserve	0	(31,245)	(444,317)	(250,000)	(10,000)	(50,000)	0
Contrib to/(from) Service Improve't Reserve	(57,610)	(57,430)	(9,630)	0	0	0	0
Contrib to/(from) Revenue Risk Reserve	0	(10,000)	(5,620)	0	0	0	0
Contrib to/(from) Earmarked Reserves	(150,000)	(150,000)	(107,000)	0	0	0	0
Contribution to Vehicle & Plant Fund	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000
Bad debt provision	50,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Surplus/(deficit) - savings target	55,781	(0)	(280,162)	(894,197)	(1,169,875)	(1,228,121)	(1,328,133)
NET EXPENDITURE	10,348,714	10,789,745	9,722,580	9,506,309	9,726,541	9,957,268	10,196,642
Total Savings Target	5,781		(507,162)	(1,125,737)	(1,762,295)	(2,053,141)	(2,351,133)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ESTIMATES SUMMARY

	2018/19		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	Original	Revised	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£

Financed By:							
RSG	0	0	434,451	0	0	0	0
Business Rates Baseline	4,104,263	4,104,263	3,317,043	3,383,384	3,451,052	3,520,073	3,590,475
Settlement Funding	4,104,263	4,104,263	3,751,494	3,383,384	3,451,052	3,520,073	3,590,475
Retained Business Rates Growth	2,027,498	2,008,451	899,095	929,865	961,581	994,248	1,027,905
Business rate growth returned to pilot	(830,186)	0	0				
Business rate growth - Strategic Investment Fund contribution		(117,717)	0				
Business rate pooling	0	0	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
NNDR Fund Surplus/(Deficit)	(288,036)	(288,036)	(288,036)				
Contrib (to)/from Business Rate Reserve	252,391	0					
Council tax support grants to parishes	(33,071)	(33,071)	(26,456)	(19,841)	(13,226)	(6,611)	0
Council Tax Fund Surplus/(Deficit)	54,318	54,318	(2,770)				
New Homes Bonus	461,645	461,645	307,339	11,480	3,080	0	0
Council Tax (taxbase x tax below)	4,599,891	4,599,891	4,781,914	4,901,421	5,024,054	5,149,558	5,278,262
TOTAL FINANCING	10,348,714	10,789,745	9,722,580	9,506,309	9,726,541	9,957,268	10,196,642

Council Tax Income:							
Taxbase Growth				0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Taxbase Estimate	28,769.10	28,769.10	29,000.63	29,145.63	29,291.36	29,437.82	29,585.01
Tax increase	0		3.13%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%
Band 'D' Tax	159.89	159.89	164.89	168.17	171.52	174.93	178.41
Yield =- taxbase x Band 'D'	4,599,891	4,599,891	4,781,914	4,901,421	5,024,054	5,149,558	5,278,262

BR Growth Retention:							
Growth rate							
CBC 40% share of income (18/19 50% share of income)	18,114,220	18,114,220	14,853,660	15,225,002	15,605,627	15,995,767	16,395,661
Less tariff	(13,733,487)	(13,738,492)	(11,265,560)	(11,547,199)	(11,835,879)	(12,131,776)	(12,435,070)
Add s31 grant re SBRR	1,513,061	1,516,150	1,300,000	1,332,500	1,365,813	1,399,958	1,434,957
Add s31 grant re other reliefs	112,908	109,819	0	0	0	0	0
Gross income before levy	6,006,702	6,001,697	4,888,100	5,010,303	5,135,560	5,263,949	5,395,548
Less Baseline Funding	(4,104,263)	(4,104,263)	(3,317,043)	(3,383,384)	(3,451,052)	(3,520,073)	(3,590,475)
Growth	1,902,439	1,897,434	1,571,057	1,626,919	1,684,508	1,743,876	1,805,073
Levy (NB 50% on nndr3 not nndr 1)			(785,529)	(813,460)	(842,254)	(871,938)	(902,536)
S31 Grant - Switch to CPI Adj					0	0	0
Adjs to Levy & Tariff	(314,726)	(334,530)	(258,169)	(264,623)	(271,239)	(278,020)	(284,970)
Retained BR re renewable energy	30,430	30,430	31,340	32,124	32,937	33,761	34,605
Grant re Multiplier Cap	409,355	415,118	340,396	348,906	357,629	366,570	375,734
BR Growth Retained above Baseline	2,027,498	2,008,451	899,095	929,865	961,581	994,248	1,027,905
Add Baseline Funding	4,104,263	4,104,263	3,317,043	3,383,384	3,451,052	3,520,073	3,590,475
Total BR Income Retained	6,131,761	6,112,714	4,216,138	4,313,249	4,412,633	4,514,321	4,618,380